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_0827**
DATE	**27 August 2025, 10:00am**
LOCATION	**Microsoft Teams**

Attendee	Representing	Initials
Anne Jackson (Chair)	REC Code Manager	AJ
Nabaz Javonhari	BIP Group	NJ
Aleksis Butler	BUUK	AB
Craig Donohue	National Grid	CD
Amanda Monaghan	National Grid	AM
Laurie Edwards	Northern Gas Networks	LE
David Mitchell	Southern Gas Networks	DM
Paul Hart	Uk Power Networks	PH
Olga Batsari	Wales & West Utilities	OB
Alan Cookson	British Gas	AC
Dani Watt	British Gas	DW
Jennie Smy	Drax	JS
Jen Stevenson	E.ON	JS
Nicole Farrier	E.ON	NF
Shamil Udayar	E.ON	SU
Cathy Muliss	E.ON Next	CM
David Lewis	Scottish Power	DL
Oliver Kyriacou	Smartest Energy	OK

Claire Kane	SSE	CK
Carole Coleman	Tomato Energy	CC
Anne Stevens	UGP	AS
Ben Clark	Utilita	BC
Scott Manson	Seeka	SM
Gareth Evans	Waters WYE	GE
Alasdair Jenkins	Elexon	AJ
Lynne Fallon	Retail Energy Code Company	LF
Rebecca Lowe	Retail Energy Code Company	RL
Rosalind Timperley	REC Code Manager	RT
Andrew Waghorn	REC Code Manager	AW
Tom Stewart	REC Code Manager	TS
Annabel Ashworth	REC Code Manager	AA
Eve Marriner	REC Code Manager	EV
Flo Monea	REC Code Manager	FM
Francine Peyroux-Sissoko	REC Code Manager	FPS
James Hardy	REC Code Manager	JH
Mica Thomas	REC Code Manager	MT
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) and encouraged open discussion, engagement and questions. Slido was introduced as a tool for anonymous questions and gauging group sentiment. No formal apologies were received.

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 30 July 2025. There were no comments, and the minutes were approved as an accurate reflection of the meeting.

4 I0187 – SCHEDULE 8 REVIEW AND BEST PRACTICE GUIDANCE DEVELOPMENT

LF and RL provided an overview of I0187 – Schedule 8 Review and Best Practice Guidance Development, found on slides 6-23 of the meeting pack.

LF informed Members that 23 completed issues have been reviewed in the Schedule 8 matrix and cross-referenced with red-lined documents. Six outstanding issues were discussed in detail and feedback was requested from TIG members.

Members were asked via Slido to provide feedback on issues marked as complete and whether changes made had resolved these issues. All Slido responses received can be found in RECTIG_25_0827 – Slido Responses.

- Feedback received was that some issues are still not fully resolved.
- It had been previously discussed that, in regard to clause 6.6, Networks would only provide photographic evidence whilst at the site if it is safe to do so. LF noted there is a separate Issue raised on this matter: I0253 Theft - DNO/Networks not providing photos. RL noted any amendments to Schedule 8 on this matter should be consistent with the solution proposed within the above mentioned Issue.
- Clarity was asked on why clause 9.4's obligation on registration had been removed. LF clarified that clause 9.4 has not been removed, rather moved to a different section.
- Members raised that they have internal departments reviewing the changes to Schedule 8. LF and RL confirmed that they can still review the changes and provide written feedback by populating the Comments column in the TIG Review Table. These should be returned to theft@retailenergycode.co.uk.
- A point of clarity was raised regarding a situation where a Supplier refuses to share data with DNOs. LF clarified that if a Supplier refuses to share information requested for the purposes of paragraph 6, the DNO can point to it as a Service Level Agreement (SLA) obligation for Suppliers.

The first issue discussed was **Issue 2 – Options for Cut-off or Disconnection**:

- There were changes proposed to clauses 11.2, 11.3, and 18.9. These changes had been raised to clarify that the exercise of statutory powers is permitted if there is

evidence of relevant offences. However, this depends on the investigator knowing the legislation and/or knowing where to access this legislation. As such, Schedule 8 does not include a list of these offences.

- There was a discussion on whether service removal processes should be developed within or outside Schedule 8. These are shared as part of the Slido responses which can be found in RECTIG_25_0827 – Slido Responses.
- Feedback from TIG members highlighted the need for clearer guidance and training materials.

The next issues discussed were **Issue 5 and 28 – Reports:**

- Members agreed to include Theft in Conveyance in clause 2.1(d) and (e).
- There was support from TIG members for a definitive list of theft data and alignment with R0263 – Sharing Confirmed Energy Theft Data with the BSCCo.
- There were mixed views from members on whether data should be part of the Theft Detection Incentive Scheme (TDIS) or submitted separately. These are shared as part of the Slido responses which can be found in RECTIG_25_0827 – Slido Responses.

The next issue was discussed was on **Issue 13 – Section 5 Information Sources**

- There was a discussion around merging clauses 5.1 and 6.8 to streamline reporting processes. Members were in support of this merge.
- There was a discussion on the need for non-anonymous reporting channels and priority escalation routes. These are shared as part of the Slido responses which can be found in RECTIG_25_0827 – Slido Responses.
- Suggestions were made from members for industry-specific tip-off mechanisms. A Member noted that the benefit of a separate reporting process for Priority 1 jobs where the tip-off is from an industry expert is that it would stand out from reporting from ETTOS. It was suggested that this separate process have its own rules of engaging with industry.
- There was a discussion on the use of Secure Data Exchange Portal (SDEP), with some Members noting that this should be the channel all Parties use going forward. It is a secure way of reporting theft and providing detailed information across Parties and protects against data protection breaches.
- RECCo SMEs noted that the discussion showed there may be confusion around the use of ETTOS across industry and that Schedule 8 may need to be clearer on the use of ETTOS and other reporting channels.
- A Member asked when gas transporters will have access to SDEP. The Code Manager referred them to R0162 – Access to SDES for Gas Networks for further updates.

The next discussion was on **Issue 22 and 23 – Section 7 Response Times**:

- 7.4 and 7.5 are new paragraphs that have been added to define response times. Members agreed that these paragraphs were needed but disagreed with the proposed text. The majority of Members agreed that the PARC/TDIS submission should be updated.
- It was clarified that clause 7.10 has been introduced to allow for justified delays (e.g., police coordination).
- There was a debate on aligning gas and electricity response times. A Member noted that target response times need to be achievable and take into consideration the different complexities associated with different end uses. There was a suggestion that if gas and electricity response times are aligned, there may need to be a review of them in 6 months -1 year to ensure they are still appropriate and reflect operational reality.
- Another Member noted that, ultimately, timescales should be linked to risk.

Two further points of discussion were raised on next steps after this discussion on the timeline of I0187.

- RL clarified that the next steps would be for RECCo and the Code Managers to review the TIG's feedback and make changes to Schedule 8 as needed. There are still some outstanding queries that have yet to be finalised, so there will need to be another TIG session to discuss those.
- FM also noted that this change will be presented at Change Panel in September, with an updated timescale. The estimated date for completing the review of Schedule 8 is January, taking into account that all issues and proposed solutions have been addressed, TIG has been engaged, the redlined document completed and a legal review has been conducted.
- A Member noted that there will come a time for a review of the theft change process and TIG may not necessarily be the appropriate channel for that review.

The final discussion was on the feasibility of 90-day resolution targets.

- This discussion was raised in reference to clause 8.7.5, which discusses Theft in Conveyance and the 90-day resolution target for DNOs. Clarity was provided that this meant 90 days from when Energy Theft is discovered and thus includes investigation and resolution.
- LE raised that this was not a realistic target, noting that some of their investigations can take up to 12-18 months.
- RL noted that 90-days was chosen as this is the target for electricity Suppliers. RL further clarified that clause 7.10 outlines exceptions to the 90-day SLA.
- Members suggested rewording of clause 7.5 to reflect operational realities.
- PH noted that 90-days is not enough time to include de-energising the meters as well, especially as Theft in Conveyance is usually more technically complex. PH agreed that

there should be a resolution target, but 90-days would be too short. PH took the action to suggest a different target and provide written justification via email.

Action: RECTIG_25_0827_04_01 – PH to suggest a different target for the potential 90 day resolution target for DNOs, relating to Theft in Conveyance and provide written justification to RECCo.

- OK noted that Suppliers would also struggle with the 90-day SLA, especially noting that different approaches are taken in different parts of the country, and raised concerns about dealing with resistance from customers and non-domestic considerations (e.g. businesses need down-time).
- LF clarified that the 90-day SLA is only about getting a view of the meter and to determine that there is not an unsafe situation that could escalate into a major incident and is not an SLA for a full investigation. Furthermore, clause 7.10 should be the exception, not the rule.
- Members were encouraged to provide further feedback to theft@retailenergycode.co.uk.

5 ENERGY THEFT ENFORCEMENT SERVICE (ETES) PILOT – RAS REFERRALS

LF and RL provided an overview of the Energy Theft Enforcement Service (ETES) Pilot – Referral Assessment Service (RAS) referrals, found on slides 24-29 of the meeting pack.

LF informed Members the portal for the RAS referrals is expected to be implemented by the end of September 2025. LF encouraged Members to prepare cases under six different theft categories:

- Organised Groups
- Professional Enablers
- Rogue Landlords/Developers
- Cannabis Cultivation
- Cryptocurrency Mining
- Repeat Offenders
- Organised groups

Members were encouraged to email ras@retailenergycode.co.uk if they would like further information on the RAS.

6 ENERGY THEFT DASHBOARD UPDATES

AW and TS provided an overview of the Energy Theft Dashboard updates.

AW informed Members that the Energy Theft Dashboard enhancements include:

- ETTOS lead matching to investigations;

- Validation warnings and rejection logs;
- Enhanced reporting on unconfirmed cases;
- KPI tracking for confirmed thefts and energy volumes; and
- Historical data from 2024–25 will be seeded for trend analysis.

Further updates are to be expected following implementation of R0173 – Improvements to Theft Detection Incentive Scheme and R0259 – Updating the Implementation of R0173.

7 CHANGE UPDATE

FM provided an overview of the Change Update, found on slide 32 of the meeting pack.

No comments were received by Members on this agenda item.

8 FUTURE MEETINGS

The Chair informed Members next meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday, 24 September 2025**. Meetings will continue monthly on the last Wednesday of the month.

9 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No further business was discussed. The Chair reminded Members to submit feedback and share implementation concerns.

The Chair thanked attendees for their input and closed the meeting.