



PO Box 10189
Grand Cayman KY1-1002
Cayman Islands
Tel: (345) 946-4282
Fax: (345) 945-8284

Utility Regulation and Competition Office

Case # C1 – 2026

Entity involved: Gas Station (little Cayman)

Date of Complaint: 15 January 2026

Summary

The customer reported that fuel prices fluctuate in Grand Cayman but appear to remain unchanged in Little Cayman and that fuel was being sold in U.S. gallons rather than imperial gallons. The customer was advised that, because fuel shipments to Cayman Brac and Little Cayman are less frequent than shipments to Grand Cayman, fuel prices on the Sister Islands generally do not fluctuate as often. The customer was further informed that the Office had calibrated the fuel pump in Little Cayman and confirmed that the fuel-dispensing equipment is dispensing fuel in imperial gallons, as required under the Dangerous Substances Regulations.

Case # C2 – 2026

Entity involved: Digicel

Date of Complaint: 12 January 2026

Summary

The customer reported that the telephone lines at their location are not functioning properly and that the system intermittently freezes during use. The premises in question was a business premises, and the customer was advised to report the matter internally.

Case # C3 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 15 January 2026

Summary

The complainant advised that they were issued with an incorrect bill in respect of their iPhone services and requested accurate receipts and billing records from the service provider. The Office subsequently engaged with Flow in relation to the matter, following which the duplicate charges were identified and removed from the complainant's account.

Case # C4 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 15 January 2026

Summary

The customer advised that they had completed the required documentation to close their account and returned Flow's equipment; however, they continued to be billed incorrectly despite Flow's indication that the error would be corrected. URCO subsequently contacted Flow regarding the matter, following which the issue was resolved.

Case # C5 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 30 January 2026

Summary

The customer advised that two telephones were purchased from a private business and that a Flow SIM card was subsequently inserted; however, the devices did not function as expected. This Office made several attempts to contact the customer but was unable to establish communication. Based on the information available, it was determined that the devices were restricted from accepting a Flow SIM card and Flow would need to look at the phone.

Case # C6 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 15 January 2026

Summary

The customer advised that they had notified Flow of their intention to cancel the account but did not receive a response. Flow subsequently indicated that the customer's request had been sent to a closed mailbox and confirmed that it would now take the necessary action to address the matter. Despite several follow-up attempts by the Office; the customer did not respond to confirm whether the matter had been resolved.

Case # C8 – 2026

Entity involved: Logic

Date of Complaint: 28 January 2026

Summary

The customer reported that they had been without service for several days and expressed the view that the service provider should have issued a public notice regarding the outage. The customer also requested a credit in respect of the service interruption. The customer was advised that there is currently no legislative provision requiring compensation in such circumstances; however, the Office intends to undertake a consultation to consider this issue further.

Case # C10 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 23 February 2026

Summary

The customer advised that they had inadvertently failed to pay their telephone bill, following which their service was disconnected after four days. The customer further stated that, when attempting to make payment online, they received a notification indicating that the account had been temporarily suspended due to late payment. The customer was advised that a formal complaint should first be submitted to Flow before the Office could intervene in the matter.

Case # C11 – 2026

Entity involved:

Date of Complaint: 6 March 2026

Summary

The customer reported experiencing intermittent service issues. However, the Office was unable to determine whether the matter related to Wi-Fi connectivity or internet service. The Office contacted the customer to arrange a meeting in order to obtain a clearer understanding of the issues raised. As the customer did not respond, the matter was subsequently closed.

Case # C12 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 9 March 2026

Summary

The customer reported that they had been overbilled for services. Following the Office's intervention, the matter was referred to the service provider for review, and a credit was subsequently applied to the customer's account.

Case # C13 – 2026

Entity involved: Stingray Media

Date of Complaint: 16 March 2026

Summary

The customer raised concerns regarding potentially inappropriate material broadcast during a radio programme. The Office reviewed the relevant recording and determined that no breach of the applicable requirements had occurred.

Case # C14 – 2026

Entity involved: Digicel

Date of Complaint: 2 March 2026

Summary

The customer reported experiencing frequent interruptions to their internet signal. Digicel attended the customer's residence and conducted various tests, which did not identify any faults on Digicel's network. Digicel advised the customer to connect their smartphone to the home internet Wi-Fi modem, particularly as the customer had indicated that the connection performed well when using high bandwidth applications such as TikTok, Instagram, and Facebook.

Case # C15 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 10 March 2026

Summary

The customer reported that they were being charged an automatic daily roaming fee of \$10.00. Flow advised that, provided data roaming was not enabled on the customer's FLOW service, roaming data charges should not be incurred. The customer was further advised that, when travelling and using a separate travel eSIM selected for data services, any data usage should be billed to that eSIM rather than to the FLOW mobile service. The customer subsequently indicated that they were satisfied with the explanation provided and confirmed that the issue had not recurred.

Case # C16 – 2026

Entity involved: Cayman Water Co.

Date of Complaint: 27 March 2026

Summary

The customer reported an excessive water leak and alleged that Cayman Water Company ("CWC") could have mitigated the resulting water loss by discontinuing the water supply to the property. Following its review, the Office determined that CWC had complied with the applicable policy requirements by notifying the customer of the suspected leak. Notwithstanding that compliance, the Office considered that CWC could have taken the additional precautionary step of temporarily discontinuing the water supply to limit further loss. The Office will therefore review the applicable escalation procedures for suspected leaks to determine whether additional safeguards or response measures should be implemented in similar circumstances.

Case # C17 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 9 April 2026

Summary

The customer advised that they were unable to place international calls to the United States. The customer was informed that, in accordance with the Office's complaints policy, complaints should first be submitted directly to the relevant service provider. The customer was further advised that, if the matter remains unresolved following the service provider's review, they may contact the Office for further assistance.

Case # C19 – 2026

Entity involved: Digicel

Date of Complaint: 12 April 2026

Summary

The customer reported that their mobile internet service was experiencing frequent interruptions. A Digicel technician attended the property and conducted various tests. The results of the on-site assessment were normal, and the diagnostic logs did not identify any faults or issues on Digicel's network.

Case # C20 – 2026

Entity involved: defamatory statements

Date of Complaint: 14 April 2026

Summary

The customer reported that defamatory statements had allegedly been made against them. The customer was advised to report the matter to the Royal Cayman Islands Police Service.

Case # C21 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 14 April 2026

Summary

The customer advised that they had made several attempts to obtain a refund from Flow but had been unable to resolve the matter directly with the service provider. Following receipt of the complaint, the Office contacted Flow to seek clarification and facilitate a response regarding the outstanding refund request. Flow subsequently confirmed that the refund had been processed, and the customer was issued the refund on 21 April 2026.

Case # C22 – 2026

Entity involved: Logic

Date of Complaint: 15 April 2026

Summary

The customer reported being charged a late payment fee, a reconnection fee, and a service fee. Upon review of the customer's billing records, the Office determined that only the late payment fee was applied. The reconnection and service fees had been reversed by the service provider and were therefore not charged to the customer's account.

Case # C23 – 2026

Entity involved: Logic

Date of Complaint: 28 April 2026

Summary

The customer advised that their internet service had been unavailable for two days and that they had had trouble contacting the service provider. The Office provided the customer with the relevant contact details for Logic to report the issue. The customer subsequently confirmed that they were able to contact Logic and that the matter had been resolved.

Case # C24 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 1 May 2026

Summary

The customer advised that they were no longer able to access their voicemail service. Following intervention by the Office, the matter was raised with the service provider, which subsequently assisted the customer in resolving the issue. A representative of the service provider was able to guide the customer through the necessary steps to regain access to their voicemail functionality, resulting in the matter being satisfactorily addressed.

Case # C25 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 3 May 2026

Summary

The customer alleged that fuel prices at a retail gas station had increased by approximately 100% over a two-week period and expressed concern that the increase constituted price gouging. The Office reviewed the complaint and conducted an assessment of the relevant pricing information. Following its review, the Office advised the customer that the price increase was attributable to the higher landed cost of a new fuel shipment and was consistent with the wholesale price adjustment implemented by the importer.

Case # C26 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 1 May 2026

Summary

The customer reported that a number of allegedly malicious and defamatory posts had been published about them on a social media platform. Upon review, the Office advised the customer that the matter fell outside its regulatory jurisdiction and was more appropriately addressed by the competent law enforcement authorities. Accordingly, the customer was directed to report the matter to the Police Service, which possesses the authority and investigative mandate to assess and pursue complaints relating to potential criminal conduct or unlawful online activity.

Case # C27 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 5 May 2026

Summary

The customer reported that their internet service had been unavailable for a portion of the morning and expressed concern that they had not been notified by the service provider, Flow, of the service disruption. Upon inquiry by the Office, Flow confirmed that it was aware of the outage and had dispatched a technical team to investigate and rectify the issue. This information was subsequently communicated to the customer. The customer was further advised that, in accordance with established complaint-handling procedures, service-related issues should first be reported directly to the service provider to allow an opportunity for resolution before the matter is escalated to the Office.

Case # C28 – 2026

Entity involved: CUC

Date of Complaint: 8 May 2026

Summary

The customer reported that CUC had undertaken tree-trimming activities adjacent to their property and alleged that fallen tree branches came into contact with electrical lines servicing the residence, resulting in an interruption of electricity supply for approximately one week. Upon investigation, CUC advised that the service disruption was not attributable to its vegetation management activities but rather resulted from defective electrical components located within the customer's premises. The Office communicated the utility provider's explanation to the customer. The customer subsequently indicated that they did not accept CUC's assessment of the matter and advised that they intended to seek independent legal advice regarding the issues raised.

Case # C29 – 2026

Entity involved: Digicel

Date of Complaint: 3 May 2026

Summary

The customer reported that, despite subscribing to Digicel's highest-tier postpaid plan, they were experiencing persistent issues with slow mobile data connectivity and call performance. The matter was referred to Digicel for investigation. In response, Digicel advised that it had conducted network testing in relation to the customer's device and service. The service provider reported that no faults or service deficiencies were identified during its assessment. Digicel further provided the results of testing conducted at various locations relevant to the customer's complaint, all of which indicated that network performance was operating within expected parameters and that no service-related issues were detected. The findings of the investigation were communicated to the customer. The customer, however, expressed dissatisfaction with the response provided and maintained concerns regarding the service provider's level of accountability in addressing the reported issues. The Office advised the customer of the outcome of the investigation and recorded their continued dissatisfaction with the provider's position.

Case # C30 & C31 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 10 May 2026

Summary

The customers expressed dissatisfaction with Flow's decision to discontinue its candw.ky email service. Upon receiving the complaint, the Office engaged with the service provider and requested that the deadline for the discontinuation of the email service be extended to provide affected customers with additional time to make alternative arrangements. Flow subsequently agreed to extend the applicable deadlines. The Office communicated the revised discontinuation dates to the customers and advised that the decision to discontinue the candw.ky email service constituted a business and operational matter within the service provider's discretion. As such, while the Office facilitated communication and sought additional transitional accommodations for affected customers, the ultimate decision regarding the continuation or cessation of the service remained within the provider's lawful business operations.

Case # C32 – 2026

Entity involved: CUC

Date of Complaint: 26 May 2026

Summary

The customer reported concerns regarding the relocation of a utility pole on their property by CUC and the trimming of trees that had previously provided shade to their residence. The customer further inquired as to why representatives of the Office were present at the site during the execution of the works alongside personnel from CUC. Upon review of the matter, the Office advised the customer that CUC, pursuant to the rights and obligations conferred under its licence and applicable regulatory framework, was authorized to relocate utility infrastructure where necessary to facilitate the provision of service to new and existing customers in a developing area. The Office explained that the works undertaken formed part of the utility's efforts to accommodate continued growth and expansion within the service area. The Office further clarified that its representatives were present at the location at the request of CUC in an oversight capacity to ensure that the utility's activities were being conducted in accordance with its regulatory obligations, licence conditions, and applicable standards. Following this explanation, the customer was advised of the Office's role and the basis upon which the utility works were being carried out.

Case # C33 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 22 May 2026

Summary

The customer reported that an electrical outage had occurred at their business premises and alleged that, as a result of the outage, their telephone line developed a fault. The customer further advised that, despite having reported the issue to the service provider, Flow, they had not received a timely response or resolution. Upon receipt of the complaint, the Office engaged with Flow and sought an update regarding the status of the reported fault. Following the Office's intervention, the service provider investigated the matter and subsequently undertook the necessary corrective actions to restore the affected telephone service. The customer was advised of the steps taken by the service provider, and the matter was ultimately resolved to the extent that service functionality was restored.

Case # C34 – 2026

Entity involved: CUC

Date of Complaint: 28 May 2026

Summary

The customer reported that their solar system had been duly submitted to and approved by the Building Control Unit, including completion of the required inspection process. The customer further advised that the system operates independently and is not interconnected with CUC's electrical grid, notwithstanding CUC's request for installation details. The Office informed did a press release stating that CUC's requirements are limited to information reasonably necessary to confirm whether the system is connected to or could affect the grid, compliance with applicable technical and safety standards, and any inspection required before a parallel connection is energised. CUC may refuse an interconnection only on specific legal grounds, must

provide written reasons, and cannot require a non-exporting customer to join a programme that does not apply to the system.

Case # C35 – 2026

Entity involved: CUC

Date of Complaint: 29 May 2026

Summary

The customer reported that CUC was requesting additional information regarding their self-consumption system. The Office advised that CUC may require technical compliance and inspection for a parallel connection but may refuse interconnection only on limited legal grounds and must provide written reasons. These requirements should not be used to compel a non-exporting customer to join an inapplicable programme.

Case # C36 – 2026

Entity involved: CUC

Date of Complaint: 29 May 2026

Summary

The customer reported that CUC was asking for more information about their self-use electricity system. The Office explained that CUC may require the system to meet technical standards and pass an inspection before it is connected. CUC may refuse the connection only for specific legal reasons and must explain its decision in writing. CUC cannot require a customer whose system does not send electricity back to the grid to join a programme that does not apply to them.

Case # C37 – 2026

Entity involved: CUC

Date of Complaint: 27 May 2026

Summary

The customer raised concerns about CUC's request for information regarding a permitted, non-exporting solar and battery system and questioned CUC's authority and the manual isolation requirement. The Office advised that self-consumption renewable energy should be allowed subject only to reasonable and lawful technical and safety requirements. The Office committed to reviewing CUC's authority, permit-disclosure requirements, any standby service arrangements, and the need for a manual air gap, while engaging with the relevant authorities to establish a clear and coordinated regulatory approach.

Case # C38 – 2026

Entity involved: CUC

Date of Complaint: 1 June 2026

Summary

The customer reported that CUC had delayed completion of their consumer self-consumption solar and battery system by classifying it as unauthorised, despite the system having been approved by the Cayman Islands Planning Department and allegedly complying with Government policy. The Office advised the customer that CUC may require the system to comply with applicable technical standards and pass an inspection before connection. However, CUC may refuse the connection only on specific legal grounds and must provide written reasons for its decision. The Office further clarified that a customer with a non-exporting system cannot be required to participate in a programme that does not apply to that type of system.

Case # C39 – 2026

Entity involved: CUC

Date of Complaint: 27 May 2026

Summary

The customer advised that CUC had prevented the completion and operation of their consumer self-consumption solar and battery system on the basis that the installation was unauthorised. The customer maintained that the system had received approval from the Cayman Islands Planning Department and was consistent with applicable Government policy. Accordingly, the customer requested that the Office investigate the matter and issue any necessary regulatory determination to facilitate the system's

completion and operation without further delay. The customer later advised that the planning dept began approving applications in August 2026.

Case # C40 – 2026

Entity involved: CUC

Date of Complaint: 1 June 2026

Summary

The customer stated that CUC's designation of their consumer self-consumption solar and battery installation as unauthorised had delayed the project's completion and commissioning. According to the customer, the proposed system had been approved by the Cayman Islands Planning Department and complied with the relevant Government policy. The customer therefore sought the Office's intervention to investigate the matter and make any regulatory decisions required to enable the system to become operational without further delay. The Office provided the customer with a copy of a statement stating that CUC cannot require a non-exporting customer to join a programme that does not apply to the system.

Case # C41 2026

Entity involved: CUC

Date of Complaint: 2 June 2026

Summary

The customer reported that CUC had delayed completion of their consumer self-consumption solar and battery system by classifying it as unauthorised, despite its approval by the Cayman Islands Planning Department and alleged compliance with Government policy. The customer requested that the Office investigate and make the necessary regulatory decisions to allow the system to be completed and placed into operation without further delay. The solar installer informed the Office that the Planning Department began approving the solar installation after the Office advised all relevant parties that CUC could become involved only where there was a potential for feedback to the grid.

Case # C42 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 4 June 2026

Summary

The customer reported that CUC had treated their consumer self-consumption solar and battery system as an unauthorised installation, thereby delaying its completion and operation. The customer asserted that the system had been approved by the Cayman Islands Planning Department and was consistent with applicable Government policy and requested that the Office investigate and provide the regulatory direction necessary to resolve the matter. The Office subsequently published a statement confirming that customers with non-exporting systems cannot be required to enrol in a programme that does not apply to their installations.

Case # C43 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 4 June 2026

Summary

The customer reported that they were unable to access their candw.ky email account and had been advised that Flow intended to discontinue the service. The Office informed the customer that it was engaging with Flow to establish a formal process for addressing the matter and that a public announcement would be issued once a final decision had been made.

Case # C44 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 4 June 2026

Summary

The customer advised that CUC's classification of their consumer self-consumption solar and battery installation as unauthorised had prevented the system from being completed and brought into operation. The customer maintained that the installation had received approval from the Cayman Islands Planning

Department and complied with the relevant Government policy. The customer therefore requested the Office's intervention to investigate the matter and facilitate the necessary regulatory resolution. The Office subsequently issued a public statement clarifying that CUC cannot require a customer with a non-exporting system to participate in a programme that is not applicable to that installation.

Case # C45 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 8 June 2026

Summary

The customer alleged that Flow did not provide customers with reimbursement or billing credits for periods during which services were unavailable. In order to assess the complaint, the Office requested that the customer provide copies of the relevant billing statements and supporting documentation for review. The customer subsequently advised that they had discontinued their services with Flow and did not provide the requested documentation.

Case # C47 – 2026

Entity involved: Logic

Date of Complaint: 19 June 2026

Summary

The customer reported that invoices were issued in Cayman Islands dollars, but they paid using a credit card denominated in United States dollars and disputed the foreign exchange rate applied by Logic to those transactions. In response, Logic advised that a modest variance from prevailing interbank exchange rates is common among telecommunications and utility providers processing foreign-currency payments and may arise from operational considerations, including system configuration and billing-cycle processing. Logic further stated that the difference between its applied exchange rate and the relevant commercial bank rate was approximately 2.4%, rather than the more substantial discrepancy alleged in the complaint. Logic maintained that its billing practices are fair, transparent, and compliant, while confirming its willingness to engage constructively with the Office and to review its exchange-rate practices where appropriate. The Customer was also informed that if they were still unsatisfied with the rates, they can contact Cayman Islands Monetary Authority (CIMA) for a further review.

Case # C48 – 2026

Entity involved: Island Energy Ltd/ Flow

Date of Complaint: 22 June 2026

Summary

The customer reported that both electricity and telephone services in Cayman Brac had been disrupted. In accordance with the Office's established complaints-handling policy, the customer was advised to raise the matter directly with the relevant service providers in the first instance, thereby affording each provider a reasonable opportunity to investigate and address the reported service interruptions. The customer was further advised that, should the matter remain unresolved following the service providers' review, it may be referred to the Office for further consideration and assistance.

Case # C49 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 22 June 2026

Summary

The customer reported that Flow had not responded to their emails and that upgrading their service plan required an in-person visit to a retail store. The Office contacted Flow, which advised that its technicians had made unsuccessful attempts to reach the customer. This information was communicated to the customer; however, the customer did not acknowledge or respond to the Office's correspondence.

Case # C52 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 23 June 2026

Summary

The customer reported numerous discrepancies in billing statements issued by Flow. The complainant was advised to submit a detailed written complaint to the Office, together with any relevant supporting documentation, to enable the matters raised to be properly assessed. As the complainant did not respond to the Office's correspondence, the Office was unable to proceed with its review. Accordingly, the complaint was administratively closed due to the complainant's non-response.

Case # C54 – 2026

Entity involved: Gas station

Date of Complaint: 10 July 2026

Summary

The customer reported that, after using their payment card to purchase \$25.00 in fuel, no fuel was dispensed from the pump. The customer also observed an additional \$50.00 hold on their card. Following its review, the Office determined that the \$50.00 authorisation hold had been applied by the customer's bank and advised the customer to contact the bank directly for further assistance. In relation to the \$25.00 fuel transaction, the gas station issued the customer a gift certificate for the relevant amount. The gas station further advised that 139 transactions had been processed at the same pump that evening and that no operational errors had been identified.

Case # C56 – 2026

Entity involved: Gas station

Date of Complaint: 22 May 2026

Summary

The customer alleged that a retail gas station had engaged in price gouging after the self-service fuel price increased to \$6.84 per gallon on 2 May 2026, representing an increase of \$0.81 per gallon since the customer's previous purchase at the same location. Following a review of the relevant pricing information, the Office determined that the increase reflected the higher landed cost of a new fuel shipment and was consistent with the corresponding wholesale price adjustment implemented by the importer. The Office further established that comparable price increases had been introduced during the same period at other retail outlets supplied by the same importer. Accordingly, based on the available evidence, the Office was unable to substantiate the allegation of price gouging in relation to the transaction.

Case # C57 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 29 July 2026

Summary

The customer reported that changes made to their telephone plan resulted in an increase in their monthly charges. The customer subsequently visited a Flow retail location and requested that the plan be amended to reduce the charges. However, as Flow did not process the requested change promptly, the customer disputed responsibility for the additional charges incurred during the delay. Following the Office's intervention, Flow reviewed the matter and applied a credit to the customer's account.

Case # C58 – 2026

Entity involved: Logic

Date of Complaint: 6 August 2026

Summary

The customer reported a loss of service and advised that, despite several attempts, they were unable to contact the service provider. Upon receipt of the complaint, the Office contacted Logic to facilitate an investigation into the reported service interruption. The customer subsequently confirmed that the affected services had been restored.

Case # C60 – 2026

Entity involved: CUC

Date of Complaint: 10 August 2026

Summary

The customer alleged that CUC had not extended the benefit of the Government's fuel-cost relief programme to customers participating in its solar programme. In accordance with the Office's complaints-handling policy, the customer was advised to submit a formal complaint directly to CUC in the first instance, thereby affording the service provider a reasonable opportunity to investigate and respond to the matter. The customer was also provided with information explaining the operation of the fuel relief programme: <https://www.ofreg.ky/news/fuel-relief-programme-explained>

Case # C61 – 2026

Entity involved: Digicel

Date of Complaint: 11 August 2026

Summary

The customer alleged that their former spouse had access to information associated with the customer's account. Upon receipt of the complaint, the Office referred the matter to Digicel for review. Digicel subsequently confirmed that the accounts, which had previously been consolidated, were separated to prevent continued access between them.

Case # C62 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 24 August 2026

Summary

The customer reported that, upon reviewing their account, they identified an additional charge that they did not recognise. Upon receipt of the complaint, the Office contacted Flow to obtain clarification regarding the disputed charge. Flow subsequently advised the customer that the charge related to roaming services. Following receipt of this explanation, the customer confirmed that they were satisfied with the clarification provided and expressed appreciation for the Office's intervention.

Case # C63 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 25 August 2026

Summary

The customer reported that they had been informed that the candw.ky email service would be discontinued at the end of July 2026 and that they were unable to access their account. Upon receipt of the complaint, the Office contacted Flow, which subsequently restored the customer's access to the account. The customer was also advised of the revised service-discontinuation timeline as follows: 31 August 2026, outgoing email functionality would cease; 15 September 2026, incoming emails would remain available for download but could no longer be forwarded; and 31 December 2026, the candw.ky email platform would be permanently discontinued.

Case # C65 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 29 August 2026

Summary

The customer reported that internet services were unavailable within their residential area. The customer subsequently advised the Office that a Flow representative had attended the location and taken the necessary corrective action, following which the service issue was resolved.

Case # C66 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 11 September 2026

Summary

The customer reported that they were unable to reset the password associated with their candw.ky email account and copied the Office on their request for assistance. Flow subsequently contacted the customer and provided the necessary instructions to complete the password-reset process.

Case # C67 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 15 September 2026

Summary

The customer reported that unwanted websites were appearing on their mobile device without their authorisation. As the matter appeared to relate to the device's security or configuration settings, the customer was advised to seek assistance from a qualified technical service provider to identify the cause of the issue and implement appropriate measures to block access to the relevant websites.