MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**RECPAB_26_0224**
DATE	**24 February 2026**
LOCATION	**Virtual**

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 Everett	Supplier Representative	PE	PAB Member
Anne Jackson	UNC Representative	AJa	PAB Member
David Brown	MEM Representative	DBr	PAB Member
Fungai Madzivadondo	DNO Representative	FM	PAB Member
Simon Waltho	BSC Representative	SW	PAB Member
Beth Procter (*until item 6*)	SEC Representative	BP	PAB Member
Faye Brookes Lewis	Citizens Advice Representative	FBL	PAB Alternate
Kev Duddy	Code Manager	KD	Operational Account Manager
Scott McPhillimy	Ofgem	SMcP	Ofgem Representative
Anna Weeks	RECCo	AWe	Service Manager
Walter Carlton	Code Manager	WC	Performance Assurance Partner
Anton Moden	Code Manager	AMo	Performance Assurance Lead
Andrew Waghorn	Code Manager	AWa	Performance Assurance Analytics Lead
Vaishnavi Campbell-Sharma	Code Manager	VCS	Performance Assurance Senior Management
Daniel Rodgers	Code Manager	DR	Performance Assurance Manager
Bailey Robb	Code Manager	BR	PAB Secretary
Alex Halkyard	Code Manager	AH	Performance Assurance Team Member
Aleksandra Maczka	Code Manager	AMa	Performance Assurance Team Member
Christopher Thompson (*for item 2 only*)	Code Manager	CT	Operational Account Manager
Rodger Stoney (*for item 3 only*)	Party Representative	RS	Party Representative
Francine Peyroux-Sissoko (*for item 3 only*)	Code Manager	FPS	Change Analyst

DRAFT

Attendee	Representing	Initials	Role
Bilal Ali (*for items 4 and 5 only*)	DCC	BA	Head of Customer Relationship Management
Sodiq Lawal (*for item 5 only*)	Code Manager	SL	Service Provider Assurance
James Hardy (*for item 7 only*)	Code Manager	JH	Senior Change Lead
Ishita Ghosh (*for item 8 only*)	Code Manager	IG	Qualification Manager
Elise Handy (*for item 13 only*)	RECCo	EH	Service Delivery Manager – Enquiry Services
Joel Fernandes (*for item 13 only*)	RECCo	JF	Senior Service Delivery Manager – Enquiry Services

1. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES AND REVIEW OF ACTION LOG

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting of the PAB. Apologies were received for Paul Saker, Supplier Representative.

The PAB unanimously **APPROVED** the actions and draft minutes from the PAB meeting held on 27 January 2026. PAB Members reviewed the open and overdue actions. Four 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. DATA ACCESS REQUESTS

CT joined the meeting.

The PAB considered a paper from the Code Manager seeking changes to the Gas Data Access Matrix (DAM) which removes items that are no longer relevant to the DAM, and approval to provide aggregated data of the Annual Quantity value for MPRNs to Energy Consultants.

The Code Manager outlined that the updates to the DAM were to remove incorrect data items, duplications, and data not relevant to the REC. In relation to Energy Consultants, it was clarified this was not a specific organisation name but rather a descriptive term for many organisations.

The PAB Chair asked the Code Manager to elaborate on the process that they had gone through to verify that none of the DPM terms (from the DPM of the original UNC) are used in the REC. The Code Manager explained an initial review was undertaken by Xoserve, with several discussions over the past few years. After Xoserve had worked through it, the Code Manager reviewed it and concluded that a robust process had been followed.

The Code Manager provided further explanation regarding Energy Consultants who act for companies which have carbon reporting obligations but cannot access the required MPRN data directly as they do not have a direct relationship with the end consumer. Therefore, the plan is they source data from GES

with aggregation to resolve concerns regarding access to personal data. Xoserve are proposing a minimum of 5 MPRNs, which aligns with RECCo's legal advice and the industry position. One concern is that there may be a way for a group to disaggregate data and see individual MPRN information. The Code Manager stressed that this is for organisations that do not have consumer consent such as banks, landlords, and individuals who do not currently have a way of obtaining this information.

A PAB Member asked for clarification on what was meant by duplicate requests. The Code Manager advised that the Energy Consultants would be requesting the same data once a month, so it is duplicate in that respect, but that it won't be duplicates of data within that report. The Code Manager explained that while there may be an existing relationship between the organisation requiring the information and the consumer, they have found it difficult to get the information required when consumers have not provided their consent, particularly within existing agreements which would require to be changed (e.g. 10-year-old mortgage agreement) but will consider this in the future.

Another PAB Member queried how the Code Manager would check and confirm that the organisations aren't using the information for other purposes. The Code Manager advised that there is an audit process which would look to monitor this, clarifying that the audit would be of the Energy Consultant. The information would ultimately go to the team within an organisation that deals with the carbon reporting as part of the legislation given the regulatory obligation to provide this carbon reporting.

A PAB Member commented that, in their opinion, it feels as if REC are incurring an audit cost here when there is uncertainty around whether information may be passed across or it is actually accurate, noting it is flawed by design. The Code Manager disagreed and stated that they would be auditing whether information is passed on, therefore it is not flawed in that respect. They clarified that the exact scope of the audit is to be determined but understands that this scope would be helpful to increase confidence in this.

The PAB Chair interjected that this is a backstop to misuse and not a condition of access. Regarding costs, these would also be recovered so there should not be a cost impact on Parties. PAB need to focus on whether this is a legitimate request with the appropriate safeguards. From a Performance Assurance perspective, the Code Manager asked whether this is proposed to be an upfront audit activity, e.g. as part of Qualification and ISDP, or an ongoing programme of audits to check activities of Energy Consultants. It was important to understand how costs would be recovered how and from whom, as this is currently unclear, with the RECCo Charging Statement only dealing with audit costs in response to a non-compliance rather than a programme of activity to check how data is processed, used and shared.

After extensive deliberation, PAB approved the recommendations. The PAB Chair asked whether any PAB Member wished to record an objection. One PAB Member stressed the importance of the point around audit and associated costs raised by the Code Manager and, subject to clarification, would be happy to agree but without clarification was less comfortable with the position. The Code Manager agreed that the paper should have included more information on this and committed to bringing further clarification to the PAB next month.

The PAB:

- **AGREED** that the Code Manager had followed appropriate actions to update the DAM;
- **AGREED** that only changes that impact the access of REC Service Users be brought to the PAB for approval; and
- **APPROVED** the approach to allow Energy Consultants to access aggregated Gas data reports.

CT left the meeting.

NEW ACTION: Code Manager to clarify the scope, nature and extent of the assurance required to ensure data is used and passed through the supply chain by Energy Consultants in line with the use case approved by PAB, including how costs are charged and recovered.

3. SANDBOX REQUEST

RS and FPS joined the meeting.

The PAB considered a Sandbox Request from Dynamic Electric Metering Limited (DEML) to allow them to perform Safe Isolation Provider (SIP) requirements of Schedule 14 'Metering Operations' in relation to sending data flows, without the need to Qualify in other Party roles. The Code Manager recommended the PAB reject the Sandbox Application.

The Party representative raised that if the Sandbox is not granted, they would have to go through the MHHS Qualification unnecessarily despite having not been appointed to any sites for the last 2-3 years.

A PAB Member queried the timescales for the Application being presented to PAB after it was initially received in November 2025, in particular why it has taken several months for it to reach PAB. They also suggested it would be a good idea to allow DEML to test this out and inform the change to help understand how the process would work, but noted their concerns for other Parties from a competition perspective.

The Code Manager advised that since the application was received, there had been several meetings with the Change Team to improve the content and structure of the paper and make sure the approach was appropriate. There had been discussions around whether this should be a derogation or sandbox. In terms of the change, it is difficult to estimate when a change would be approved as the current change is currently only in the definition phase.

The Code Manager asked PAB whether, if this is approved, it should be approved for any other organisation that requests it. If so, the PAB would be effectively enacting the change without the proper change process being carried out. The Party representative noted that DEML has previously held MOA accreditation and sought this approval as they wanted to continue delivering only part of this role. They had opted to no longer be a MOA in relation to MHHS. This could differentiate them from other organisations that may wish to enter the market to fulfil this role prior to the REC change.

DRAFT

Another PAB Member agreed that that this should have potentially been a derogation, noting they believe it to be a flawed proposal put forward. They asked the DEML representative to explain the impact of waiting until the change came through. The representative responded that it would result in a two-year delay which they believe to be unfair as it is related to an admin delay rather than a safety concern.

Several PAB Members commented that this seemed to be more of a derogation, in the way that the paper would have laid out what DEML is intending to do and in what parameter as this is an existing process rather than a new one.

The PAB Chair queried why the change was taking so long if it was purely administrative. The Code Manager pointed out that the change is a larger piece about making SIP a standalone party.

A PAB Member pointed that the process of getting this approval suggested that the REC processes were uncoordinated. The PAB Chair pointed out that this is a bit more nuanced than that due to the different routes that can be taken, noting the question for PAB is whether they feel comfortable taking a decision given this proposal came in as a Sandbox and the conversation has highlighted that this is in fact a derogation.

A RECCo representative highlighted that their colleagues would have an issue with the PAB not assessing the full impact of this change and what it means, noting the time is an issue and that it potentially leaves a delay but that the elements do need to be considered more carefully.

A PAB Member asked if this were to be approved, would it be helpful for the wider change. The Code Manager explained that the change is looking at a larger scope and has wider considerations than what is presented here.

Another PAB Member moved the idea that the Sandbox may be a better option as it does limit the scope and just mentions DEML which may help them in the interim while they wait for the change to come in. The PAB Chair confirmed that this may mean the PAB will have to open the door for other Sandbox applications in future which would be considered on a case-by-case basis. It was also agreed by the PAB, the DEML representative, and the Code Manager that DEML would help provide evidence to support the change process as it proceeds.

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the Sandbox Trial Application as set out in the paper, for a period of up to two years or once a decision and outcome has been reached on the related REC Issue I0278, whichever is sooner.

RS and FPS left the meeting.

4. CRS IMPROVEMENT PLAN – QUARTERLY UPDATE

BA joined the meeting.

A DCC representative presented an update on the Central Registration Service (CRS) Improvement Plan to the PAB, further to the previous update in October 2025. The paper provided key updates on progress on each of the five workstreams and the plans for CRS into the new financial year.

The DCC representative delivered a presentation to the PAB noting that CRS Improvement Plan is on track to deliver its key outcomes by end of March. While most workstreams are progressing as planned, a few are being closely monitored to ensure timely completion. Any outstanding items post-project closure will transition to BAU activities with the appropriate governance.

Key achievements of the Plan include the introduction of a new small change process, significantly reducing the time and costs compared to the previous enduring change process. This has enabled faster implementation of small changes for the industry. Additionally, inefficiencies in the full enduring change process have been addressed, improving overall change management.

In address management, collaboration with industry has reduced the unmatched address pot from 2.8 million to 2.1 million with further reductions targeted. Engagement with industry has also improved significantly over the past six months, fostering greater collaboration and feedback.

Incident management processes have also been enhanced, including new categorises, improved templates, and auto-routing of incidents to relevant Switching Data Service Providers. These changes are currently progressing through the small change process. Reporting processes are also being reviewed to eliminate inefficiencies and ensure reports are relevant and valuable to stakeholders.

The project team will conduct an early-life review six to twelve months after project closure to assess the effectiveness of the changes and ensure they deliver the intended benefits to the industry. Feedback will also be gathered through the Annual Stakeholder Survey from REC and other appropriate channels. DCC are also hoping to present to Ofgem following the conclusion of the plan so that they have a view of where it has landed.

A RECCo representative raised the action on incentivisation and queried the status of discussions with Ofgem. The DCC representative advised that they have not had anything back from Ofgem over the last six months despite continuously chasing, hence they have assumed no incentives are to be applied. They suggested that it is a bit late for any incentivisation as the plan is now at project closure.

A PAB Member asked whether the results of the work would be to continue into new ways of working and business as usual. They also congratulated the representative on the address management work. The DCC representative advised that they would soon be looking at the reprocurement of the CSS system and part of that will be to look at what improvements can be sought from the incumbent or what improved service could be delivered by a new supplier.

An Ofgem representative asked who they had been in contact with at Ofgem to see if this is something they can chase internally. The DCC representative advised that they would provide the name after the meeting and advised of the background to the point regarding incentivisation. The Code Manager added that they could provide the contact so that the Ofgem representative could be brought up too speed.

DRAFT

The PAB:

- **NOTED** the update.

5. CRS PERFORMANCE CHARGE

SL joined the meeting.

The PAB considered a report from the Code Manager in relation to the Performance Charge for the Central Registration Service (CRS) for the quarter ended 31 December 2025. The paper detailed the breakdown of the Performance Charge for PAB to consider.

The DCC representative noted that they would be conducting an internal review to try and match the 100% target for all measures going forward and was content with the recommendation of the paper.

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the Performance Charges applied to the CRS Provider for the quarter ended 31 December 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; and
- **NOTED** that no exemption request was submitted by the CRS Provider for this period.

BA and SL left the meeting.

6. R0298 – ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE REPORT CATALOGUE (2025-26) – CHANGE REPORT (FINAL RECOMMENDATION)

JH joined the meeting and BP left the meeting.

The Code Manager presented the PAB with the R0298 – Annual Review of the Performance Assurance Report Catalogue (2025-26) – Change Report (Final Recommendation) as the Responsible Committee for the change. It is a requirement for the PARC be reviewed at least annually by the Code Manager, alongside the PAB. The updates following this review include modifying the frequency of the 1431 and 1441 files to on-demand, the inclusion of ERDS reports as part of the R0201 final change solution and some minor housekeeping changes. The Code Manager carried out a consultation with Parties and four responses were received. Two were from Suppliers and two from DNOs, all of which were supportive of the changes taking place. There were additional comments regarding the use of MPxN level data in certain reports and the rationale of moving to on-demand for the 1431 and 1441 reports. However, the Code Manager has responded stating that those were outside the scope of the change proposal but if they require further conversations, the Code Manager can support them.

A PAB Member asked, regarding the inclusion of ERDS reports, whether CSS could provide these reports to the Code Manager directly rather than different DNOs and iDNOs providing these individually. They advised that incidents are created and DCC hold the information, with the report most likely being

automated. When DNOs are providing the report, it is more likely to be manual and could increase the likelihood of error. The Code Manager sought clarification on which reports were being referred to, and whether it may be the data misalignment 2000 or 2010 reports, noting that no comments were received during the consultation in respect of these reports. They concluded that if there is an opportunity to obtain reports centrally from DCC, they would explore during the next annual review of the PARC as this would be easier than receiving reports from multiple DNOs.

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the proposed change solution.
- **APPROVED** the proposed implementation approach; and
- **APPROVED** the proposed implementation date of 27 March 2026.

JH left the meeting.

7. QUALIFICATION AND MHHS UPDATE

IG joined the meeting.

The Code Manager presented the PAB with a Metering Escalation in relation to United Infrastructure Connected Limited following an audit performed by Wilcock which identified limited CoMCoP compliance.

The PAB:

- **SUSPENDED** the accreditation of United Infrastructure Connected Limited for 1 year, and for this to be reassessed at that time if no further progress has been made.

The Code Manager then presented an update on Qualification and MHHS activities, including insights on the progress of MHHS Qualification, as well as operational issues that are emerging. The paper also outlined proposed changes to Qualification artefacts to reflect the transition from MHHS Programme activity and Enduring Qualification arrangements, alongside other changes to improve the market entry journey for new entrants.

A PAB Member queried what the changes would mean for those Parties that have already qualified. The Code Manager clarified that these provisions and updates only apply to Market Entry and not Maintenance of Qualification, therefore none of it is retrospective and is only for new entrants.

The PAB had no queries on the other MHHS updates, including the MHHS qualification progress and level 3 or level 4 validation issue presented in the paper.

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the REC Qualification Code Products described in Section 1 of the paper for publication;

DRAFT

- **APPROVED** delegation of authority to the REC Code Manager to approve changes to future iterations of these documents with a notification of the update to PAB, in line with current practice; and
- **NOTED** the updates.

IG left the meeting.

9. SERVICE PROVIDER ASSURANCE UPDATE

The Code Manager presented an update on the performance of REC Services (up to 31 January 2026). An update on PAB Action RECPAB_25_0826_04 was also provided within the paper.

As outlined in the paper, most of the trends have continued over the last quarter. Switching Operators are missing their user support SLAs as previously mentioned under the Performance Charge agenda item, often related to CSS market entry when a Party is ready for testing. The Code Manager advised the PAB that there are ongoing discussions with DCC about how this process could be improved.

Additionally, an update was provided to the PAB in relation to the CSS-EES data misalignment issue further to the PAB Action. 'Pot 1' has since been closed off. 'Pot 2' is now with Suppliers to take action to deregister disconnected MPANs with a number of PATs being issued as outlined in the paper, reminding them of their obligations following the recent implementation of R0191. Lastly, actions relating to 'Pot 3' are with RECCo and DCC, and a further update will be provided by them at the March PAB meeting.

A Supplier PAB Member advised the Code Manager that it was a helpful update, and had resolved an issue for their organisation.

The PAB:

- **NOTED** the update.

NEW ACTION: RECCo and DCC to present an update to PAB on Pot 3 of the CSS/ESS Data Misalignment Issue, highlighting the root cause, impacts and actions required for resolution.

10. DEEP DIVE ON BETTER CROSS CODE COLLABORATION

The PAB considered a report from the Code Manager, outlining the refined recommendations made by the working group comprising representatives from REC, BSC, UNC, IGT UNC and SEC Performance Assurance to improved collaboration to tackle the risks and performance issues within the market following previous discussions at the January 2026 PAB meeting.

The Code Manager thanked the SEC and IGT UNC PAB Members for supporting their attendance at the PAB and PAC, noting both committees had commented on the need for clarity around ownership

and leadership of the recommendations to avoid double jeopardy but also to ensure that the actions do not fall between the cracks.

A RECCo representative advised that the SEC representative, who had since left the meeting, asked for their comments to be passed on to the Code Manager and the PAB that they are fully in support and wanted to thank the Code Manager for attending SEC PAB and that they were very supportive.

The IGT UNC Representative noted that they had also endorsed the approach, and it was positive. They noted that with Code reform, there is a recognition that the UNC will be transitioning over the next couple of years but that they were supportive.

A PAB Member commented that it was a very clear paper from the Code Manager, in stark contrast to other papers presented to the PAB in the early part of the meeting, and paid tribute to the excellent job that had been done in carrying out this work.

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the recommendations made in the paper for implementation, accepting ownership of oversight with a view to hold themselves, RECCo and any future REC Service Providers accountable for delivery; and
- **APPROVED** the proposed plan to track progress of delivery with the next update to PAB expected in May 2026.

9. ANNUAL RATING - APPROACH

The Code Manager updated the PAB on the proposed improvements to the Annual Rating, most notably extending it to cover Metering Agents. The paper outlined the objectives and principles for creating the Annual Rating and outlined the specific criteria and scoring for DNOs, Suppliers and Metering Agents.

The Code Manager pointed out that the consultation closes on 27 February 2026 and that they would be speaking to the Association of Metering Operatives on 26 February 2026 so that they can cascade to their members and provide significant extra publicity so that metering organisations are aware of this change.

A PAB Member sought clarification on the proposed minor adjustment to Suppliers and DNO criteria and whether DNOs will be impacted by TDIS. The Code Manager confirmed that this includes ~~a~~ new criteria that involve~~s~~ submitting data to market schemes, namely the Theft Detection Incentive Scheme and ~~-~~the ~~P~~Payment~~repayment Methodeter~~Payment Method Levelisation scheme, both of which are Supplier schemes that do not affect DNOs. The Code Manager explained that both these schemes rely on various Parties doing the right things at the right time. Additionally, the Code Manager noted that meeting the M10 MHHS Qualification Criteria are also taken into account and they do not believe there were any DNOs caught up in this for non-compliance.

DRAFT

The PAB Chair asked whether there is a problem with the Payment Method Levelisation or whether this was a case of reflecting on emerging areas of concerns.

The Code Manager replied that they had consulted widely when they started drafting these criteria and it was colleagues at RECCo who had suggested it be added given there had been some isolated incidents where this had been a problem.

The PAB:

- **NOTED** the update.

10. PARTY ASSURANCE UPDATE

The Code Manager presented an update on Party Assurance as part of the active cycle month. Additional updates were provided on the progress of the Unqualified MEM Appointments activity, the ongoing SoLR activity, and TDIS updates including upcoming TDIS verification activities. The Code Manager also provided a summary of the quarterly peer comparisons on Erroneous Switches and Smart Meter Installations and the mid-sprint review for Data Cleanse Sprint 5.

The Code Manager shared an update on outstanding PATs, including an Action Plan PAT with a DNO which has now been closed following a change to their automated process which enables them to work to the timelines outlined in the Code.

In relation to the TDIS verification, this included selection of the Supplier for the first Process Review / Assessment, but both the PAB Chair and Code Manager reinforced that the selection of the Supplier does not imply any wrongdoing on their part. The Code Manager confirmed that if any wrongdoing was found as part of any Process Review / Assessment, findings would be brought to the PAB's attention to allow for a decision on the most appropriate course of action.

The Code Manager referred to the provision in the REC Theft Schedule which states that the Code Manager reserves the right to request any Supplier participating in the scheme to provide evidence of any of their investigations for validation purposes.

The Code Manager also updated the PAB on the Authority's decision to approved R0287 – Clarification and Amendments to Annulment Definition in Schedule 23 – Alignment with SLC Obligations in line with the recommendation from the Code Manager and REC Change Panel. The Authority also decided to reject R0287A – (Alternate Change).

A RECCo representative asked the Code Manager to confirm if there would be any change to the Performance Assurance Framework as a result of the Authority's decision. The Code Manager confirmed that there is no change proposed at this time as they can see the rate of annulments compared to successful switches. They noted that there was a delay in the data so they may not be able to update it instantly but that they would make it clear in the PAB papers when the first numbers on this following the changes are published.

An Ofgem representative asked whether the Code Manager had noted any differences in the numbers since the issue was first raised. The Code Manager confirmed the numbers have remained similar.

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the selection of one Supplier to be subject to the Process Review / Assessment for TDIS verification;
- **NOTED** the PATs applied by the Code Manager in line with the Performance Assurance Methodology and Techniques Document; and
- **NOTED** the updates.

11. DATA QUALITY DEEP DIVE - RECOMMENDATIONS

The Code Manager presented an update on the Data Quality Deep Dive, with multiple recommendations for PAB to consider. The paper outlined the responsibilities of the PAB relating to data cleanse within the REC and potential enhancements to the approach to enable estimates of costs and benefits.

The PAB Chair asked whether there is anything in the REC already which necessitates periodic reconciliation with the CDSP. The Code Manager confirmed there is an annual process of CDSP reconciliations, noting this has previously been discussed at PAB given the challenges for the Code Manager and Gas Parties, primarily relating to latency and the information not being quickly available. It has also shown multiple discrepancies and hence the data has been included in the cleanse activity.

A RECCo representative queried the value estimate of £100 and where this had come from. The Code Manager explained that this was an initial estimate that they are looking to validate with Suppliers and DNOs but that they felt was reasonable to provide the PAB at this stage.

A PAB Member commented on the cost and benefits more broadly, explaining that some Parties require a lot more effort and action from Code Manager than others. The Code Manager responded that the costs are socialised and explained that it may be more efficient at times for the Code Manager to work with a couple Parties more closely before the issue becomes a bigger problem in the wider industry.

Another PAB Member raised the point that the data cleanse activity may not be fixing the issue permanently because the underlying cause remains unclear. The Code Manager responded with an example from the last Sprint and how they aim to address these (MAP Gas ID issue).

A PAB Member commented that another reason for incomplete data may be the optionality of certain fields due to cases where it is not possible to fill out (e.g. addresses being 4 vs 5 lines long), with the result that some companies not filling in fields completely as a policy decision. They noted their frustration with this.

The PAB Chair raised a question around potential collaboration workshops on data quality, for instance with the PAC. The PAB Member noted that a particular current concern of the PAC is smart meter readings not being loaded into settlement, and was concerned that this may be due to smart meter

readings being wrong or there being an issue with the asset, with resulting failure in validation. The UNC has set up a review group to look into the root causes of these validation failures. This may lead to the UNC engaging with the REC as the initial source of meter readings and asset information is from REC Parties such as MAMs, suppliers, etc.

The Code Manager advised that the consultation is intended to seek the industry's views on the activity and estimated costs, before a further update to the PAB.

The PAB:

- **DISCUSSED** the paper.

12. AOB

EH and JF joined the meeting.

RECCo provided an update to the PAB on EES system performance testing that had been conducted further to an incident following MHHS go-live in October 2025, which caused peak usage of nearly 500,000 API hits per hour, leading to performance issues such as high latency and timeouts. Since then, EES has been migrated to the Microsoft Azure platform, resolving query inefficiencies and improving performance, as confirmed by user feedback.

To ensure the system could handle high volumes, a live environment test was conducted on 20 February ahead of the next price cap announcement. Preliminary testing in the UIT-B environment, refreshed with live data, indicated the system could handle significantly more API hits per hour before degradation. The live test simulated peak usage over 80 minutes, by incrementally increasing the load to 500,000 API hits per hour in the final 45 minutes. The test was successful, with no performance issues or SLA breaches observed. The results provided assurance of the system's capacity to handle high volumes. Further analysis will compare UIT-B and live test data, with a potential follow-up test planned for March to confirm performance.

The Code Manager enquired where the Microsoft Azure cloud was hosted from given EES contains personal data. After the meeting, RECCo confirmed to the PAB Chair and Secretary that it is hosted in Microsoft Azure UK South and UK West.

The PAB Chair queried if wider communication was planned. RECCo representatives advised that this was a good news story but that they were unsure of the messaging, noting this would be picked up by communications colleagues.

13. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting of the PAB will be held in-person on 24 March 2026.

DRAFT