RETAIL ENERGY CODE

This document is classified as **WHITE**.
Information is for public, unrestricted dissemination and publication.

THEFT ISSUES GROUP
DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**RECTIG_25_0528**
DATE	**28 May, 09:30**
LOCATION	**Microsoft Teams**

Attendee	Representing	Initials
Anne Jackson (Chair)	REC Code Manager	AJ
Jenna Smith	Cadent Gas	JS
Laurie Edwards	Northern Gas	LE
Amanda Monaghan	Northern Gas	AM
David Mitchell	SGN	DM
Lisa Warnock	SGN	LW
Dani Watt	British Gas	DW
Rachel Thorpe	E.ON	RT
Cathy Mulliss	E.ON Next	CM
Alice Hooper	EDF	AH
Nicole Farrier	Npower	NF
Shamil Udayar	Npower	SU
Megan Cetera	Octopus	MC
David Lewis	Scottish Power	DL
Raquel Fernandes	SO Energy	RF
Charles Anarfi	SSE	CA
Victoria Burkett	SSE	VB
Danielle Gibson	SSE	DG

Claire Kane	SSE	CK
Carole Coleman	Tomato Energy	CC
Ben Clark	Utilita	BC
Alisdair Jenkins	Elexon	AJ
Aiyesha Andrade	Retail Energy Code Company	AA
Rebecca Lowe	Retail Energy Code Company	RL
Paul Sutherland	Retail Energy Code Company	PS
Rosalind Timperley	REC Code Manager	RT
Tirna Sen	REC Code Manager	TS
Andrew Waghorn	REC Code Manager	AW
Eve Marriner	REC Code Manager	EV
Andy Knowles	REC Code Manager	AK
Flo Monea	REC Code Manager	FM
Glenn Sheern	REC Code Manager	GS
Paul Witton-Dauris	REC Code Manager	PWD
James Rees (Secretary)	REC Code Manager	JR

1 WELCOMES AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the ninth meeting of the Theft Issues Group (TIG).

FM informed Members that Slido will be used for the TIG meeting, to help provide more collaboration and engagement. FM advised certain agenda items may raise specific questions that Members can ask anonymously, which could help Members feel more comfortable asking questions.

2 CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

RECTIG Members noted the contents of the agenda, no additional items of business were raised.

3 APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

The Chair invited attendees to provide comments on the draft minutes of the meeting held on 30 April 2025. There were no comments, and the minutes were approved as an accurate reflection of the meeting.

4 REVIEW OF ACTIONS LOG

The Chair provided Members with an overview of the below actions on the Action Log:

RECTIG_25_0129_08_02 – The Code Manager to reach out to DNO's to understand their appetite for receiving a report for settlement purposes. - Open

FM informed Members conversations are still taking place with DNO's around understanding their appetite to receive reports for the purpose of settlement.

VB asked if the REC are involved in the Balancing Settlement Code (BSC) working group for modification 117, as this is looking at Energy Theft and settlement. RL confirmed RECCo have representation at that working group.

RECTIG_25_0430_05_01 – **RECCo to circulate a draft agenda for the workshop to discuss the strategic review and prioritisation of theft project - Closed.**

FM informed Members that three potential dates have been selected for when the Energy Theft workshop will take place. FM advised these dates were, 25 June, 02 July and 10 July, with the Code Manager and RECCo's preference being 25 June. Further details can be found on slide 5 of the meeting pack.

5 SMART ALERT BACK TEST

TS provided Members with an overview Smart Alert Back Test, found on slides 7-12 of the meeting pack.

TS recapped the previous session on RECCO's Energy Theft pilot, highlighting the use of multiple data science techniques and machine learning models. TS highlighted the next phase involves building a working test detection model, training a predictive model, improving theft estimation methodology, and enabling smarter engagement.

RL informed Members that the analysis shows there is a clear opportunity to be able to identify target meters for investigation, using data from the detection. RL asked members for their thoughts on the next steps, is this a type of service Parties would find useful and what they think about the proof-of-concept stage.

LW noted it is much more beneficial to have targeted leads, rather than data driven leads. LW mentioned this will help obtain more evidence and will get better sign off from resources to attend these sites.

RL asked Members if their organisations were currently conducting anything similar internally. RL highlighted various different forms of data would be required from the industry and asked what Members thought around access to the data.

AG supported the proposal, however noted it is very dependant on the accuracy of data and quality of leads. AG noted the data should be available at industry level, and if it works according to the theory being presented, it will be beneficial for Parties.

TS informed Members that with the use of AI, they were able to navigate the data and the results were promising, with a 75% true positive capture rate.

CM highlighted this sounds like a good opportunity to help all Suppliers. CM asked how consumer consent is being considered. RL advised the analysis relied on legitimate interest under Data Protection provisions, due to the detection and prevention of crime. RL noted all the governance and due diligence behind it needs to be completed, however it doesn't rely on consumer consent. RL mentioned the impact on the consumer is minimal.

AH informed Members their organisation is currently trying a similar process internally. AH mentioned it is proving to be difficult, due to the amount of data involved and the accuracy of data.

RL asked Members for their thoughts on how the proof-of-concept stage will work. AG mentioned the proof of concept for Non-Domestic may look different to the Domestic one. RL asked if having a mixed user group of Domestic and Non-Domestic representatives would be beneficial. AW highlighted the patterns of data for both markets could be very different.

LE asked how the Change of Tenancy (CoT) element will work with this proposal. TS advised CoT data forms part of the proposal and will help populate the risks. LE mentioned these sorts of proposals usually target specific areas and groups of people. LE asked how this will be targeted across all areas. TS explained the current data is only reflecting what is being investigated and there is a bias of data. TS provided an overview of the different clusters of Energy Theft profiles, with the highest cluster being high crime/drug profile.

RL informed Members if they would like to be involved in this proposal and wish to provide any more feedback, they can email theft@retailenergycode.co.uk

6 I0175 – INTRODUCING A REASONABLE ENDEAVOURS SCHEME WITHIN IN THE REC

RL provided Members with an overview of I0175 – Introducing a Reasonable Endeavours Scheme within the REC. RL advised there will be a series of questions asked on Slido for this agenda item, with Members having the opportunity to answer them anonymously. The questions that were asked can be found on slides 13-20 of the meeting pack.

When asked if the paper provided was read, out of the seven responses received, two members voted 'Yes'. TIG members were then asked if there were any comments regarding the four criteria points outlined in the paper and included in BR02. No comments or questions were raised by TIG members.

FM advised a question had been asked on BR05: 'Do you have any comments on the requirements set for requesting compensation claims?'. FM noted one comment received regarding not all cases would require police input and the query on what is considered to be a technical expert. RL explained this will need to be defined as this is further developed. RL noted there are a variety of different ways a technical expert could be used. For example, if it is a

larger meter, a different level of engineer may be required, there may be a need to force entry in a certain way or additional support may be required for complexities on site. RL mentioned the importance of not limiting the scope of what the technical expert would be.

FM mentioned another question had been asked on Slido. The question was: Could the investigation timeline and outcome data come from TDIS (Theft Detection Incentive Scheme), rather than being reported separately in order to reduce duplication of work? RL highlighted there could be an addition to the TDIS files, with some of the report requirements being included in them.

LW asked if a Gas Transporter is required to attend any Supplier investigation, how would the costs be factored. RL advised this could be an area that needs fair practice exploration and is under discussion with the industry,

FM advised a question had been asked on BR10: 'Do you have any comments about the funding scheme as outlined in BR10?'. A query was received from one respondent regarding any estimates of the cost per Party and whether this scheme would be funded by both Suppliers and Networks. RL highlighted the concept is if a Supplier makes a claim for any complex investigations, the cost is split out between all Suppliers based on market share.

FM advised a comment had been raised on BR11: 'Do you have any comments on the application of transaction caps for each investigation stage?'. FM explained the comment was that one cap would make it simpler.

7 I0173 – IMPROVEMENTS TO TDIS (UPDATE)

PS provided Members with an overview of I0173 – Improvements to TDIS (Update), found on slides 21-24 of the meeting pack. FM mentioned that a question will be on Slido for Members to answer. The question is 'If an earlier implementation date option is preferred, which one of these dates should be targeted?'. FM advised the two dates Members are able to choose from are 27 June 2025 with an effective from date of 01 July 2025 (if the Change Process allows), with the second date being 01 October 2025.

All responses received from Members (nine) indicated the preferred date for R0173 implementation to be 01 October 2025.

FM informed Members a new Change Proposal will be raised to amend the implementation date of R0173, which will need to go through a formal Consultation process, giving industry the opportunity to provide their thoughts on the change.

8 CHANGE UPDATE

FM provided an overview of Change Update, which can be found on slide 26 of the meeting pack.

9 FUTURE MEETINGS

The Chair asked Members if they are finding TIG meetings useful and would be happy for them to continue, or if the Energy Theft topics can be incorporated within the generic change process.

VB advised they were happy with the current set up of the TIG and asked for them to continue as they are. Several TIG members agreed with this.

No further business was discussed. The Chair thanked attendees for their input and closed the meeting.