REC SUPPLIER OF LAST RESORT (SOLR) WORK GROUP
MEETING 2 - MEETING NOTES

DATE	**29 January 2026 (10:00 – 12:00)**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Glenn Sheern	REC Code Manager	GS	Subject Matter Expert
James Hardy	REC Code Manager	JH	Chair / Senior Change Lead

Full attendee list available upon request.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the second Supplier of Last Resort (SoLR) Workgroup meeting and thanks members for their patience since the first meeting and continued engagement as the group progresses further analysis of the SoLR process.

2. AGREEMENT OF LAST MEETING NOTES

The meeting notes from the first session were agreed, subject only to a minor organisational correction. No other comments were raised.

3. RECAP OF FIRST SESSION

JH provided an overview of the discussions held during the first Workgroup meeting. JH reiterated the REC's core objectives during SoLR events, which include ensuring a smooth and coherent transition for Consumers, maintaining the protection and integrity of Consumer data, and equipping the Gaining Supplier with the information they need to onboard customers effectively. JH also reminded members of the need to minimise knock-on impacts across the wider REC, including CSS, EES, GES, SDES and ETOS.

The workgroup revisited the difference in responsibilities held by the REC and Ofgem, particularly in relation to licence conditions. JH highlighted that Schedule 19 of the REC remains the primary source of SoLR process requirements, although additional schedules, for example, those relating to Prepayment Meters, may also be affected depending on circumstances. JH confirmed that following Meeting 1, the Code Manager had been tasked with exploring the feasibility of codifying SoLR processes across CSS, MHHS, Smart and traditional industry systems.

4. CONSUMER CONSIDERATIONS

The workgroup held an extended discussion on Consumer-related issues, focusing heavily on the practical challenges that arise during SoLR events.

Members noted that Switching freezes frequently occur at the point a failing Supplier's certificates are revoked. This can leave Consumers who are in the middle of a Switch unable to proceed, sometimes for extended periods. The group discussed the wider problem of misaligned certificate and process triggers across DCC, SEC, CSS and the MHHS Programme, which can cause operational friction and unnecessary delay.

Administrators were another area of focus. The group reflected that administrators are often involved before a replacement Supplier has even been appointed, yet many existing processes assume that the Gaining Supplier is already in place. This misalignment has resulted in data loss, confusion and inconsistent handover practices, particularly where administrators shut down operations quickly.

Concerns were also raised about the variability in how SDEP messages are handled. Members reported different levels of visibility and inconsistent handling of historic or outstanding queries, such as cross-meter issues and Erroneous Switches. Many noted that limited or delayed data at the point of SoLR, particularly configuration data and information relating to PPM portfolios, can cause significant onboarding errors and affect tariff allocation.

Members also discussed the experience of Consumers with 'mid-journey' issues, including open disputes or unregistered flows, where there remains a lack of clarity about next steps. In addition, the identification of export MPANs and non-standard supply configurations continues to be inconsistent, making early action difficult.

5. REC REQUIREMENTS

JH presented the REC SoLR Requirements spreadsheet that was circulated in advance of the meeting and discussed the non-reporting items. The key themes of discussion are noted below.

5.1. USER ACCESS AND MAU CONCERNS

Members revisited the recent experience with Rebel Energy, where the early revocation of access credentials prevented staff from accessing EES and SDEP. There was interest in whether MAU ownership could be transferred to the gaining supplier; however, the group was informed that this is not currently technically possible due to existing restrictions on duplicate MAUs.

5.2. SWITCHING TIMELINES

Clarification was provided regarding REC Switching obligations. Initiation must occur within five Working Days of receiving the necessary data, although the end-to-end switch is permitted to take up to three months unless the Performance Assurance Board grants an extension. Members agreed that late or incomplete data often undermines the ability to meet these expectations, especially in large or complex portfolios.

5.3. SDEP STANDARDISATION

The workgroup expressed a strong desire for greater consistency in the SDEP process. Members commented that approaches to message management, user access and the handling of archived records differ significantly between organisations. The option to transfer SDEP queries exists but is not well understood, and the cost of optional reporting remains a barrier for some Suppliers.

5.4. REDUCING RELIANCE ON THE FAILING SUPPLIER

There was unanimous agreement that reliance on the failing supplier during SoLR events should be minimised to the greatest extent possible. Staff departures, loss of system access and a general lack of industry knowledge among administrators all contribute to fragility in the process.

5.5. ADMINISTRATOR BEHAVIOUR

Members described wide variations in administrator capability and engagement. While some administrators retain essential staff and work collaboratively, others close operations immediately, creating significant Consumer and system detriment. The group agreed that clearer expectations, potentially developed jointly with Ofgem, would be beneficial.

5.6. BEST PRACTICE GUIDANCE DOCUMENT

There was broad support for developing a REC Best Practice Guide that would bring greater consistency across Energy Suppliers, DNOs/GTs, administrators and Service Providers. Any guidance would need to complement Schedule 19 without duplicating or contradicting formal requirements.

JH confirmed that the Code Manager would begin to draft a Guidance Document and an update will be shared at the next working group meeting.

5.7. MPID OWNERSHIP IN EES

The group discussed the issue of historical data appearing to transfer to the gaining supplier when MPIDs change hands. Members felt that this can create confusion and recommended exploring the possibility of recording ownership dates within EES.

5.8. EXPORT MPANS AND COMPLEX CREATIONS

Members expressed that identifying export MPANs early in the SoLR process remains difficult. The group suggested that this should be integrated into standard reporting to reduce missed cases.

5.9. NEW CONNECTIONS AND UNREGISTERED MPANS

Members reiterated the ongoing challenge of MPANs that become stuck in the CSS or DNO processes. These issues can stall customer registration and, in some cases, delay MHHS qualification activities. Members expressed the need for clearer escalation and resolution pathways.

5.10. PREPAYMENT REQUIREMENTS

JH and GS provided a brief introduction to the PPM related requirements. JH confirmed that these four related PPM requirements would be discussed as part of the reporting requirements at the next working group meeting.

6. REPORTING PREPERATIONS

GS explained that the REC currently mandates only a limited set of reporting requirements. Under the existing framework, the Authority is responsible for providing the initial MPAN list, while DNOs and GES must supply portfolio data as early as reasonably possible. The replacement Supplier is required to submit its migration plan, and the Code Manager is then responsible for monitoring progress throughout the process.

Several gaps were identified in the current reporting arrangements, including the absence of any mandated CSS report, the lack of EES migration reporting, the absence of a standardised data specification, and the fact that there is no alignment across systems such as CSS, MHHS and Smart.

The group agreed that the next meeting would therefore focus on opportunities to standardise reporting, improve data quality, establish a clear master data source, and consider the implications of the new MHHS arrangements.

7. AOB AND NEXT STEPS

The Chair invited items of any other business. No additional items were raised.

JH provided an overview of the next steps and actions and confirmed that he Code Manager will begin exploring alignment opportunities across DCC, SEC, CSS and MHHS on certificate management, and will also engage with Ofgem on clarifying expectations for administrator behaviour.

The Code Manager will also commence on developing a draft Best Practice Guide, reviewing the feasibility of tracking MPID ownership dates in EES, and incorporating missing requirements, such as MHHS migration reporting, into the consolidated list.

8. NEXT MEETING AND CONTACT

The next meeting is planned for Thursday 12 March 2026 (10:00 – 12:00), with pre-meeting papers due to be circulated by 05 March 2026.

Any queries, or further feedback can be directed to the Code Manager via the standard enquiries and change management mailboxes, as well the relevant Senior Change Lead and Subject matter expert, below.

- enquiries@recmanager.co.uk;
- Change.management@recmanager.co.uk;
- Glenn.sheern@recmanager.co.uk; and
- James.hardy@recmanager.co.uk.