RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

THEFT ISSUES GROUP
DRAFT MEETING NOTES

MEETING	**RECTIG_25_0730**
DATE	**30 July, 10:00am**
LOCATION	**Microsoft Teams**

Attendee	Representing	Initials
Anne Jackson (Chair)	REC Code Manager	AJ
Aleksis Butler	BUUK	AB
Charlotte Gilbert	BUUK	CG
Laurie Edwards	Northern Gas	LE
Paul Hart	Uk Power Networks	PH
Olga Batsari	Wales & West Utilities	OB
Tom Stuart	Wales & West Utilities	TS
Joel Browne	British Gas	JB
Jennie Smy	Drax	JS
Colin Paine	Engie	CP
Martin Lane	EDF	ML
David Lewis	Scottish Power	DL
Oliver Kyriacou	Smartest Energy	OK
Charles Anarfi	SSE	CA
Danielle Gibson	SSE	DG
Claire Kane	SSE	CK
Carole Coleman	Tomato Energy	CC
Anne Stevens	UGP	AS

Ben Clark	Utilita	BC
Matt Cogram	Elexon	MC
Andrew Green	ICoSS Group	AG
Scott Manson	Seeka	SM
Tui Pirie	Octopus Energy	TP
Kirsty Maddock	National Grid Electricity Distribution	KM
Aiyesha Andrade	Retail Energy Code Company	AA
Ann Perry	Retail Energy Code Company	AP
Jon Dixon	Retail Energy Code Company	JD
Lynne Fallon	Retail Energy Code Company	LF
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	TSe
Tom Stewart	REC Code Manager	TS
Eve Marriner	REC Code Manager	EV
Holly Law	REC Code Manager	HL
James Hardy	REC Code Manager	JH
Mica Thomas	REC Code Manager	MT
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 meeting of the Theft Issues Group (TIG).

The Chair informed members that Slido would be used for the TIG meeting, to help provide more collaboration and engagement. The Chair 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 at the start of the meeting, although members were informed that they could raise AOB later if needed.

3 APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

The Chair invited attendees to provide comments on the draft minutes of the meeting held on 28 May 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. - Closed

JH provided an update on the action for the Code Manager to engage with Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) regarding settlement reporting. A meeting had taken place and a new reporting mechanism using confirmed Energy Theft data is being developed under the Schedule 8 review. TIG Members agreed to close this action.

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.**

The Chair advised the theft workshop took place on 10 July 2025 and the agenda had been circulated in advance of the workshop. TIG members agreed to close this action.

5 I0253 – THEFT DNO/NETWORKS NOT PROVIDING PHOTOS

MT provided an overview of I0253 – Theft DNO/Networks not providing photos, found on slides 7 & 8 of the meeting pack.

MT introduced issue I0253, which concerns the lack of photographic evidence provided by Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) and Gas Transporters (GTs) during site visits for suspected Energy Theft. Currently, there is no obligation for networks to take images of metering equipment when attending sites to make them safe. This absence of visual evidence prevents suppliers from confirming Energy Theft under Schedule 1 of the REC, which requires photographic or sketch evidence to qualify for the Theft Detection Incentive Scheme (TDIS).

The issue was previously raised in January and has since progressed through the change proposal process and the Change Panel. It is now in the solution development phase. A partial solution exists for electricity, while a gas solution is still being explored, with a target for a confirmed dual-fuel solution by August 2025. The change has a low priority rating due to minimal consumer impact and the limited operational adjustments required.

OK raised concerns about inconsistent DNO responses regarding site attendance. They have historically been told they need to book an appointment to resolve the pot-ends. However, they often get conflicting information from the DNO as they advise that it is the Agent that should be calling but occasionally when the Agent calls, there is a request that the Supplier should be calling. OK continued to advise that it would be good if there was something within the code that would allow for this process to be the same across the board. MT agreed to provide the code references relating to the DNO and Supplier processes and was happy to provide the referencing relevant to the Supplier and DNO working practices, but made it clear that there may not be a current outline for the process.

OB highlighted limitations in the Xoserve Contact Management System (CMS) used by gas networks, which does not support photo uploads. MT offered to liaise with internal teams to clarify how information flows to suppliers and suggested that enhancements to the system are planned but not yet implemented.

PH advised that there was a discussion around disconnecting properties to make them safe at a Revenue Protection Association session. It was determined that the Code was not clear on this and the messaging from DNOs has differed and has no clarity. PH asked if the Code can be reviewed as it needs to be clearer and more standardised. PH explained that if there is a genuine concern of safety at a site, they as the DNO will pot-end it. If there is a need to permanently disconnect then the work will become chargeable and require an appointment. They have a specific process of doing a temporary disconnection where the MPAN remains active, this is only currently something that UKPN offers for sites where there is Energy Theft.

CA asked whether DNOs are expected to send photos to the Supplier even if there is no Confirmed Energy Theft from the Supplier. MT clarified that while there is no current obligation, the definition of Confirmed Energy Theft requires Suppliers to have visual evidence. The change aims to address this gap and may result in a future code obligation.

LE advised that Suppliers often call the wrong team, they should be calling connections unless it is an emergency. However, this is rarely done. LE also noted that Northern Gas Networks cannot attach photos via CMS but offers them upon request via email, adding Suppliers rarely request these images from them although they are available to be provided.

GS added that discussions are ongoing with Xoserve to explore whether their systems could support photo sharing. They reiterated that the focus is on unplanned theft events, such as emergency site visits where there is Energy Theft, when pre-remediation photos are critical for TDIS eligibility as images of the site pot-ended does not show the tampered equipment.

NF raised a question about the use of the Secure Data Exchange Portal (SDEP) for image sharing and whether it would support dual-fuel. GS confirmed that dual-fuel support is being considered, though governance and security concerns around portal use remain.

Slido was used to gather member feedback on current practices, challenges, and suggestions. Responses indicated that image sharing is inconsistent, the confirmed theft process may be outdated, and suppliers face barriers in accessing necessary evidence.

The Chair confirmed that Slido would remain open for further input and thanked members for their contributions, which will inform the ongoing solution development. Slido results are outlined in Section 13 of these minutes.

6 I0265 – THEFT CALCULATOR USAGE AND SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT

AA provided an overview of I0265 – Theft Calculator Usage and Sustainability Assessment, found on slide 11 of the meeting pack.

AA introduced issue I0265, which aims to assess the usability and accessibility of the REC Theft Calculators for both electricity and gas. The issue was raised following limited engagement with previous consultations and a live derogation granted to a Party unable to use the calculator on their field devices.

The discussion highlighted that some Parties use alternative tools, such as those provided by Xoserve, and that there may be inconsistencies in tariff data and calculation logic. OB noted that their network typically uses the Xoserve calculator and raised concerns about its alignment with REC expectations. AA confirmed that the official REC calculators are available on the REC Portal and should be used in accordance with the Code.

TS added that their organisation is reviewing its calculator and would benefit from visibility of the REC version to ensure consistency. The Chair explained the original intent of the calculator was to standardise theft assessments across the industry, ensuring fairness and legal defensibility.

GS clarified that the REC Code mandates use of the Code Manager's calculator, and using alternatives may constitute a breach. However, the group emphasised that the purpose of the discussion was not to penalise Parties but to understand barriers and improve the tool.

TS added to the live chat during the meeting around using spreadsheets with macros enabled (the REC calculator spreadsheet has macros enabled). Their cyber team had received advice from government of the risk of macros within excel documents, which when run could provide a way into systems for a cyber criminal. WWU are working on solutions with 3rd parties to move away from macros.

Slido was used to gather anonymous feedback from members on:

- Whether they use the REC calculator.
- Barriers to access and usability.
- Suggestions for improvement.
- Whether alternative calculators are being used and why.

Responses indicated that issues span both the functionality of the tool and the data it uses. Some Members noted that the calculator feels outdated and may not reflect newer energy use

cases, such as electric vehicles. Others highlighted the need for more intuitive interfaces and better integration with field systems.

The Chair confirmed that Slido would remain open for further input and encouraged members to consult with colleagues and submit additional feedback. The Code Manager will use this input to inform solution development and determine whether updates or alternative validation methods are needed. Slido results are outlined in Section 13 of these minutes.

7 VALIDATING ALTERNATIVE ENERGY THEFT CALCULATION METHODS

RT provided a verbal overview of Validating Alternative Energy Theft Calculation Methods.

RT advised this was a second update about Energy Theft calculators. One Party has raised a concern because the current calculator doesn't work on their field operative's tablets. The Performance Assurance Board (PAB) approved their request to use a different calculation method and asked for that method to be checked to make sure it gives the same results as the official calculator.

Although only one Party has formally asked to use an alternative, it looks like other Parties might be doing the same. To ensure fairness, it's suggested that all alternative methods should be validated, not just the ones with formal approval.

Before moving forward, the Group will need to decide if this approach makes sense and gather more details about the different methods being used. Therefore, the plan to discuss validation at TIG will be paused until there's more clarity. Once more information is available, the topic will be revisited with Performance Assurance Board (PAB).

The group agreed to pause further discussion until the theft calculator issue progresses, and more information is available. Members were invited to share feedback via email technicalenquiries@recmanager.co.uk to support future validation planning.

8 UPDATE FOLLOWING ENERGY THEFT WORKSHOP

JD provided Members with an update following the Energy Theft workshop, which took place on 10 July 2025.

JD advised that the Energy Theft Workshop took place at Cadent offices, which included a mix of presentations and collaborative discussions. The agenda was shared in advance, was made available on the RECCo website and the session aimed to facilitate face-to-face dialogue on key issues.

One of the main updates was the confirmation from Ofgem regarding the approval of REC Change Proposal R0233 and R0234, which establishes the Energy Theft Unit and the Energy Theft Referral Assessment Service (RAS). This was a significant milestone and was briefly discussed during the session.

JD explained to members that Cadent presented their ongoing work to combat Gas Theft, particularly highlighting the safety risks and their proactive media outreach. They have been working closely with the BH&P marketing agency and have reused materials from the Stay Safe campaign.

BH&P's marketing team gave a presentation on their strategic approach, messaging, and insights gathered from the campaign. This presentation is available on the RECCo website for further reference.

ELEXON provided an update on BSC Issue 117, which aims to address the challenges in reporting Energy Theft and other non-technical losses within settlement processes. A key concern is the disincentive for suppliers to self-report due to retrospective wholesale charges. This issue is being tackled through proposed REC changes under the Reasonable Endeavours Scheme, which aims to extend legacy gas-only arrangements into a dual-fuel retail solution. The goal is to offset both investigation costs and wholesale impacts for gas and electricity.

The afternoon session focused on reviewing the contents of a RECCo White Paper, which had been circulated prior to the meeting. The day concluded with a Q&A session featuring representatives from ELEXON, REC, BH&P, Cadent and the Code Manager.

Attendees were encouraged to follow up with questions or provide additional feedback, especially if they were present at the session and had further insights to share.

JD also provided a brief update on developments within the Energy Theft Unit. Further discussions with the City of London Police have revealed that a government White Paper on policing reform is expected imminently. Although originally announced by the Home Secretary in November with a summer release target, the exact timeline remains uncertain.

This reform could significantly impact how police services are structured across the UK, potentially altering national responsibilities for certain crimes. The City of London Police, currently the lead force for economic fraud and cyber-crime, may see changes to their remit. These reforms could influence their ability to commit to non-traditional activities, such as supporting the Energy Theft Unit.

Despite this uncertainty, the City of London Police remain committed to collaborating with the industry to establish a short-term initiative addressing Energy Theft. The team is seeking support from stakeholders to identify cases suitable for referral, particularly those involving organised crime, such as Meter Tampering linked to cannabis cultivation or the sale of meter bypass devices. These cases often fall outside the scope of traditional police priorities and industry capabilities.

To build a strong proof of concept, the team encourages stakeholders to share relevant cases or assist in developing referral criteria. This will help gather evidence and demonstrate the organised nature of these crimes. While long-term arrangements depend on the forthcoming White Paper, momentum is building for a pilot scheme.

Stakeholders willing to contribute are asked to contact the team via the theft email account theft@retailenergycode.co.uk.

9 WHITE PAPER DISCUSSION

JD provided Members with an update on the White Paper.

JD advised during the recent face-to-face workshop, attendees were divided into five groups, each assigned one of the substantive chapters from the draft White Paper. Each group reviewed their chapter, discussed the positives and negatives, and shared the feedback in a

plenary session. This feedback has been captured and will be incorporated into the next version of the paper, alongside any additional input received during the current session or via email.

JD explained that the version of the White Paper circulated with the TIG Papers was the original draft shared with workgroup attendees. No changes have yet been made based on the workshop, but all feedback will be considered before publication. While the document has been referred to as a "White Paper" for several months, there is recognition that this may not be the most appropriate title. Alternatives, such as Theft Strategy Proposals Paper or similar, may be considered, as the document outlines substantive proposals intended to support long-term Energy Theft reduction efforts.

It was noted that some operational suggestions, such as updates to the calculator, are being handled through business-as-usual processes and are not included in this paper. The focus remains on more strategic items that may require formal consultation to determine whether they should be progressed as standalone projects or integrated into existing workstreams.

JD advised that incentives remain a major concern in tackling Energy Theft. The current structure can create a perverse incentive for suppliers to overlook theft, as costs may be socialised. The Theft Detection Incentive Scheme (TDIS) has undergone several changes, with the most recent Modification R0173 which was approved by Ofgem in late May. This change introduces incentives for site visits and desktop investigations, even when theft is not confirmed, aiming to encourage broader supplier participation.

Despite these changes, some suppliers remain disengaged, possibly due to economic considerations or lack of theft evidence in their portfolios. Further engagement between the Performance Assurance Board (PAB) and suppliers is needed to understand and address this.

JD advised members that Ofgem has emphasised that suppliers have obligations to actively participate in Theft Detection, and R0173 reinforces this expectation. The scheme's implementation date has been moved to 1 October 2025, rather than the originally intended 1 April. As a result, no further substantive changes to the scheme are planned until April 2027. Data will be collected during this period to inform future decisions.

A short consultation will be held on the Theft Target Methodology, primarily to revise theft values in line with inflation. However, no major changes to the scheme itself are anticipated in the near term.

While no substantive changes are planned for the Theft Detection Incentive Scheme during the 18-month period ending March 2027, there are opportunities to introduce complementary initiatives. One such proposal is the implementation of a Reasonable Endeavours Scheme (RES). This would allow suppliers to claim for exceptional investigations that fall outside the scope of standard incentive scheme values. Discussions are ongoing with stakeholders regarding how these claims could be backed off at the retail level and integrated into settlement processes.

A report by Capgemini on the use of smart meter data and tamper alerts has been produced but not yet published. Capgemini previously presented high-level findings, and discussions have taken place with DESNZ and other bodies to explore support for progressing this work. A key challenge remains access to sufficient data to conduct meaningful trials. To date, data has been provided voluntarily by a limited number of suppliers, making it difficult to scale pilot projects.

Recent legislative changes, including the Data Use and Access Act signed in June, may help facilitate broader access to smart energy data. The next step may involve securing data access through a formal governance framework, potentially supported by DESNZ, Ofgem, or through code modifications. Discussions with the Smart Energy Code (SEC) are underway to explore enabling direct data sharing with the Code Body for theft-related analytics.

The paper will also seek feedback on the future role of the Code Body in Smart Meter data analytics. One option is for the Code Body to focus solely on establishing governance and methodology, leaving suppliers and third parties to conduct the analytics and generate insights. This reflects a broader consultation on whether a centralised service is necessary or if a more decentralised approach would be more effective.

The concept of a Theft Detection Resolution Body has been discussed extensively and may form part of the broader strategy. JD advised that a proposal has been put forward within the Theft Issues Group (TIG) to centralise the procurement of revenue protection teams and field services. The White Paper presents a balanced view of this proposal, outlining both its advantages and potential drawbacks. The aim is to gather sufficient feedback through consultation to determine whether the proposal should be further developed either within TIG or through another forum or whether there is insufficient industry appetite to pursue it.

JD explained that the insights from the establishment of the Energy Theft Units highlighted a significant decline in prosecutions since 2016, when Ofgem removed the two-year inspection mandate from supplier licences. This was intended to be replaced by supplier-led risk-based inspection policies. However, there is currently no visibility of these policies, suggesting a lack of coordination and transparency across the industry.

JD explained that the White Paper explores options to address this gap, including:

- Consolidating existing risk-based approaches to create a consistent industry-wide framework.
- Mandating a more uniform inspection approach, potentially codified through industry standards.

Such measures could improve theft detection and provide continuity when sites change suppliers, ensuring that assets have undergone complete inspection and reducing the need for reassessment. By integrating inspection data with other indicators such as historical theft flags the industry may be able to overcome challenges in maintaining a centralised record of known fraudsters. Previous attempts to establish a register similar to those used in the insurance sector, were deemed unfeasible due to data sensitivity concerns.

The White Paper explores the potential benefits of creating an industry-wide asset risk register. This register would not be limited to theft-related risks but could also include factors such as asset age, manufacturer-specific issues (e.g. faulty meter batches), and other supply point vulnerabilities. The aim is to provide a more comprehensive view of risks associated with supply points, which could support better decision-making across the industry.

JD advised that the chapter on objections builds on commitments made under Change R0155, particularly regarding change of tenancy and the appropriate use of objections. The paper revisits the idea—previously consulted on by Ofgem—of allowing suppliers to object to a switch if a live theft investigation is underway. While this was generally supported, concerns remain

about potential misuse. The paper proposes safeguards, such as defining a reasonable investigation period and linking objections to formal reporting, to ensure legitimacy and prevent abuse.

The paper also considers physical and manual interventions to reduce repeat offending, such as engineering changes to meters or meter housings to make tampering more difficult. This idea was first raised in the 2022 Theft Workgroup and is now being revisited with a view to potentially running trials under REC governance.

Finally, the White Paper proposes improved knowledge sharing across the industry. This includes both operational best practices and academic research. The paper suggests curating a library of such resources and making them accessible via the REC portal to support industry-wide learning and innovation.

CP raised concerns regarding the recent changes to the TDIS, specifically the inclusion of needing to complete both desktop and site visits. While the changes were welcomed, they currently have limitations to cases originating from the Energy Theft Tip Off Service (ETTOS). This is a significant limitation, particularly for organisations that receive few tip-offs or theft leads from ETTOS. RL clarified that site visit changes are not limited to ETTOS. CP suggested revisiting the scope of the scheme to broaden its applicability and improve its overall effectiveness.

Additionally, CP expressed interest in the proposals related to Meter Inspections. Since Ofgem's 2016 decision to remove the two-year inspection mandate, suppliers have struggled to interpret what is expected under the risk-based approach now referenced in legislation. The relevant requirements are perceived as unclear and buried within broader health and safety regulations. CP emphasised the need for greater clarity and consistency in expectations, advocating for a balanced approach that manages risk without imposing overly burdensome obligations.

JD provided clarification and further reflections on the scope of change R0173. JD noted that the limitation to ETTOS applies specifically to desktop investigations, whereas site investigations initiated through other means, such as proactive analysis are still eligible under the scheme. The restriction was introduced to manage volume and ensure a clear, auditable trail for desktop leads, which ETTOS provides.

It was also noted that the scheme's effectiveness will be reviewed during its initial 18-month run, with a post-implementation evaluation planned to assess whether the inclusion of site and desktop investigations is delivering the intended outcomes. If not, the scheme may revert to focusing solely on confirmed theft cases.

10 CHANGE UPDATE

MT provided Members with the Change Update, which can be found on slides 17 & 18 of the meeting pack.

Summarised below:

- R0173 (TDIS improvements) is awaiting implementation, with R0259 raised to update its implementation date.

- I0175 (Reasonable Endeavour Scheme) and I0176 (Theft Detection and Resolution Body) are in assessment.
- I0187 (Schedule 8 review) is in legal drafting.
- R0212 (Crime Stoppers protection) is awaiting implementation.
- I0253 (DNOs not providing photos) and I0265 (Theft calculator assessment) were discussed in this meeting and are progressing.
- R0225, R0233, and R0234 were implemented on 27 June 2025.

No questions were raised on the update.

11 FUTURE MEETINGS

The Chair explained calendar invites have been sent to Members for the next 12 months, with future TIG meetings scheduled for the last Wednesday of the calendar month.

12 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

13 SLIDO RESPONSES

Slido responses for I0253 Theft DNO/Networks not providing photos:

Question	Response
Do members currently receive images from DNOs/GTs ?	Not normally, even the information that we get is very vague and hard to understand. When photos are requested they do not have anything at all in most cases.
	Not consistently.
	As a DNO we do send photos upon request
	We are a network not applicable for WWU
	Not all the time, but only a small handful are received
	N/A as I am from a DNO, and we do send photos.
	Sometimes
	No

Do members think this is currently a problem with both fuels?	More likely with electricity (non-domestic perspective)
	No
	N/A
	Yes
	Mostly electricity, gas GTs much better
What are members views of the current Confirmed Energy Theft process?	That a photo is required to select confirm theft
	DNOs notify suppliers within 1 WD as per obligation.
	Feels outdated, there should be more updated and live reporting system used
	A little disjointed
	na
Are members actively using SDEP for Data Transfers when sharing images?	I do but I do t get any from anyone else
	No, tends to be email (non-domestic)
	WWU as a gas transporter does not have access to SDEP we would love acess
	Yes
	This is being trialled for internal ops reasons, but we will be looking to move over to this permanently very soon.
	No
Does the issue of DNOs not providing images directly impact suppliers and their ability to make a TDIS claim?	I does make it harder to categorise
	Yes. If the site is “made good” and no photo is taken of the tampered state, we have no evidence to make a claim.
	N/A as I am from a DNO, and we do send photos.
	Yes
	yes absolutely, not able to claim as confirmed theft or assess any losses, settle etc.

Are there any other issues you would like the Code Manager to consider as part of this solution?	No comment
	Obligated DNO's,GT's to provide captured evidence - photos and witness statements
	NO

Slido Responses for I0265 – Theft Calculator Usage and Sustainability Assessment

Question	Response
Do you use the REC provided tools for theft assessments ?	Yes (50%)
	No (50%)
If not, what is stopping you from using it?	We use our own (supplier) data as we find it is the most accurate method.
	We do use the calculators but we sometimes have to wait for a long time for a mac-friendly version. We have even had to buy PCs just to do the calculators. It would be much more efficient to create an all-systems friendly calculator
	Tried early on. Found poor. Gave up.
	We use tong test results from physical site visits
	We are coming across more and more tampers jobs that are not covered by the calculator
	Other tools already used
	We use a TOG calculator provided by XOSERVE (gas network). I have now been given the link for the REC one to review and see if it is best to utilise.
	Each site is looked at individually

If you don't use the REC Theft Assessment Calculators, what tool or method do you use?	N/A we use the calculators
	A variety depending on situation and data held.
	Purpose built excel documents which we find information from online as to average usage per hour.
	Elexon profile class and yearly consumptions Historical consumption
	As noted above, gas network (WWU) we use the Theft of Gas calculator provided via XOSERVE.
	Yes (33%)
	No (67%)
What are your current experiences and challenges with the REC Theft Assessment Calculators?	Not our 1st choice method.
	Typically they are used with the ft calculator and only used for equipment that is deemed as high users.
	It everything is cover If you don't have the information doesn't have a true reflection
	I struggle to use the theft calculator as I am not provided the details of the equipment at site to be able to fill in the boxes so I have to guess
	To be reviewed after we assess the link provided by the REC (Gas network)
What changes would make it easier for you to use?	Mac friendly Fewer steps and pages An understanding of the logic behind the calculator I would recommend an online tool or something similar. The calculators are outdated and clunky
	Adding more business types and equipment that are high electrical users like sunbeds
	Being able to input own information, equipment
	To be reviewed after we assess the link provided by the REC (Gas network)