UK Government

Consumer-led flexibility: consumer engagement

Consultation response

Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2026)

Contents

Executive summary

Strategic context

As set out in the Clean Power 2030 Action Plan[1], a significant increase in clean flexibility is critical to reaching Clean Power in 2030. The government set out its vision for a flexible energy system in the July 2025 Clean Flexibility Roadmap[2], which contained commitments from DESNZ, Ofgem, and NESO, as well as a governance framework to sustain momentum beyond publication. Since publication, the government has appointed Cathy McClay as Flexibility Commissioner to accelerate flexibility delivery across boundaries. And alongside this document, the government has published a Roadmap Update, setting out progress over the last year and committing to new actions to maintain ambition. The publication of the current document fulfils one of the 102 commitments made a year ago.

A key element of the Roadmap is setting the pathway for increasing CLF which involves the voluntary shifting of electricity use to times when supply is more abundant, cheaper, and cleaner, and away from peak periods. Transitioning to a clean, flexible electricity system will bring numerous benefits. The energy system will become more cost-effective by utilising low-cost renewable energy. By using flexibility to reduce peak demand and network constraints we will require less grid infrastructure, which will help to minimise consumer bills. Consumers who directly participate in CLF have the potential to save more, for example, smart charging of electric vehicles can already save typical EV drivers around £330 per year[3].

Alongside a range of work to ensure that the right infrastructure is in place for CLF, set out in the Clean Flexibility Roadmap, an effective approach to consumer engagement is essential, as CLF is a voluntary activity and ultimately relies on consumers being informed and willing to participate.

Government's CLF consumer engagement consultation

Our July 2025 consultation on CLF consumer engagement[4] sought feedback on the best approach to engage consumers in CLF to help optimise and sustain uptake over the long term. In doing so, it sought to determine the appropriate role for government and other organisations as a part of that. It explored what should be in scope for core activities of any potential CLF consumer engagement framework, with four potential scope components set out for feedback. On the industry-facing side, the functions related to the case for some coordination of industry and on standards; on the consumer-facing side, the focus was on the provision of advice and communications for consumers.

[1] Clean Power 2030 Action Plan - GOV.UK
[2] Clean flexibility roadmap - GOV.UK
[3] Default energy tariffs for households: call for evidence - GOV.UK
[4] Consumer-led flexibility: consumer engagement - GOV.UK

The consultation made no firm assumptions on the viability of continuing with current arrangements, where information and awareness on CLF is available organically via multiple actors, including energy suppliers, third party intermediaries, trade associations and consumer advocacy groups. Instead, it sought to test the potential that, as CLF matures, the continuation of this organic approach to consumer engagement may carry risks of increasing fragmentation, with increasing complexity, incoherence or confusion for consumers. This could in turn risk lower uptake of CLF. The consultation did not assume that intervention must take place but asked a number of open questions to explore the case for any intervention relative to the status quo.

Key decisions and actions

Government received 62 responses to this consultation, with a very wide range of input, which will provide a valuable resource for the development of policy going forward. However, it did not provide a clear consensus on gaps, levels of intervention or timing across the questions posed in this consultation. Nor did it provide compelling evidence for medium-high levels of intervention in the current market-led engagement model.

In light of this, the government believes that it is appropriate to opt for a lighter touch approach to intervention in relation to these proposals, therefore we do not intend to take forward a formal consumer engagement framework at this time. In relation to the specific functions discussed in the consultation, the government proposes the following proportionate actions, with greater degrees of intervention to be kept under review as the CLF market develops.

- **Coordination:** the government acknowledges the range of extant fora but believes that there is a role for a new CLF consumer engagement forum, to reflect the level of interest and diversity of opinion on this subject, with the aim of supporting an appropriate degree of coherence in the market on the engagement of consumers on CLF. This new forum will be led by Ofgem, with support from government, and will be a lower intervention option, e.g. biannual, to be convened from Autumn 2026. Leadership of the new CLF consumer engagement forum will sit with Ofgem given their remit across retail market regulation, load control licensing, and their general consumer protection role.

  Standards: the government is cognisant of extant and incoming measures cited by respondents, including Ofgem's general role on consumer protection, the voluntary Flex Assure and Home Flex schemes[5], and the incoming SSES Programme load control licensing regime[6]. The government intends to take no firm additional action on CLF engagement standards and regulation at this time beyond the introduction of load control licence responsibilities, aside from working with Ofgem to explore the case for a degree of standardisation of CLF terminology as a voluntary measure. This position will be kept under review, including via the proposed CLF consumer engagement forum in its role as a channel for any gaps to be made known.

- **Advice:** the government believes that there is value in taking forward a lower intervention approach to information provision on CLF, to provide general framing for consumers on the array of information on CLF from a wide range of bodies across industry and society. The

[5] Flex Assure
[6] Smart Secure Electricity Systems (SSES) Programme: draft load control licence regulations and conditions - GOV.UK

intention would be to provide trusted channels for consumers to find out more about CLF in general terms, so as to foster a baseline of consistent understanding for consumers to engage in a vibrant and competitive CLF market. Government will continue to seek opportunities to integrate information on CLF into government-led initiatives to support the uptake of relevant technologies, including via the development an enhanced impartial digital-first service launching in 2026 for home retrofit advice, and will work with consumer organisations over 2026 to consider the expansion of advice provision to include general information on CLF.

- **Communications:** Government acknowledges that timing is key for national communications on CLF. The CLF market is evolving rapidly, with industry continuing to develop and innovate in its approach to consumer engagement. Government therefore acknowledges that the case for broader national communications will depend on how the market develops, beyond targeted campaigns already being delivered for specific technologies, such as those run by Smart Energy GB.[7] We will keep the case for forms of national communications on CLF under review, including via the new CLF consumer engagement forum, and for the immediate term we will continue to work to ensure CLF is brought out in government-led initiatives noted above, to help forge a wider narrative on the opportunities CLF can provide.

Government acknowledges a concern for inclusion of different consumer groups in CLF as it develops, as a strong theme from respondents. The responses to this consultation have provided a strong evidence base that will remain useful in the development of policy on CLF. Government will use the responses to inform the work already in progress to identify measures to define and support inclusion, as set out in the Clean Flexibility Roadmap.

Wider policy landscape

These actions will be taken forward in line with a range of other work within government which is relevant to consumer engagement for CLF.

Measures specific to consumer engagement:

The roll out of smart meters is part of the national infrastructure upgrade needed to achieve our mission to build a flexible and decarbonised power system by 2030. Smart Energy GB is responsible for the national public engagement campaign for the rollout of smart meters in Great Britain and continues to undertake a range of activity to promote smart meters to consumers, including by highlighting the consumer benefits of participating in CLF, where smart meters, alongside the implementation of Market Wide Half Hourly Settlement[8], act as enablers for new products and services, such as “time of use” tariffs.

The Government will continue to provide advice and support to make it easier for consumers to switch to low carbon heating, including the “Find Ways to Save Energy in your Home” tool[9], which provides tailored advice to consumers on clean heat and energy efficiency upgrades,

[7] Smart meters for homes and businesses | Smart Energy GB
[8] Electricity suppliers are required to buy enough energy from generators to meet their consumers’ needs in each half-hour period, and ‘settlement’ is the process for determining whether what they bought matched what their customers used. The rollout of smart meters, which record the amount of energy consumed in each half-hour period, means information about customers’ actual half-hourly consumption, can be used in settlement instead of estimates, where the consumer has given their consent. This will incentivise suppliers to offer smarter solutions to consumers, such as “time of use” tariffs.
[9] Find ways to save energy in your home - GOV.UK

and the “Heat Pump Home Suitability tool”[10], which helps consumers to compare heat pump options for their home. In September last year we relaunched the Boiler Upgrade Scheme campaign[11] to promote the benefits of heat pumps and the Scheme, which provides grants to property owners to help them save money on the cost of a heat pump.

Government-led advice and information services are being strengthened, including via the development of the Warm Homes Agency and starting with an enhanced impartial digital-first service launching in 2026 for home retrofit advice. This will explain suitable measures, help users find funding and check eligibility, identify trusted local installers, and signpost green finance options. In England, a national phoneline will remain available for householders needing additional or specialised support. Appropriate information on CLF will be incorporated into this service.

The government has published the first UK wide climate and nature participation plan, “Energising Britain: Your voice in our Clean Energy Superpower Mission”[12]. This sets out how we will work with businesses and communities across the country to help people to access the opportunities and benefits of the transition to clean energy. A key goal of the plan is to ensure that people have the information and resources that they need to access the full range of benefits that the mission is creating.

Broader measures that support consumer engagement:

Government recently published Smart Secure Electricity Systems (SSES) Programme consultations on first phase energy smart appliances (ESAs) regulations, and proposed legislation and licence conditions for regulating load control on domestic-scale ESAs[13]. The first phase ESA regulations will provide a regulatory foundation for the growth of the ESA market and protect the interests of consumers. These regulations will introduce a set of minimum requirements in relation to smart functionality, cybersecurity and grid stability for ESAs. This will ensure that consumers are more easily able to use their devices to access smart tariffs and services if they choose to do so. The regulations will also establish a smart mandate for electric heating products and incorporate, with some planned amendments, the Electric Vehicles (Smart Charge Points) Regulations 2021 into the first phase ESA regulations.

The SSES Programme’s new load control licence seeks to build consumer trust in load control and related flexibility propositions and will require flexibility service providers to meet consumer protection conditions which support transparent consumer interaction. For example, that flexibility service providers or their representatives must ensure they provide information to their customers that is clear, accurate and not misleading, as well as further consumer protections against mis-selling. The introduction of these protections supports consumers to have confidence that when taking up a flexibility service they will not be unfairly treated. Government responses to the first phase ESAs regulations consultation and load control licensing consultation will be published later in 2026.

We have set out a clear and coordinated approach to energy digitalisation through the Energy Digitalisation Framework[14]. We have progressed work on improving asset visibility through

[10] Check if a heat pump could be suitable for you - GOV.UK
[11] Heating Up Success: How we’re building a Cleaner, Greener Britain – Civil Service
[12] Energising Britain: Your voice in our Clean Energy Superpower Mission - GOV.UK
[13] Smart Secure Electricity Systems (SSES) Programme: first phase energy smart appliances regulations - GOV.UK; Smart Secure Electricity Systems (SSES) Programme: draft load control licence regulations and conditions - GOV.UK
[14] Energy digitalisation framework: a vision for a coordinated and connected energy system - GOV.UK

publishing our government response to last year's call for evidence[15]. Following a separate call for evidence last year, the government is developing detailed proposals on energy smart data, ahead of consultation in 2026. This will make it easier for consumers to share energy data with trusted third parties to access new services.

The Warm Homes Plan[16] is the biggest investment in home upgrades ever, with £15 billion of investment to cut energy bills, bring households out of fuel poverty, increase our energy security and make our homes warmer and more efficient. As recognised in the Warm Homes Plan, combining solar PV with heat pumps and home batteries can unlock a range of benefits for consumers, including CLF. The government will be providing support for households to upgrade their homes with these technologies.

We recently published the Local Power Plan[17] which was shaped through extensive engagement with stakeholders, including community energy groups. Great British Energy (GBE) will continue to work with known actors in this space during the development and delivery of their offer, this will include exploring innovative revenue models related to CLF, local flexibility arrangements and Smart Community Energy. In tandem, DESNZ will continue to engage with the community and local energy sectors to understand the wider reforms and support that the sector needs to scale community energy.

Government will continue to work with Ofgem to ensure alignment in our approach to engaging consumers for CLF. Through the Markets Regulatory Vision and Strategy to 2030[18] Ofgem has committed to considering how to support and protect consumers engaging in flexibility. Ofgem's Consumer Confidence programme is establishing a future-proofed regulatory approach to achieving better consumer outcomes including how to make the most effective use of the Guaranteed Standards of Performance moving forwards. In line with their delivery of outcomes-based regulatory approaches, Ofgem will ensure coherence across the load control and supply licenses as they develop and support building consumer confidence to engage as innovative CLF propositions develop.

Next steps

In accordance with the decisions set out in this response, the government does not intend to consult further on this matter in the immediate term. Aside from the actions set out in this response, any further intervention will be kept under review, including via the new CLF consumer engagement forum.

[15] Improving the visibility of distributed energy assets - GOV.UK
[16] Warm Homes Plan - GOV.UK
[17] Local Power Plan - GOV.UK
[18] Markets Regulatory Strategy and Vision to 2030 | Ofgem

Summaries of responses to consultation questions

1. Do you agree that government should be exploring how to achieve a more joined up and holistic approach to consumer engagement on CLF? Please provide supporting commentary.

Summary of responses:

There was a strong majority of respondents in agreement that it is appropriate for government to be exploring the case for a more holistic and joined-up approach to CLF, albeit with a wide range of views as to what this could involve. Of the 58 respondents to this question, 48 broadly agreed, 9 broadly disagreed and 1 did not provide a firm view.

Aside from noting that there are 4 energy suppliers in the cohort of 9 in opposition, there is no clear dividing line in opinion across the consultation in terms of respondent type.

Respondents that provided supporting commentary in relation to this question made a number of arguments for and against - these arguments recur, and are represented in more detail, in the responses to the other consultation questions.

Of those in favour, 11 respondents noted a need for more consistency and clarity in messaging to help to reduce complexity in the CLF market, including via standardisation of terminology; 14 respondents cited a need for appropriate levels of awareness and trust via neutral advice provision, with 5 of those respondents noting the potential role for national awareness raising campaigns; 13 respondents cited inclusion as a strong concern, with a view to ensuring that low-income, digitally excluded, and otherwise vulnerable consumers are not left behind; and lessons from other areas with a degree of coordinated engagement (e.g. Smart Energy GB) was cited by 5 respondents as a precedent.

Of those opposed, 6 respondents flagged risks in taking an overly prescriptive approach, which could stifle innovation and impede industry in developing engagement strategies in a still nascent market; 4 respondents cited timing as a factor, with some suggesting waiting until enabling infrastructure is more widespread (including the deployment of smart meters, and implementation of market-wide half hourly settlement[19]); and 6 respondents called for continued prioritisation of the removal of barriers related to market access and regulation before focusing on consumer engagement.

Scope of consumer engagement (questions 2-5):

2. The following functions are presented as desirable for an effective consumer engagement framework to have in scope. Do you agree that some or all of these

[19] See footnote 8

functions should feature in such a framework? Please provide supporting commentary. • Coordination • Standards • Advice • Communications

Summary of responses:

There was broad agreement that all four functions matter in principle, but there were mixed views on which functions should be prioritised, who should deliver them and how much intervention from government is needed. There were 51 respondents to this question. The breakdown for the functions was:

- Coordination: 38 in favour; 7 opposed.
- Standards: 34 in favour; 10 opposed.
- Advice: 38 in favour; 8 opposed.
- Communications: 40 in favour; 6 opposed.

Coordination:

Of those in favour, several respondents (18) agreed that coordination is important to prevent fragmented or confusing messaging as the CLF market matures, with respondents noting that a coordination function could help to align terminology, share best practice on engagement, and map offers. Some respondents (4) highlighted the importance of involving a range of stakeholders, including local actors, community groups and frontline services, to help foster inclusion. A couple of respondents (2) noted that lessons from the smart meter rollout show how industry forums help maintain consistent communication.

Specific arguments against a coordination function included 1 respondent arguing that commercial offerings should be allowed to evolve and that there is no justification for central coordination on engagement. 2 respondents cited resource pressure for industry already engaged in multiple workstreams requiring substantial industry involvement and that introducing an additional initiative may risk overburdening industry. Further to this, 1 respondent added that any new coordination function would need to avoid duplication with existing initiatives such as Ofgem's Market Facilitator[20].

Standards:

Of those in favour, 11 respondents cited arguments on the importance of standards and regulation, but in general terms, setting out that minimum expectations for how industry engages consumers is required to build consumer confidence as the CLF market develops. 3 respondents added that standards could help to prevent bad practice from market actors affecting the credibility of the CLF market, adding that the existing Flex Assure and Home Flex schemes[21] provide a good foundation. Another respondent suggested a need for a comprehensive gap analysis as CLF is an area that has grown informally over many years.

Those opposed to an initiative on standards focused on existing and incoming measures. 2 respondents cited Ofgem's general role on consumer protection, with 4 respondents citing the

[20] Coordinating flexibility: the market facilitator blueprint | Ofgem

[21] See footnote 5

incoming licensing regime for load controllers[22], arguing that together, this will be sufficient in terms of ensuring standards for CLF. 2 respondents raised concerns as to the enforceability of any new standards or regulation, in the context of constrained resources. 2 respondents argued that any such standards function should avoid inhibiting innovation in a growing market and should only be considered once more consumers are engaged in CLF.

Advice:

Of those in favour, 13 respondents argued that trusted and neutral provision of advice on CLF is important for consumer confidence in a complex, still emerging market. 1 of these respondents argued that a neutral, basic information hub on CLF would be useful, with another respondent noting the value of a straightforward resource that provides simple explanations of the CLF landscape. 4 other respondents stressed the value of such an advice function in helping to reduce barriers of jargon and complexity, enabling informed decision making. Integrating clear and impartial information at key points in the consumer journey was stressed by 5 respondents, including in relation to frontline services delivered via charities, and local or community groups.

Specific arguments against an advice function included 2 respondents noting that any such function should not replace or duplicate the role of industry in explaining specific offers, with detailed advice and onboarding remaining their responsibility. 2 respondents cited the relevance of proposals for advisory services in relation to the Smart and Secure Electricity Systems (SSES) programme licensing regime, with 1 of those respondents noting that the proposed advice function in this consultation would only signpost routes to access redress so would not be duplicative of the SSES proposals.

Communications:

Of those in favour, 13 respondents argued in general terms that a communications function could be important in order to raise awareness of CLF, its benefits, to help to normalise participation and counter misinformation. 3 respondents noted that high level communications to raise awareness of CLF would be helpful but that this should be about providing a clear and trustworthy narrative on why flexibility matters (e.g. for bills savings, system efficiency, decarbonisation), leaving room for market actors to run their own targeted campaigns. 3 respondents cited Smart Energy GB's role in communications to support the uptake of smart meters, as a positive precedent for a national campaign on CLF.

Specific arguments against a communications function included 5 respondents arguing that communications on CLF should remain the responsibility of industry actors, due to their expertise with customers. 2 respondents raised a concern on timing for any such national communications, with 1 of those respondents noting that a push to engage consumers on a mass level might be counter-productive before the benefits to them are clearer and more significant. 2 respondents noted a preference for the government to integrate CLF messaging

[22] See footnote 13

into trigger points in the consumer journey, including the installation of relevant technology (e.g. an EV charger).

3. Would you propose additional or alternative functions? If so, please state your reasoning.

Summary of responses:

Of the 34 respondents to this question, 26 proposed what they considered to be additional or alternative areas of focus for any consumer engagement framework, while 8 disagreed that this would be necessary.

Of those who responded, 9 highlighted the risk that, without intervention, CLF could evolve into a two-tier system, as access to enabling technologies, such as EVs, heat pumps, batteries, remains uneven across renters, low-income households, digitally excluded, and otherwise vulnerable groups. 1 of these respondents stated that market actors report difficulties in identifying vulnerabilities, which may lead them to focus on wealthier, lower-risk consumers. To prevent this, respondents recommended an approach that sets expectations on engagement being equitable and inclusive, underpinned by inclusive design, that monitors participation across key groups, and prompts action on any emerging gaps in the market where some consumer segments may struggle with routes into CLF participation.

Some respondents (5) argued that effective engagement for CLF is best delivered through locally grounded partnerships and that this will support inclusion. These respondents argued that messaging on CLF should be supported by place-based activity via trusted intermediaries, including local and community organisations, to help reach digitally excluded consumers and to build trust among low-income and vulnerable groups. 1 of these respondents argued that households with strong community ties are more likely to adopt flexible energy behaviours, underscoring the value of locally tailored, in-person engagement.

Some respondents (3) were in favour of the creation of standardised and consistently applied terminology for CLF. 1 of these respondents argued that a living, cross-industry glossary and style guide for CLF could reduce jargon and inconsistency that may hinder consumer engagement. Another of these respondents argued that this would help frontline energy advice providers to be able to explain CLF and recommend suitable offers.

4 respondents argued for a more prominent role for research and behavioural science in any approach to consumer engagement for CLF, with 1 of these respondents proposing a behavioural trials hub, and another respondent stressing the need to continue to assess the relative importance of financial incentives and other values-based framing (e.g. “playing your part”) in driving sustained participation, to help ensure that approaches to engagement are optimised.

2 respondents argued for the role of installers of low carbon technology to be made more prominent, with one of these respondents asserting that installers are not yet incentivised or equipped to discuss CLF with customers and that training and materials that allow installers to

signpost customers to independent advice services at the point of installation, could help ensure consistent explanation.

7 respondents highlighted the importance of monitoring and feedback. 2 of these respondents noted that, while monitoring and evaluation is referenced in relation to communication, a dedicated function is missing. These respondents stressed the need to understand who is engaging in CLF, in what ways, and with what impacts, warning that without this, policy risks “flying blind”. 5 respondents emphasised the importance of building robust feedback mechanisms. Feedback - whether through panels, workshops, advisory boards, or transparent data-sharing - was seen as essential for sustaining long-term engagement, improving trust, and ensuring a responsive approach to evolving consumer needs. 2 of these respondents stressed that enabling consumers to see the tangible impact of their actions on their bills, their local community, their region and nationally, could support motivation to participate in CLF, rather than solely relying on monetary rewards.

4. Would you propose a particular combination of functions and degrees of intervention for those functions? Please provide supporting commentary.

Summary of responses:

The 38 respondents to this question focused on levels of intervention for the 4 functions discussed in the consultation. There was a relatively even split of opinion across the functions in terms of degrees of intervention, with no clear consensus in terms of stakeholder type.

Coordination:

A few respondents (3) argued for a low level of intervention, stressing that innovation and competition should be the primary drivers of CLF, with government intervention limited to setting standards and fostering inclusion, rather than coordinating market activity. 1 respondent preferred a low to medium level of intervention favouring light touch convening through existing mechanisms, the development of best-practice materials, and stewardship of common language. Several respondents (7) advocated for a medium level of intervention that recognises the need for proactive coordination in a fast-moving and complex market but emphasised the importance of maintaining impartiality and a preference for periodic forums. 4 respondents preferred medium to high intervention, arguing that rapid innovation and development of CLF may require more formalised coordination mechanisms, potentially including working groups. Some respondents (5) argued that a high level of intervention could be necessary in order to establish and maintain an appropriate degree of coherence, as new market participants enter and technologies evolve.

Standards:

4 respondents argued for a low to medium level of intervention, suggesting that principle-based frameworks would better preserve space for innovation while still offering a degree of oversight. Several respondents (6) argued for a medium level of intervention, with 1 of those respondents noting that it is appropriate to set clear protections, routes to redress, and minimum service expectations for CLF, while another of those respondents stressed the need to maintain active collaboration with industry and statutory bodies to identify gaps and

co-develop solutions. 3 respondents argued in favour of a medium to high level of intervention, with 1 of those respondents noting the potential value of a code of practice for CLF communications. Respondents (6) favouring high intervention stressed the need for strong, early regulatory action to establish robust consumer protections and to build trust.

Advice:

Those respondents (7) in favour of low intervention emphasised the importance of a trusted, neutral, “on-demand” information source that avoids providing personalised advice, via a light-touch, primarily online model. 1 respondent suggested a low to medium level of intervention, with multi-channel access, including phone support to reduce digital exclusion. Respondents (4) in favour of a medium level of intervention preferred a multi-channel national platform offering clear signposting, triage for vulnerable users, and delegation of in-depth casework to established consumer bodies. 1 respondent in favour of medium to high intervention, stressed the value of personalised advice to increase engagement with CLF via community-based support. Those respondents (9) that advocated for high intervention argued that tailored, multi-channel advice is essential to accommodate diverse needs and make CLF more accessible.

Communications:

2 respondents favoured a low to medium level of intervention, suggesting that targeted campaigns could effectively complement supplier and aggregator outreach, without requiring a centralised communications programme. Several (7) respondents argued for a medium level of intervention, emphasising that CLF messaging should be embedded within wider government communications on energy and net zero, supported by national campaigns explaining why CLF matters. 2 respondents advocated a medium to high level of intervention, proposing a strong communications function that blends national narrative-building with targeted, locally delivered engagement. 11 respondents supported a high level of intervention, calling for a nationally run awareness campaign underpinned by robust consumer research, and consistent messaging to build trust and understanding.

5 respondents were opposed to any level of intervention, at this stage of CLF market development. 2 of these respondents argued that intervention should be reconsidered once the market is more established. Another of these respondents cautioned that centrally-led campaigns could suppress innovation and confuse consumers, noting that when consumers feel government is instructing them to act, suspicion may grow and engagement could decline.

1 respondent proposed a phased approach, due to CLF being a still emerging market, starting with light-touch intervention across the functions and scaling up if evidence of consumer harm emerges.

5. **To what extent do you believe that the functions presented at Q2, and any other functions as per Q3, can be provided via current arrangements? Please state your reasoning.**

Summary of responses:

There were again mixed views in response to this question, with a degree of coordination emerging as a priority from those that argued that current arrangements are inadequate, and an expansion in consumer advice the most likely area for a form of intervention from those in favour of the general sufficiency of current arrangements. Of the 39 respondents to this question, 21 argued that current arrangements are inadequate, 11 felt that they are largely sufficient and 7 did not provide a firm view.

Several respondents (21) argued that current arrangements for CLF are piecemeal and insufficient. 8 of these respondents argued in general terms, noting that without a form of more systematic coordination, potential risks of confusion, mistrust, and exclusion could materialise. The present landscape is described by these respondents as a patchwork of initiatives, with inconsistent messaging on CLF, which risks undermining consumer confidence as CLF matures. 2 respondents argued that Ofgem could expand in this area, at least in terms of coordination. 2 respondents cited lessons from the earlier development of CLF in the large non-domestic sector, noting that without a structured framework, there is wide variation in quality of engagement. 3 respondents noted a lack of a single, trusted CLF advice service spanning the propositions and providers available. 1 respondent pointed to low levels of energy literacy amongst consumers, arguing that communications on CLF may not be well understood under current arrangements.

Some respondents (11) asserted that the functions discussed in the consultation can be delivered adequately by existing organisations. On coordination, 2 of these respondents cited Ofgem's *current* remit, with 1 of these respondents noting that the regulator should already be monitoring and sharing knowledge on the state of the CLF market. 4 of these respondents noted the role for a number of existing organisations on standards, including that Citizens Advice and the Energy Ombudsman already have a role to notify the government and Ofgem on gaps in the standards landscape, to support Ofgem's duty to ensure consumer protection. The relevance of the Advertising Standards Agency and Competition and Markets Authority as relevant regulatory bodies was cited, alongside the incoming licencing regime for load controllers and flexibility service providers. On advice, 2 of these respondents noted the statutory role for Citizens Advice, with 4 suggesting that an expanded role on CLF for Citizens Advice could be a consideration. Alongside industry-led communications, 4 respondents noted that Smart Energy GB have played a part in raising awareness of CLF via its communications to support the smart meter roll out.

Industry-facing engagement (questions 6-7):

6. How important is a role for coordination of industry for consumer engagement on CLF? Please state your views on how such coordination could be best achieved.

Summary of responses:

Of the 46 respondents on the importance of coordination for consumer engagement on CLF, 26 respondents argued that coordination is important, 6 contended that it is less important, 4 felt that it is not important, and 10 provided no firm view.

Many respondents (26) viewed coordination as important for a still nascent CLF market, in order to offset potential fragmentation. These respondents argue that a neutral body could convene industry via a regular forum, to develop shared terminology, consolidate learning via knowledge exchange, and potentially produce simple guidance for consumers (e.g. which could explain the basics of CLF in plain language, list all applicable market agents, and provide links to relevant information). 1 of these respondents stressed that coordination should mean that valuable learnings would be more accessible, helping innovators design suitable CLF offerings and consolidate understanding on how to engage different consumer groups. 2 of these respondents argued that coordination is critical in a still developing market, so that consumers get the same core experience of CLF regardless of which market actor is engaging them. Precedents for a similar form of coordination cited included Smart Energy GB's role in the smart meter roll out, the Radio Teleswitch Service (RTS) electricity meter migration, the Digital television switchover, and Open Banking.

Some respondents (6) argued that only light-touch coordination is necessary, suggesting that minimal intervention, via market monitoring by Ofgem and government and existing industry trade associations, would be sufficient to prevent any risk of fragmentation. They emphasise that such existing structures already allow knowledge sharing and can provide an overview, although 1 respondent noted that an occasional neutral forum to share learning could be of value, as long as this did not involve prescriptive coordination.

A smaller number (4) of respondents argued that formal coordination would risk limiting innovation and imposing a "one-size-fits-all" approach on a market still developing varied consumer propositions. These respondents contend that industry should be free to test and evolve engagement methods organically, with government focusing instead on enabling innovation and consumer protection, rather than centralised coordination.

7. What would be the appropriate approach for a framework to ensure appropriate standards on consumer engagement for CLF are in place? (Note that "standards" here covers a range of mechanisms, e.g. regulation, licencing and codes of practice.)

Summary of responses:

38 responses were received for this question, providing a range of views.

Several (15) respondents recommend building on existing schemes and initiatives, rather than creating a new framework. Ofgem's role in the design and enforcement of standards was noted in general terms, with 2 respondents reiterating the existing role for Citizens Advice and the Energy Ombudsman to notify the Government and Ofgem of any gaps in the CLF standards landscape. 2 respondents cited Flex Assure as a well-established scheme to build on, providing common standards for flexibility service providers in relation to large non-domestic consumers, and now extending to the domestic scale via the Home Flex scheme. 8 respondents asserted that the Smart and Secure Electricity Systems programme, including licensing for load controllers and appliance standards, should ensure that a clear and enforceable standards regime is in place to protect consumers and build trust in CLF offers.

A few respondents (3) proposed embedding a “consumer duty” in supply and load control licences, similar to Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) standards. 1 of these respondents explained that the FCA’s consumer duty places a cross-cutting obligation on organisations to avoid foreseeable harm, and embedding a similar duty within the load control and supply licences could deliver strong protections for energy consumers.

A number of respondents (6) reiterated the potential benefit of standardised language and terminology to reduce complexity in the CLF market now and as it develops. 1 of these respondents suggested that any new initiative on standards should focus on translating rules into plain English, while helping to identifying other gaps as CLF matures and supporting industry solutions.

Consumer-facing engagement (questions 8-9):

8. a) To what extent should the Advice function focus on being a trusted, neutral source of information to engage consumers on CLF? b) To what extent should it go to in providing support to individual consumers as a service?

Summary of responses:

a) Of the 48 respondents to this question, 42 argued for a higher extent, 5 for a lower extent, and 1 had no firm view.
b) Of the 43 respondents to this question, 13 argued for a higher extent, 11 for a lower extent, 11 were opposed, and 8 had no firm view.

On part a) of this question, there was near unanimity from respondents that neutrality and trust are essential for any advice function on CLF.

Several respondents (10) advocated for a central, impartial hub providing, e.g. plain-English explanations of CLF, FAQs and signposting to channels for redress. This was described by 1 of these respondents as a single point of truth for consumers on the basics of flexibility, to help enable informed decision making when engaging with market actors. Another respondent expanded by suggesting that this should involve an explanation of the key actors (aggregators, suppliers, DNOs, etc.) and what roles they play, alongside guidance on what to expect from a CLF offer, case studies, and questions to ask before signing up.

Some respondents (3) argued that existing consumer bodies are best placed to provide this advice function, with the potential for an expansion of the role for Citizens Advice, in its role as a statutory advice service, reiterated by 2 of these respondents.

Some respondents (6) recommended embedding CLF advice within wider advice services, as consumers are not likely to be making decisions on CLF in isolation of other energy needs, e.g. related to home upgrades. 3 of these respondents called for the development of a form of wider national advice service, while another respondent called on government to provide greater funding for local, impartial energy advice organisations to upskill in smart energy advice.

3 respondents struck notes of caution, with 1 respondent flagging the difficulty in providing advice that is both relevant and accurate for a wider range of consumer sizes and types, e.g. domestic, small non-domestic and large non-domestic consumers.

On part b) of this question, several respondents (16) argued in favour of online information as the minimum viable option but noted a preference for a multi-channel approach supplementing online provision with telephone and in-person support. 3 of these respondents noted that consumers should have access to a service that provides advice which takes the individual consumer's personal or household circumstances into account, while 6 respondents highlighted that online provision could risk leaving certain consumer groups behind, i.e. those that are less digitally confident and other consumers that may be vulnerable or harder to reach.

The role for local and community organisations in breaking down barriers and fostering confidence in CLF was reiterated by several respondents (10), with 2 of these respondents calling for more support from government for frontline services and community energy groups, and another of these respondents arguing for more emphasis to be placed on the role for local councils in a more tailored delivery of energy advice services.

Several respondents (11) stated their opposition to the inclusion of tailored advice, beyond online information, with 3 of these respondents noting that this role belongs with suppliers, aggregators, and existing consumer protection and advocacy services, and another 4 of these respondents noting the additional resource implications of including more bespoke advice. 1 of these respondents added that tailored advice would be prone to error if not underpinned by the type of direct consumer relationship that market actors can foster.

9. a) To what extent should the framework focus on proactive, targeted communication activity directly to consumers on CLF, to supplement the approach to Advice, which would be available "on demand"? b) To what extent should the framework focus on national or more targeted communications? If the latter, what consumer segments should be targeted and why?

Summary of responses:

a) Of the 43 respondents to this question, there was general agreement that it would be appropriate to supplement advice available "on demand", with proactive communications. 21 respondents argued for the importance of proactive communications to higher extent, with 11 respondents arguing to a lower extent. 4 respondents opposed intervention on communications, and 7 did not provide a firm view.
b) Of the 41 respondents to this question, 24 argued for a combination of national and targeted communications, 6 focused on targeted communications, 5 were opposed to any intervention on communications, and 6 did not provide a firm view.

A majority view from respondents (24) advocated a hybrid approach, involving national campaigns, combined with targeted communications.

For national communications, arguments in favour coalesced around a concept of communications providing a baseline of awareness and understanding on CLF, its benefits for consumers, which can prompt consumers to seek further information, and generally help to normalise CLF as an aspect of energy usage. 2 respondents argued that Smart Energy GB's engagement of consumers smart meter rollout is a good precedent for the type of approach that could be taken. 1 respondent stressed the value of national communications to help address any potential misconceptions about CLF from permeating the national conversation at an early stage. 3 respondents reiterated an argument in favour of situating CLF in wider communications, including related to public participation for net zero.

Arguments in favour of targeted communications stressed that different consumer groups have distinct capabilities, motivations and barriers, meaning more generic national campaigns could be too broad to be effective on their own. Several respondents (14) cited particular consumer groups that could benefit from targeted communications, including:

- EV owners and prospective EV buyers (for smart charging);
- other low-carbon tech adopters (e.g. heat pumps, batteries, solar);
- vulnerable groups, including low-income, fuel-poor, and digitally excluded;
- renters and social housing tenants (due to the need for landlord collaboration/permission);
- budget-conscious families and those with high energy demand;
- tech cautious consumers (as opposed to early adopters);
- SMEs and microbusinesses (with different needs to domestic consumers);
- industrial and commercial consumers (likely to require more specific and tailored messaging in relation to their business activity).

1 respondent added that different groups will respond to different prompts, adding that financial savings often lead to initial interest but other factors, including convenience, comfort, environmental values, and "doing your bit" may to help sustain participation. By focusing on specific segments, communications can better support equitable access to CLF, driving wider participation by aligning messages with what different consumers value.

Some respondents (9) expressed opposition to government intervention on communications for CLF, emphasising that a centralised campaign would risk stifling innovation and duplicating or undermining the effective work already being led by market participants. They noted that suppliers and other market actors are best placed to communicate with their own customers because they understand product specifics, consumer motivations, and opportunities for tailored messaging.

2 respondents noted that timing for any communications drive would be important, as communicating with consumers in a still nascent market carries risks of creating disappointment if offers are not accessible (e.g. due to the absence of low carbon technology at the time) or that they cannot find the information or protections they need at this stage.

Wider scope (questions 10-14)

10. a) What considerations should there be for assessing the cost of establishing and running a framework? b) Do you have views on potential funding mechanisms that may be considered for such a framework?

Summary of responses:

There were 36 respondents to part a of this question, and 30 respondents to part b of this question.

On part a of this question:

Several respondents (9) argued that value for money should guide consideration of any such framework, with the aim to keep costs low. These respondents emphasised that any new initiative must add clear value and not duplicate functions already performed by industry, with 1 respondent recommending a review of current roles and activities in order to ensure efficient use of resources.

Some respondents (5) flagged the need for thorough cost-benefit analysis for any such framework, with respondents advocating for an impact assessment across different functions and intervention levels, which would need to demonstrate positive impacts for consumers. The evaluation should consider avoided system costs, wider social benefits, and the long-term value of sustained consumer participation, which could significantly outweigh upfront investment.

A few respondents (3) stressed the importance of avoiding regressive impacts, particularly that low-income households should not be seen to subsidise those better positioned to benefit from CLF. The government is urged to carefully consider the distributional impacts of CLF to ensure that costs are allocated fairly, as households with greater capacity to flex electricity loads - often those with low-carbon technology - are more likely to benefit in the short to medium term. 1 of these respondents argued that the substantial system savings achieved via CLF should be leveraged to fund any such framework appropriately.

Respondents differed on the scale of the framework, with 2 respondents preferring a low-cost digital-based approach, including a website/hub and coordination through existing industry bodies, while another respondent argued that funding in this area should be considered as an investment in the social license for net zero, and not limited to arguments focused on cost savings.

On part b of this question:

Several respondents (6) advocated for government funding for any such framework, given the broader system benefits of CLF. 2 respondents noted the potential for a form of levy mechanism on market actors benefiting from CLF, e.g. similar to the smart metering model that funds Smart Energy GB. 1 of these respondents put forward a view that any such framework should be fairly funded by those parties who benefit from CLF and so broader than just energy suppliers, including network operators, aggregators and other market actors. 2 respondents suggested a hybrid approach, combining initial government funding, to be followed by a form of industry levy as the market matures, with the aim of ensuring that those who benefit contribute to its ongoing operation.

Several respondents (9) expressed opposition to any such initiative entailing additional costs on consumer energy bills. 3 respondents added that additional costs on bills could be counterproductive in dampening price signals for CLF, with another respondent noting that added costs could negatively impact wider perceptions on the costs and benefits of CLF, at a time when it needs to scale.

11. a) Do you agree that core governance arrangements should include an expectation that the framework operates broadly in line with government objectives for CLF? b) To what extent (very involved, somewhat involved, not involved) should government be in ongoing monitoring and stewardship of the consumer engagement framework?

Summary of responses:

a) Of the 39 respondents to this question, 34 agreed, 1 disagreed, and 4 provided no firm view.
b) Of the 42 respondents to this question, 11 advocated for very involved, 25 for somewhat involved, 1 for no involvement, and 5 did not provide a firm view.

On part a of this question:

There was near unanimity from respondents that core governance for any such framework should be broadly in line with government objectives, as set out in the Clean Flexibility Roadmap, with 1 respondent summarising this as necessary to maintain consistency across relevant reforms and to provide a basis for monitoring and evaluation. Another respondent cited the approach taken for the smart meter roll out, with Smart Energy GB's governance structure demonstrating that alignment with wider policy objectives can be embedded into programme design and delivery.

Some respondents (10) cautioned against a heavy-handed approach from government, advocating for high-level oversight rather than micro-management, with 3 respondents stressing the need to take account of wider interests including social equity and a further 3 respondents arguing for the need to ensure consumer representation as a part of the approach to governance. 1 respondent explicitly stating opposition to any such governance arrangements being necessary, preferring a light touch or market-led approach.

On part b of this question:

There was moderate support from respondents (11) for government to be *very involved* in the ongoing monitoring and stewardship of any such framework. Those in favour argued that government leadership is essential for legitimacy in terms of consumer perceptions, and to ensure alignment with wider objectives related to net zero and energy security. 3 respondents noted that government involvement could reduce as the CLF market matures, consumers become better informed about CLF, and as necessary levels of CLF are achieved by 2030.

A clear majority of respondents (25) favoured government being *somewhat involved* in the ongoing monitoring and stewardship of any such framework. Respondents argued that this could entail strategic oversight in setting objectives and ensuring accountability, while avoiding being overly prescriptive on how market actors engage consumers. 1 respondent suggested that any such framework should be reviewed periodically (e.g. every 2 years) to evaluate its effectiveness and the level of intervention. 1 respondent reiterated that the level of ambition for any such framework should be light touch and that no monitoring and stewardship from government should be necessary.

12. a) Do you agree with an aim to establish the framework before the end of 2028? b) If you do not agree, please indicate your preferred timeframe, including rationale for how this would be achieved?

Summary of responses:

Of the 43 respondents to this question: for part a) 21 agreed; for part b) 15 disagreed, and 7 did not provide a firm view.

There was strong support from respondents (21) in broad agreement that any such framework ought to be in place before the end of 2028, in the context of the government's clean power targets for 2030. Those in favour highlighted the relevance of timings for the implementation of market-wide half hourly settlement in 2027, with the assumption that this, alongside the wider adoption low carbon technology, will bring forward more CLF offers for consumers, helping the CLF market to mature. 1 respondent explained that it would be suitable to introduce any such framework once market penetration of smart meters and market-wide half hourly settlement is higher, as more consumers would be able to take part in CLF at that time.

Several respondents (15) disagreed with this timeframe. 13 of these respondents argued for earlier implementation of any such framework, asserting that 2030 clean power targets require more urgent action, that the CLF market is developing rapidly, and there is a need to take action to mitigate potential risks around exclusion becoming embedded. There was broad consensus amongst these respondents that lighter touch measures should be considered from 2026, and scaling to higher levels of intervention by 2027-2028 as necessary, although there was divergence on which functions could be taken forward earlier.

2 respondents to this question were generally opposed to the introduction of any such framework, arguing that the CLF market is still in the discovery and innovation phase, but with 1 of these respondents suggesting that a light-touch review around 2028 could assess whether some form of intervention is required at that time.

13. Considering different consumer groups across the range of domestic and non-domestic consumers, does there need to be a different approach considered for some or all of these? Please explain for which consumer groups and why.

Summary of responses:

There were 46 respondents to this question: 42 agreed, and 4 did not provide a firm view.

There was near unanimity from respondents that a generalised approach to CLF will not work, and different consumer groups will require tailored engagement strategies. The relevance of responses to question 9b is recognised and reinforced by respondents in the distinctions made between different consumer groups here.

At the domestic scale, 1 respondent argued that early adopters (e.g. households with relevant low carbon technology like an EV or heat pump) should be encouraged to adopt automation by default, be rewarded through smart tariffs, and targeted with communications at installation points. Otherwise, for domestic consumers, the focus from respondents was on those consumer groups that could be at risk of some degree of exclusion. 1 respondent flagged the relevance of CSE's Smart and Fair project[23], which underlines the importance of distinguishing between different types of consumer capabilities in relation to CLF engagement.

Several respondents (13) cited low income, digitally excluded, and otherwise vulnerable consumers, emphasising the value of clear, plain language engagement for these consumer groups, including via trusted channels like community groups, local councils or housing providers. 1 of these respondents argued that the focus should be on supporting access to low-carbon technologies, including low-cost assets like smart thermostats. Another of these respondents noted that some consumers in this broad category may have relevant technology in their home, e.g. electric storage heaters or low carbon technology such as heat pumps and batteries installed by social housing landlords, and that targeted engagement to ensure that these consumers are able to use these assets flexibly is important. 2 respondents noted that particular consideration should be given to those with health needs which require electrically powered medical equipment, and 3 respondents highlighted the risk of exclusion for rural communities, flagging challenges related to access to smart meters, and reliable internet connection.

4 respondents highlighted that renters and social housing tenants may face particular challenges, e.g. related to ability to install, or permission to use, relevant technologies. 1 of these respondents noted that landlords, freeholders and housing associations will need to be key partners in delivering building-level flexibility and fair access for those with less control over their energy bills.

7 respondents noted the need to consider microbusiness and SMEs separately from domestic engagement, with tailored messaging linking flexibility to cost-saving and operational efficiency. 1 of these respondents noted that the load profiles in this case are business-hour driven and can create opportunities for CLF, (e.g. some may be operating outside of peak hours).

7 respondents highlighted that engagement of large industrial and commercial consumers requires an emphasis on site-specific technical detail and should focus on commercial drivers. 1 of these respondents noted that these consumers have higher and more controllable demand, plus greater in-house expertise and data, and more capacity to engage, normally via energy managers on site.

3 respondents agreed that there is a need to differentiate engagement for different consumer groups but reiterated that industry is best placed to develop their own engagement strategies.

14. Please provide any additional feedback here.

[23] Smart & Fair - Centre for Sustainable Energy

Summary of responses:

There were 38 responses to this question. Additional feedback from respondents was sufficiently captured under preceding questions. The government will ensure that feedback that goes beyond the remit of this consultation is retained in order to inform wider policy development, where appropriate.

Government response

Government received 62 responses to this consultation, with a very wide range of detailed input, which will provide a valuable resource for the development of policy going forward. However, it did not provide a clear consensus on gaps, levels of intervention or timing, across the questions posed in this consultation, and did not provide compelling evidence for medium-high levels of intervention in the current market-led engagement model.

Key policy decisions and actions:

1. **Decision:** In light of the mixed views provided, the government believes that it is appropriate and proportionate to opt for a light touch approach to intervention in relation to these proposals, therefore we do not intend to take forward a formal consumer engagement framework at this time, to be kept under review.

Coordination: Government acknowledges the range of extant fora but believes that there is a role for a forum dedicated to CLF consumer engagement, with the aim of supporting an appropriate degree of coherence in the market in this area. Government believes that it would be proportionate to take forward a lower intervention option (e.g. biannual). This would be to ensure a degree of monitoring and feedback, to facilitate the sharing of best practice, and to keep the case for any further intervention under review. This forum should consider ideas like a degree of standardisation of terminology, enable issues and gaps to be raised and discussed, be informed by behavioural science, and provide a forum to discuss still emerging questions such as the extent to which increasing automation of CLF could change the approach to CLF engagement over time.

2. **Action:** Ofgem to convene a biannual CLF consumer engagement forum, with support from government. The expectation is for attendees to reflect the breath of respondents to this consultation, including, but not limited to, energy suppliers, trade associations, third party intermediaries, consumer bodies, think tanks, academics, and local, community and other frontline services. The forum is expected to convene in autumn 2026. Leadership of the new CLF consumer engagement forum will sit with Ofgem given their remit across retail market regulation, load control licensing, and their general consumer protection role.

Standards: Government is cognisant of the relevance and interplay of extant and incoming measures cited by respondents, including Ofgem's general role on consumer protection, the voluntary Flex Assure and Home Flex schemes, and the incoming SSES Programme load control licensing regime.

Government acknowledges a concern for inclusion of different consumer groups as a strong theme from respondents. Proposed condition 11 in the draft conditions for the load control licence sets an overarching requirement for flexibility service providers to ensure their customers are treated fairly. This includes a requirement to seek to identify domestic customers in vulnerable situations and ensure that the vulnerable situation of any domestic customer is taken into account. In relation to the concept of a “consumer duty”, Ofgem’s Markets Regulatory Vision and Strategy to 2030 already aims to ensure that markets deliver for all consumers through regulation which provides confidence and protections. Government will use the responses to this consultation to inform further work already in progress to identify measures to support inclusion, as set out in the Clean Flexibility Roadmap.

3. **Decision:** The government intends to take no firm additional action on standards or regulation in relation to consumer engagement for CLF at this time beyond the introduction of load control licence responsibilities. This will be kept under review, including via the proposed CLF consumer engagement forum in its role as a channel for any gaps to be made known.

4. **Action:** The government will work with Ofgem to explore the case for a degree of standardisation of CLF terminology via the proposed CLF consumer engagement forum but this would be expected to remain a voluntary measure.

Advice: Government believes that there is value, on balance, in a lower intervention approach to information provision on CLF, to provide general framing for consumers on the array of information on CLF from a wide range of bodies across industry and society. The intention would be to provide trusted channels for consumers to find out more about CLF in general terms, so as to foster a baseline of consistent understanding for consumers to engage a vibrant and competitive CLF market. As a part of that, government will continue to collaborate with industry, including Flex Assure, to support the understanding of CLF by large non-domestic consumers. Government will keep the potential for medium to high levels of intervention under review as the market develops.

5. **Action:** Government will continue to seek opportunities to integrate information on CLF into initiatives to support the uptake of relevant technologies. This includes consumer messaging and campaigns supporting the smart meter roll out, heat pump deployment, EV smart charging, and batteries. Appropriate information on CLF will be integrated into government-led advice and information services that are being strengthened, including via the development of the Warm Homes Agency and starting with an enhanced impartial digital-first service launching in 2026 for home retrofit advice. Government will also explore how installers of smart technology engage consumers on CLF, including the role of information about CLF at the point of installation.

6. **Action:** Government will work with consumer organisations, including Citizens Advice, over 2026 to consider the expansion of advice provision to include general information on CLF. This proposal for a trusted source of general information on CLF would be complementary to any future extension of statutory advocacy and advice specifically related to the incoming

load control licensing regime. Government is currently minded not to extend statutory advocacy and advice specifically for the load control licence, as set out in a separate consultation in December 2025. A response to that consultation is due later in 2026.

Communications: Government acknowledges that timing is key for national communications on CLF. The CLF market is evolving rapidly, with industry continuing to develop and innovate in its approach to consumer engagement. Government therefore acknowledges that the case for broader national communications will depend on how the market develops, beyond targeted campaigns already being delivered for specific technologies, such as those run by Smart Energy GB.

7. **Decision:** Government will keep the case for forms of national communications on CLF under review, including via the new CLF consumer engagement forum, and for the immediate term we will continue to work to ensure CLF is brought out in government-led initiatives, to help forge a wider narrative on the opportunities CLF can provide.

Next Steps:

In accordance with the decisions set out in this response, the government does not intend to consult further on this matter in the immediate term. The actions set out in this response will be taken forward alongside the range of the work within government that is supportive of consumer engagement for CLF, and in partnership with Ofgem, as noted in the executive summary. Any further intervention will be kept under review, including via the new CLF consumer engagement forum.

This publication is available from: Consumer-led flexibility: consumer engagement - GOV.UK.

If you need a version of this document in a more accessible format, please email alt.formats@energysecurity.gov.uk. Please tell us what format you need. It will help us if you say what assistive technology you use.