RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**RECPAB_25_1125**
DATE	**25 November 2025**
LOCATION	**Online**

Attendee	Representing	Initials	Role
Jon Dixon	RECCo	JD	PAB Chair
Dorcas Batstone	Independent Member	DBa	PAB Member
Steve Arthur	Independent Member	SA	PAB Member
Steve Verdon	Independent Member	SV	PAB Member
Angela Joyce	Supplier Representative	AJo	PAB Member
Paul Saker	Supplier Representative	PS	PAB Member
Anne Jackson	UNC Representative	AJa	PAB Member
David Brown	MEM Representative	DBr	PAB Member
Paul Everett	Supplier Representative	PE	PAB Member
Fungai Madzivadondo	DNO Representative	FM	PAB Member
Shiv Singh	GT Representative	SS	PAB Member
Simon Waltho	BSC Representative	SW	PAB Member
Beth Procter (*until Item 5)*	SEC Representative	BP	PAB Member
Faye Brookes Lewis	Citizens Advice Representative	FBL	PAB Member
Shelley Rouse	Code Manager	SR	Operational Account Manager Representative
Anton Moden	Code Manager	AM	Performance Assurance Lead
Andrew Waghorn	Code Manager	AWa	Performance Assurance Analytics Lead
Vaishnavi Campbell-Sharma	Code Manager	VCS	Performance Assurance Senior Management
Bailey Robb	Code Manager	BR	PAB Secretary
Aleksandra Maczka	Code Manager	AMa	Performance Assurance Team Member
Anna Weeks	RECCo	AWe	Service Manager
Mark Loveday (*for item 2 only*)	RECCo	ML	Director of Operations
Francine Peyroux-Sissoko (*for item 3 only*)	Code Manager	FPS	Change Analyst
Maitri Perea (*for item 4 only)*	Code Manager	MP	Technical Services Consultant

Attendee	Representing	Initials	Role
Carl Dennis (*for items 4 and 5 only*)	Code Manager	CD	Operational Account Manager
Sandbox Party Representative 1 (*for item 4 only)*	Party Representative	JO	Representative
Sandbox Party Representative 2 (*for item 4 only)*	Party Representative	CS	Representative
Stark Energy Services Representative (*for item 5 only)*	Party Representative	JM	Representative
Siemens Representative (*for item 5 only)*	Party Representative	HC	Representative
Eve Marriner (*for items 4 to 6 only*)	Code Manager	EM	Operational Account Manager
Ishita Ghosh (*for items 7 to 9 only*)	Code Manager	IG	Qualification Manager
Annulments Party Representative 1 (*for item 13 only)*	Party Representative	KB	Representative
Annulments Party Representative 2 (*for item 13 only*)	Party Representative	RP	Representative
Bela Ashworth (*for item 13 only*)	Code Manager	BA	Change Analyst
Holly Law (*for item 13 only)*	Code Manager	HL	Change Delivery and Release Manager

1. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES AND REVIEW OF ACTION LOG

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting of the PAB.

The PAB unanimously **APPROVED** the actions and draft minutes from the PAB meeting held on 28 October 2025. PAB Members reviewed the open and overdue actions. Six actions were closed following information provided in the meeting papers or via a verbal update.

Please refer to the Action Log for a full status update.

2. IT CAPACITY AND REC SERVICE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT – RECCO UPDATE

ML joined the meeting.

The PAB considered a report from RECCo on the planned scope and timetable of the quarterly RECCo updates on Service Providers. This includes on performance, capacity, and security for REC Services.

The RECCo representative advised the PAB that this had come into sharper focus following recent events and focused on four key areas:

- Objectives and background;
- Identifying any gaps and areas of improvement in the future;
- Which Service Providers are covered by this; and
- IT security and capacity.

The PAB were advised that the next update would be provided at the February PAB meeting when RECCo will provide a paper on whether the approach has been working as expected.

A PAB Member enquired as to the main risk this was looking to address, or whether this related to housekeeping improvements. The RECCo representative advised they were focusing on proactive housekeeping, with an immediate focus on the Enquiry Services area.

The RECCo representative then advised the PAB of an issues with the ECC 232 report. Following a price cap announcement, there is typically an influx of customers looking to switch, resulting in significant enquiries that overwhelms the EES. The RECCo representative advised that they were in discussions with the Service Provider around deploying a fix in Q1 of 2026. They were cognisant of ensuring they do not introduce an anti-competitive element and to mitigate this, there have been ongoing discussions with Ofgem and C&C.

The Code Manager queried whether this would impact on performance assurance activities as the report drives several of them, including data cleanse. The Code Manager underlined the importance of the report to the RECCo representative and the PAB. The RECCo representative assured the Code Manager and PAB that they would reach out to the Code Manager to ensure that there is no adverse impact on the performance assurance activities.

The PAB:

- **NOTED** the proposed scope and timings of RECCo's future updates on IT performance management and security.

NEW ACTION: RECCo to bring an update on the ECC232 report request from GB Group (a Third Party Intermediary Service Provider) and work with the Code Manager to ensure any changes agreed with C&C have no impacts on Performance Assurance reporting.

ML left the meeting.

3. I0265 – THEFT ASSESSMENT CALCULATOR USAGE AND SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT

FPS joined the meeting.

The PAB considered a high-level update from the Code Manager on REC Issue I0265 – Theft Assessment Calculator Usage and Suitability Assessment and its associated information request, which received eight responses.

The Code Manager advised the PAB that this was raised to investigate how widely the existing theft calculator is used by REC Parties and whether the current platform is fit for purpose in operational environments, following a recent Derogation request that was considered by the PAB.

The Code Manager noted the Information Request (IR) was used to gather Parties' input on the problems and issues they experienced with the theft assessment calculators and to support with solution development. The IR opened on 26 September 2025 and closed on 7 November 2025, with eight responses received. The results will not be published and are being kept confidential due to the sensitivity of the topic. A summary of these responses was provided to the PAB:

- All respondents acknowledge the calculator requires improvement, even where they are not currently facing issues.
- Two Parties are currently using the theft calculator.
- Two Parties use an alternate calculator.
- Four Parties use a mix of both the theft calculator and alternate calculators / their own estimated calculations.

Main issues include:

- System restraints - the calculator only works on Windows-based laptops and desktops which support the macros and excel functions required to be used. It cannot be used on MacBooks, tablets, or Google applications.
- Types of energy theft that make information gathering difficult, resulting in a minimal theft amount being estimated.
- The calculator is outdated – number of tampers, new technologies and equipment are not covered by the calculator. Some business types are also not covered.

Suggested solutions include improvements to the guidance on the REC portal and for the calculator to be made more user friendly.

The Code Manager summarised the findings by advising the PAB that the calculator is quite outdated, with several access issues. There is a clear need to update and improve. They advised it was being discussed at the Theft Issues Group to find a solution.

A PAB Member queried how old the calculator was. They were advised that it is approx. 7-9 years old and was originally produced by the Energy Savings Trust for the SPA before it was moved across to REC. Another PAB Member believed the values were updated on an annual basis but that the functionality and such was not.

A PAB Member queried whether its use was mandated. The Code Manager confirmed it was mandated in order to stop consumers switching to get a better 'deal' if theft was detected and for submission as evidence in court, given it was an industry accepted solution developed by an independent party.

The PAB Member suggested that any solution would look at the wealth of AI tools, platforms, products, and tools available. The Code Manager confirmed that Parties are keen for improvement, and they would consider these points when developing a solution.

The PAB Chair noted that, given it was mandated, it was appropriate for the PAB to look at this issue and that the PAB were supportive of this being progressed, and improvement options considered.

The PAB:

- **NOTED** the update.

FPS left the meeting.

4. ROBOTICS SANDBOX UPDATE

MP, CD, EM, JO, and CS joined the meeting.

Further to consideration last month and PAB action RECPAB_25_1028_05, the Code Manager presented the updated Robotics Sandbox Application to the PAB on behalf of a REC Party. The initial application relates to granting the REC Party a Derogation from the prohibition of using robotics in SDEP. The updated recommendation from the Code Manager outlined the proposal to allow Suppliers to participate if they agree to a Code of Practice.

A PAB Member queried a point on limiting bot speed. The Code Manager advised that this would limit the speed of the robotics due to the SDEP screens loading time. This time can increase with more users on the system, so limiting the speed of the robotics to mimic human speed would help to maintain the speed of the SDEP system and reduce potential incidents of overload or harm to the system.

The PAB Member noted that both the paper at October PAB and this one highlighted a system embedded in the past, noting the need for updating now. The Code Manager agreed, noting it was reasonable for Parties to try and find ways to modernise it, including the Sandbox application currently under consideration. Re-platforming over the longer term was probably wise and the Code Manager took an action to engage with RECCo on this point.

A RECCo representative queried whether in agreeing the recommendation outlined in the paper, it would approve the application from the Party named in the paper and open the door to enable other potential Parties to do likewise. The Code Manager confirmed that was correct and that the approval

being sought for the named Party was along the timelines previously laid out to the PAB, subject to any further slippage in the C&C timeline. This also gives the Code Manager time to develop a robust application process, including a robotics code of conduct, for other Parties who may wish to participate.

A PAB Member queried how the Code Manager would intend to communicate this to other Parties. The Code Manager replied that both the weekly bulletin and the REC Issues Group would be used to make Parties aware. They advised that meetings with OAMs would also be set up for interested Parties to go over their applications.

Another PAB Member queried how many robotics application could be supported and what the burden would be on managing, administrating, and monitoring them. The Code Manager responded that while C&C had not advised a limit, once applications are received, they would work with C&C to determine an appropriate total number of bots and these would then allocate these out on an equitable basis. The PAB Member queried who would lead the management, monitoring, and reporting of the trial once live, and how the PAB would be updated, to which the Code Manager replied it would be the REC Technical Services team.

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the Robotics Sandbox approach as outlined, and for it to be further developed before the trial commences.

NEW ACTION: RECCo to provide an update on how the Digitalisation Strategy is tackling the failure demand where users' needs were not met at first request leading to Parties raising Sandbox requests to develop bespoke robotics for SDEP.

MP, JO, CS, and BP left the meeting.

5. DEROGATION APPLICATION – SEALING PLIERS

JM and HC joined the meeting.

The Code Manager presented a Derogation Application that had been received on 13 November 2025 from Stark Energy Services Ltd. The Derogation related to permitting the transfer of the existing sealing pliers from Siemens PLC to Stark Energy Services Ltd as part of the sale of the Siemens metering business to Stark. They want to ensure the continuation of services to their customers while they are set to start trading under the new name.

The Code Manager also noted the discussion that had taken place at the October PAB meeting on Sealing Plier Derogations, noting that to make better use of the Derogation process, Stark Energy Services Ltd is also putting forward a change request to find a better solution for dealing with these requests such that each request does not need to be brought to the PAB.

A RECCo representative highlighted a cross-code impact with any change request, given there are BSC Sealing Plier related obligations that may need to be amended. The Code Manager agreed and advised they would investigate.

A PAB Member noted that Derogations are for a time-limited period up to a maximum of two years and sought clarity whether this time limit would apply to this Derogation. The Code Manager confirmed this was the case.

Another PAB Member raised concerns around the traceability of the jobs and concern around the transfer when there are specific letters on it to identify the meter operator, particularly where a DNO may assume that the identifier belongs to the previous company. The PAB Member suggested wider communications may be beneficial. The PAB Chair noted that a solution was not required today, but that it was something the PAB should look at as a wider piece of work to develop more robust thinking about a longer-term solution.

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the Derogation Application as set out in the paper, for a maximum period of up to two years.
- **APPROVED** the conditions proposed for the Derogation; and
- **APPROVED** the timescales for the Derogation.

CD, JM, and HC left the meeting.

6. QUARTERLY SANDBOX AND DEROGATION UPDATE

Following action RECPAB_25_0930_08 from the September 2025 PAB Meeting, the Code Manager presented a quarterly update paper on all Sandbox and Derogation Applications, including those in progress and those which have closed.

A PAB Member commented that quarterly updates were appropriate and appreciated the Code Manager's paper.

The PAB:

- **NOTED** the update; and
- **PROVIDED** feedback on the information required.

EM left the meeting.

7. CRS PERFORMANCE CHARGES

IG joined the meeting.

The PAB considered a report from the Code Manager in relation to a Performance Charge for the Central Registration Services (CRS) for the period from 01 July to 30 September 2025. The paper detailed the breakdown of the charge for the PAB to consider.

A PAB Member queried whether the charges were acting as an incentive as they were originally designed. The Code Manager noted that from an incentive point of view, they were operating well. The main issue at this time is to do with user support, as the PAB were advised at the October meeting.

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the Performance Charges applied to the CRS Provider for the quarter ended 30 September 2025 in line with the REC Performance Charge regime introduced from 1 April 2023 and the Performance Charges scale approved by PAB in March 2025.
- **NOTED** that no exemption request was submitted by the CRS Provider for this period.

8. SERVICE PROVIDER ASSURANCE UPDATE

The PAB considered a report from the Code Manager in relation to several key updates on the performance of REC services from August to October 2025, including an update on direct assurance.

The PAB:

- **NOTED** the update.

9. QUALIFICATION UPDATE

The Code Manager presented an update to the PAB on several Qualification related matters. This includes the withdrawal of accreditation for an AMI for non-conformance by failing to provide sufficient information to carry out an AMI audit, and on ISD V16 Publication Errors. Updates on the Enduring Qualification Activity and REC Qualification document update were also provided.

A PAB Member queried whether the Code Manager had written to the Board of Directors of the AMI about this matter and whether they had any response. The Code Manager advised the PAB that Wilcock had written to them on several occasions and were advised they would respond but have not done so.

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the withdrawal of accreditation for the AMI for non-conformance.
- **NOTED** how the Code Manager will operate the REC Qualification process, as outlined in the *Qualification and Maintenance Schedule*, during and after the MHHS transition.

- **NOTED** the changes to the REC Entry Assessment Information Pack and Entry Assessment Forms further to the annual revision and update.

IG left the meeting.

10. PARTY ASSURANCE UPDATES

The Code Manager presented an update to the PAB on Party Assurance as part of the active cycle month. The Code Manager also detailed the planned activity related to the review of unqualified MEMs, with details on the proposed PAT to address the issue outlined in the paper.

Additional updates were provided on the Erroneous Switch Peer Comparison analysis and Smart Meter Installation Survey (SMIS) results. The update also included the Code Manager's proposed approach to TDIS verification, updates to the Theft Target Methodology and proposed changes to the PARC which have been identified during the annual review.

A PAB Member queried Retail Risk 10 and the identified Supplier issue, asking the Code Manager whether the underlying issue may be that Suppliers are raising switch requests where there is already a switch in progress. The Code Manager noted that most of the impacted Parties are non-domestic Suppliers and that the responses to previous Enquiry PATs were that the customer had not informed them that they were engaging with other Suppliers, hence another Supplier has raised a switch.

The Code Manager provided an overview of the intended approach to TDIS verification that will commence in 2026, and the two intended verification streams. The first stream will see the Code Manager sampling questionable submissions and individual cases, asking Suppliers for their file on the case to verify it meets the requirements of the REC. The second stream will be looking at the process perspective, with a small number of suppliers randomly sampled. The Code Manager advised the PAB that there had been a lot of input from the theft team at RECCo in designing the verification processes and that it was intended to be a sensible approach that was not overly complicated. The Code Manager noted it would be refined throughout the year as it will be the first year, and there will be a lessons learned process.

The Code Manager also advised the PAB in relation to the unqualified MEMs appointed to meter points, that they now had access to GES so that the scope of this activity will include both gas and electricity. PATs would be applied to Parties where they have taken no action to appoint qualified MEMs following the Code Manager's communications.

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the application of the PATs as set out in Section 1 of the paper.
- **APPROVED** the proposed approach to TDIS verification.

- **APPROVED** the application of PATs to Suppliers that have unqualified MEMs appointed to RMPs on 31 December 2025 as outlined in the paper, including an Enquiry PAT and subsequently an Action Plan PAT.
- **APPROVED** the proposed updates to the PARC resulting from the Annual Review.
- **NOTED** the updates to the Theft Target Methodology that will be progressed via a Category 3 change.

11. CROSS-CODE COLLABORATION DEEP DIVE

The PAB considered a report from the Code Manager outlining the scope of a deep dive into 'Better Cross-Code Integration' across REC, BSC, SEC, and UNC, with the objective of establishing more effective collaboration mechanisms for managing underperforming Parties and enhancing overall performance assurance. The paper also contained an indicative timeline of activities for PAB's consideration.

The Code Manager noted that this deep dive was a result of reflections on the way different Code Bodies were actioning issues at the same time, but in a disjointed way, with the idea of getting together to plan how to better collaborate and coordinate action and reporting. The Code Manager noted that this was supported by the BSC, SEC, and UNC representatives, and that DCUSA were asked but had noted they do not have a performance assurance function as such but were supportive.

The Code Manager provided an overview of what would be covered in the deep dive:

- Processes that are interdependent and cross Codes;
- Data sharing – support coordinated action and sharing things more widely;
- Escalation of major incidents – having mechanisms to engage with one another;
- Sanctions – ensuring these are coordinated and where possible, PAB may be able to extend the sanctions while other bodies are getting the required approvals; and
- Peak periods of activity – having better visibility of what other Codes are planning to avoid all codes demanding a Party's time all at once.

The Code Manager noted that this would be limited to performance assurance only and would not involved Code changes. If approved by the PAB, the Code Manager intends to have a weekly slot with focused sessions on each of the points above. Following that, the Code Manager will present interim findings to the PAB before sharing this with the industry.

Several PAB Members, including the UNC representative, noted their support of the Code Manager's approach and deep dive on this topic, noting the potential for improvement in PAB's visibility.

The PAB Chair queried whether it would be helpful if they wrote to the Performance Assurance Committee / Boards of other Code Bodies to help enable them to participate. The PAB Members agreed that this would be helpful.

The DNO representative noted that while DCUSA may not have a performance assurance function, they should still be involved. The DNO representative agreed to take an action to look for ways to connect the Code Manager and DCUSA to enable their participation in this deep dive.

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the proposed scope and plan for the deep dive on Better Cross Code Integration.

NEW ACTION: The Code Manager to inform Ofgem of the deep dive on Better Cross-Code Collaboration, seeking any relevant input.

NEW ACTION: The PAB Chair to write to the UNC, IGT UNC PAC, SEC, and BSC PAB to seek endorsement for the deep dive on Better Cross-Code Collaboration.

NEW ACTION: The PAB DNO Representative to seek views from DNO Commercial Operations Group (COG) on how DCUSA engagement can be sought for the deep dive on Better Cross-Code Collaboration.

12. CODE MANAGER SOLR OBLIGATIONS

Further to action RECPAB_25_1028_10, the Code Manager presented an overview of the Supplier of Last Resort (SoLR) process. This included the role of the REC in the event of a SoLR and outlined the activities Ofgem, the Code Manager, and the Service Provider is responsible for.

PAB Members discussed various aspects of the Code Manager's presentation.

The PAB:

- **NOTED** the presentation.

13. ANNULMENTS DECISIONS

BA, HL, KB and RP joined the meeting.

The PAB considered a report from the Code Manager in relation to the allegations of potential misuse of the annulments process by a REC Party. The Code Manager summarised the paper which has been provided to the PAB Members ahead of the meeting.

The Code Manager addressed the criticism of the paper that was provided by the Party regarding the harms and consumer detriment. They emphasised that the paper only lays out the potential harms and

theoretical detriment. The Code Manager received no evidence to prove or disprove that these occurred in any of the individual cases that were looked into as part of the investigation.

The PAB Chair explained there have been some changes to the REC regarding its coverage. They emphasised that consumer outcomes are key considerations for the PAB and although there may be no explicit obligation in the Code to do or not do something, that shouldn't prevent the PAB from acknowledging that and, where appropriate, looking to widen its purview and allowing the Code to evolve.

The Code Manager emphasised that based on the evidence, the Party had met the requirements under the REC. The recommendation in the paper was to take no further action against the Party under the REC at this stage. Additionally, the proposed course of action was to inform Ofgem of the investigation and provide them with statement of facts and the conclusion of the meeting and the investigation itself. This is due to the linkage with the Supply Licence.

The PAB Chair pointed out that there was a key issue relating to the interpretation of the Code, which over the years has been through changes and as a result has deviated from the Supply Licence. The key consideration should not only be whether there has been a breach of the process/Code but also to ensure that interpretation is consistent to enable level playing field across the Suppliers.

The Code Manager agreed with the point around the interpretation of the Code and re-emphasised that while the Party had adhered to the REC, further work may need to be done to ensure the consistent interpretation, but this is not the issue at hand today.

A PAB Member agreed with that and emphasised the importance of the principle that everyone should be competing on the level playing field.

A PAB Member noted that if actions by the investigated Supplier were appropriate and permitted under the REC, further clarification to the Code is required to ensure all the other Suppliers competing in the market are aware of that and can therefore engage in the same practices. They also remarked on the fact the REC needs to provide consistency as it is important for Suppliers to have the same understanding of the rules to which they are subject. Given the apparent misalignment between the REC and the SLC, this needs to be further addressed and clarified.

The PAB Chair pointed out that where we need to inform Ofgem of this, they would be keen that this is additionally framed in a way that asks them to provide further guidance on how the REC should be tidied up and aligned with the Supply Licence.

The Party representative welcomed the statement that they did not contravene the REC. They stated that they felt that the paper misrepresented their position in suggesting they were uncooperative during the investigation and agreed that the main consideration should be the customer outcome. They also agreed that the Code is currently ambiguous and needed to be tightened/fixed. They noted that they had also put forward an alternate change to the one that is referenced in the decisions paper, and they think it is critical that that their change is assessed at the same time and given a fair chance at deliberation.

A PAB Member asked what lessons can be drawn from this investigation to ensure that a similar issue does not occur again. In answer to that question, the Code Manager noted that the lessons learnt will be translated into the key actions which will be to:

1. Communicate the issue to the Parties, including initial communication about the investigation, and a more thoughtful follow-up communication that delves deeper into the issue and the Code interpretation.

2. Address the discrepancy between REC and SLC and the current ambiguity within the Code. The Code Manager also pointed out that it is important to be open with industry about this ambiguity and any controls that are in place to prevent it in the future.

The Code Manager noted that the REC Change Team were processing two proposed changes to the Code (Annulments Process), one of which is the proposed by the Party as noted by the Party representative. The Code Manager noted that both proposed changes would go through the appropriate process, including relevant communication about this to Parties, and the PAB, in due course. The Code Manager committed to bringing back an update to the PAB as the changes go through the required verification and consultation steps.

The Code Manager further pointed out that the changes are also being discussed with Ofgem and that their input was important to bring the Code and SLC back in alignment.

The Party representative noted that they disagreed with the current approach of the Code Manager whereby they are processing two proposed changes separately. They emphasised that in their opinion, these should be considered together due to the fact that they are focused on the same issue and include alternate approaches to remedying it. The Code Manager noted the concern raised by the Party representative and they agreed to discuss this separately to agree on the best approach.

The Chair summarised the discussion and emphasised the need to communicate to Ofgem (preferably before the next PAB meeting). The Code Manager and Party representative agreed with the approach and need to do so.

BA, KB, HL and RP left the meeting.

The PAB:

- **DETERMINED** that, based on the information provided to it, there is not evidence of the REC Party failing to meet the standards expected under the REC.
- **DETERMINED** that, as a result, no PATs would be applied.
- **DETERMINED** that the Code Manager would notify Ofgem of the process, including sharing the relevant PAB paper and the decisions reached.

NEW ACTION: The Code Manager to notify Ofgem of the process it has completed in relation to investigation of allegations of non-compliance with annulment processes. The Code Manager will share the draft communication to Ofgem with PAB Members alongside the draft meeting minutes.

NEW ACTION: The Code Manager to further discuss the approach to the two changes relating to the Annulment Process with the Party and Ofgem to conclude on the right means of progression. The Code Manager will then provide an update to the PAB.

14. AOB

The Code Manager advised the PAB that due to the timelines for data submission, and the December PAB happening earlier in the month, the dashboards will not be published in advance of the PAB papers being published. The Code Manager advised they would update PAB on any significant matters verbally at the PAB meeting, but that they would move any actions/PATs to the January PAB meeting as is consistent with the approach in previous years.

The PAB Chair requested PAB Member's suggestions for 'deep dive' topics that could be covered at the in-person December PAB Meeting. There were suggestions on the changes that MHHS has brought and their effect on the PAB, as well as the recent Address Management workshop held by DCC and RECCo.

The PAB Chair raised the DESNZ consultation on potential new obligations to be placed on non-domestic suppliers from 1 January 2027 in connection with an extension to the Smart Meter rollout post 2025. The PAB Chair advised that there would be a new Schedule under the REC, with an obligation placed on the REC Code Manager to monitor adherence. The consultation closes on 12 January 2026. The PAB Chair committed to sharing the response to the consultation with PAB Members.

15. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting of the PAB will be held in-person on 16 December 2025.