RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

## MEETING MINUTES

| | |
|---|---|
| **MEETING** | **RECPAB_26_0825** |
| **DATE** | **25 August 2026, 12:30pm** |
| **LOCATION** | **In person** |

| 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 |
| David Brown | MEM Representative | DBr | PAB Member |
| Fungai Madzivadondo | DNO Representative | FM | PAB Member |
| Shiv Singh | GT Representative | SSi | PAB Member |
| Simon Waltho | BSC Representative | SW | PAB Member |
| Paul Saker | Supplier Representative | PS | PAB Member |
| Paul Everett | Supplier Representative | PE | PAB Member |
| Beth Procter | SEC Representative | BT | SEC Representative |
| Jess Collins | Citizens Advice | JC | Citizens Advice Representative |
| Oorlagh Chapman | Supplier Representative | OC | PAB Alternate |
| 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 | VCa | Performance Assurance Manager |
| Daniel Rodgers | Code Manager | DR | Performance Assurance Manager |
| Tanya Mason-Hawes | Code Manager | TM | PAB Secretary |
| Sodiq Lawal | Code Manager | SL | Service Provider Assurance |
| Kat Higby | RECCo | KH | Assurance Integration Lead |
| Joy Nnanami | RECCo | JN | Assurance Manager |
| Lewis McKenzie | Moorhouse | LMcK | PAB Observer |
| Becca Fox | Moorhouse | BF | PAB Observer |
| Nicola Garland | Moorhouse | NG | PAB Observer |
| Rachel Norberg *(for item 5)* | Code Manager | RN | Sandbox & Derogation Lead |
| Alison Nickson *(for item 6)* | RECCo | AN | Head of Information Security and Data Protection |

DRAFT

| Attendee | Representing | Initials | Role |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bradley Baker *(for items 7 and 8)* | NESO | BB | Regulatory Business Partner |
| Victoria Crossan *(for item 8)* | RECCo | VCr | Service Manager |
| Elise Handy *(for item 13)* | RECCo | EH | Service Delivery Manager - Enquiry Services |
| James Rees *(for item 13)* | Code Manager | JR | Operational Account Manager |

## 1. REVIEW OF OPEN ACTIONS AND APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINUTES

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting of the PAB. Apologies were given from Anne Jackson (UNC Representative) and Angela Joyce (Supplier Representative).

The PAB unanimously **APPROVED** the actions and draft minutes from the PAB meeting held on 28 July 2026. PAB Members reviewed the open and overdue actions. Two actions were closed following information provided via a verbal update.

**NEW ACTION:** RECCo to provide an update on the CRS Improvement Plan (and how benefits are being realised).

**NEW ACTION:** PAB Chair to issue a paper to remind PAB Members of their indemnities, following the Ofgem open data consultation and the requirement of a more robust triage process.

## 2. UPDATE ON CODE MANAGER EVOLUTION PROJECT

RECCo updated the PAB on the progress of the Code Manager Evolution Project, including the transition to the interim Performance Assurance service, detailing workstreams for strategic document development, and assurance integration.

The project is moving from a model in which the current Code Manager leads most Performance Assurance activity to one in which RECCo coordinates several specialist providers, including RECCo's own assurance team. The transition is being managed through mobilisation work-group meetings, readiness checks and evidence-based deliverables. RECCo noted the PAB Secretariat has now been appointed and will join as of 01 September.

A PAB Member raised their concern that the Secretariat appointment is late in the process and the new appointee could be faced with a steep learning curve. RECCo agreed that. while it was later than they'd hoped, the individual will be supported in their role by current team members; they are already reaching out to presenters for the September meeting which will support the new appointee getting up to speed. Another role being recruited for is the Operational Assurance Lead, with an internal assurance framework already developed to mitigate the delayed appointment.

RECCo further updated on the transition from the current Code Manager to the new service providers and RECCo led activities. These have been tracked by RECCo through the mobilisation workgroup, where they report progress against a number of deliverables and activities, as well as readiness check-ins. Service providers have to demonstrate their state of readiness and provide evidence alongside the criteria to demonstrate their status. This has been largely positive, however there has been a delay with the Digital Services Provider raising the risk that dashboards would not be ready for August parallel running. The current Code Manager has agreed to extend dashboard delivery by one month to the end of September, allowing RECCo and the Digital Services Provider to undertake dual running and testing for defects in the replacement solution, prior to cutover. Confidence had improved in the last week or so (but after the decision to delay was made), with the expectation that parallel

running could finish early in September and the Digital Services Provider could take over from October.

A PAB Member expressed their disappointment that the Digital Services Provider hasn't been able to deliver to this point, and asked RECCo how confident they are on the service provider delivering the service by the end of the extension period to 30 September. Another PAB Member asked whether this was the only current concern as part of the transition. RECCo confirmed this was the main concern at present, but they were confident that the parallel run in September would be successful.

The PAB:

- **NOTED** the update.

## 3. STRATEGIC PRODUCTS

RECCo updated the PAB on the Performance Assurance Operating Plan (PAOP) 2026-27 and the Retail Risk Register consultations following the update in July 2026.

The PAOP consultation received no responses and, as such, no amendments were made. The Retail Risk Register received three responses which were broadly supportive of the outcomes-focused structure linking risks, outcomes and assurance activities.

In response to feedback, the Retail Risk Register was broadened to capture risks arising from cross-code work and market transformation. Other suggested risks, including settlement mismatches, general customer escalations, meter-installation data quality, GES and EES changes, and AMR-specific risks, were judged to be covered by existing risks or better handled through operational or assurance activity rather than new standalone risks.

RECCo noted that the strategic products are expected to be published shortly and take effect on 01 September.

A PAB Member raised concerns of the potential risk of RECCo not meeting Parties' expectations, and the lack of monitoring of RECCo as the new licensed Code Manager. The PAB Chair confirmed that there will be an increase in monitoring going forwards, through means such as feedback from Operational Account Managers, surveys to PAB Members and the future Stakeholder Advisory Forum. Conversations are still ongoing with Ofgem to determine what the new regime will look like, including performance assurance. Further, the PAB Chair added that there are currently avenues for Parties to raise issues related to RECCo and to escalate should they not be happy with responses. The incoming Service Provider noted a recent discussion with a Party who raised two issues, one of which related to the Balance and Settlement Code (BSC) and REC not aligning on key processes which is not something that Performance Assurance is best placed to resolve. The PAB Chair responded that this, and similar issues, should be flagged with the Cross-Code Steering group and hopes that with the Code reform, there'll be clearer expectations on the Code Managers. Another PAB Member noted that although this monitoring does not completely sit with the PAB, it would be good practice to keep the communication flowing and feedback shared.

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the Performance Assurance Operating Plan 2026-27 for publication.
- **APPROVED** the Retail Risk Register 2026-27 v6.0 for publication along with the responses to the Category 3 consultation feedback.

## 4. REC PAB TERMS OF REFERENCE REVIEW

DRAFT

RECCo provided PAB with an early view of the changes expected to be required to its Terms of Reference as RECCo implements the new Performance Assurance service delivery model and prepares to become the Licensed Code Manager.

RECCo is preparing to become a licensed Code Manager and is reviewing how PAB's Terms of Reference should change. The review covers governance, the outcome-focused service model, the relationship between PAB and RECCo, the replacement of the Change Panel by a Stakeholder Advisory Forum, performance assurance interactions, secretariat arrangements and representation of service providers.

The PAB Chair advised that the review of the PAB Terms of Reference remains an active, cross-organisational exercise. The review will address the implications of Code licensing and the new outcome-focused service delivery model, including governance and service delivery arrangements, the relationship between PAB and RECCo, interactions with the change process and Performance Assurance, revised secretariat arrangements, and the participation of service providers. Members will be engaged as draft amendments are developed over the coming months.

The PAB Chair explained that the Stakeholder Advisory Forum will replace the Change Panel as an advisory, non-decision-making body for licensed Code Managers. It will provide advice, critique and recommendations, have mandatory and independent members with an independent chair, and include elected industry representatives. The forum is expected to be constituted around the licensing transition, with initial meetings likely after the licence takes effect. Cross-code groups are working towards consistent operating processes, although membership may differ by code. The PAB Chair shared a resource for PAB Members to discover more on the Stakeholder Advisory Forum.

PAB Members welcomed the direction of travel and emphasised that the revised Terms of Reference should clearly define the respective responsibilities of RECCo and the PAB, make effective use of members' expertise, support collaboration across codes and governance bodies, and address issues that fall between existing organisational or code boundaries.

PAB Members also requested proportionate access to legal and regulatory advice at an earlier stage where proposals may have material or regulatory consequences. The PAB Chair agreed that relevant analysis should be undertaken before recommendations are approved or submitted to Ofgem, rather than only after a decision is challenged.

The PAB:

- **NOTED** the drivers and intended scope of the review of the PAB ToR;
- **NOTED** the governance principles that will guide the review and the transitional arrangements ahead of Code licensing;
- **NOTED** that the new Performance Assurance service delivery model will operate within the existing PAB governance framework pending the substantive update; and
- **PROVIDED** early views on areas of the ToR or PAB governance that members consider should be addressed through the review.

## 5. DEROGATION REPORT – CHANGE PANEL MEMBER TERM EXTENSIONS

*RN joined the meeting.*

The Code Manager requested approval on a Derogation which related to waiving the maximum term of two years for appointed REC Change Panel Members, until the dissolution of the Change Panel (scheduled for 17 November 2026), to enable appointment to remain in place until the official establishment of the REC Stakeholder Advisory Forum (SAF).

DRAFT

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the Derogation as set out in the paper, including the timescales and recommended conditions.

*RN left the meeting.*

## 6. REC SERVICE SECURITY

*AN joined the meeting.*

RECCo presented the outcome of the 2026 Security and Data Protection Assurance Review of key organisations supporting REC Services. The controls and provider evidence reviewed provided positive assurance across several important areas.

Outstanding risks and information gaps remained, which were detailed in the paper (RECPAB_26_0825_06 - REC Service Security Assurance).

RECCo confirmed that these matters were not currently considered materially concerning and were being followed up through information security, data protection and service management processes.

Any material unresolved actions or changes to the assurance position will be reported to the PAB. Lessons identified through the review will also inform enhancements to future assurance assessments.

A PAB Member sought clarification on whether the outstanding assurance matters represented serious concerns or routine follow-up activity.

RECCo confirmed that the outstanding matters represented routine follow-up requests for further evidence rather than material concerns. The Services Provider's practices were considered mature, with additional assurance required to demonstrate how those practices were applied specifically to REC services.

The PAB:

- **NOTED** the controls and provider evidence that provide positive assurance;
- **NOTED** the outstanding risks and unknowns at individual REC Service Providers;
- **NOTED** the ongoing actions and proposed future assurance improvements.

## 7. DELAY TO SUPPLIER ARRANGED APPOINTMENT NOTIFICATIONS UPDATE

The Code Manager informed the PAB of a P3 incident by the CRS (Central Registration Service) provider which resulted in the failure of Supplier Arranged Appointment Notifications (CSS07000) to DNOs. The issue was resolved on 30th July 2026; however, further action is required to ensure that all failed notifications resulting from the incident are successfully resubmitted.

The Code Manager advised that three separate technology incidents have occurred over recent months, each resulting in Supplier Arranged Appointment Notification messages not reaching DNOs. Although the causes differed and some originated under SEC-governed arrangements, recurring weaknesses in release and certificate management were identified as a common concern.

DNOs had undertaken significant unplanned remediation to replay affected messages, incurring staff and supplier costs. PAB Members noted that the wider effects on suppliers, appointments, settlement and consumers had not been fully assessed or transparently communicated.

PAB Members also expressed concern about repeat incidents, delayed notification to affected Parties, incomplete impact assessments and the absence of clear remediation dates. They requested clearer accountability across REC and SEC governance, earlier stakeholder engagement and documented responsibility for incident management, impact assessment and communications.

The Code Manager confirmed that the switching operator was responsible for identifying and communicating downstream impacts and ensuring appropriate action. The SEC Representative agreed to review compliance with incident-management requirements and the controls intended to prevent certificate-related recurrence.

The PAB requested an update at its September meeting on the outstanding message replays, the remediation plan, measures to improve future impact identification and communication, and the ownership of cross-code incidents.

The PAB:

- **NOTED** the update.

**NEW ACTION:** RECCo to issue an Information Request Performance Assurance Technique (PAT) on the CRS Provider in relation to the repeat incidents that require DNOs to replay specific messages, and request the Service Provider to provide an update at the September PAB meeting.

## 8. AMENDMENTS TO THE PARC RELATING TO ADDRESS MANAGEMENT

*BB and VC joined the meeting.*

The CRS Provider requested approval for a REC Change to be progressed to remove some Address Management reports from the PARC that are no longer fit for purpose.

The PAB Chair sought assurance that the proposed removal of reports was an efficiency measure, would not affect new address-quality reporting or related initiatives, and excluded those reports marked to continue. The CRS Provider confirmed that the reports were accessible only by them and duplicated data available through alternative means. Proactive production and storage of the reports would cease, but the underlying data and metrics would remain accessible through dashboards and on-demand reporting.

The PAB Chair noted that the proposal would proceed through the formal REC change process and was unlikely to return to the PAB before the Change Panel's dissolution.

A PAB Observer asked whether removing the reports would affect current data analytics. The Code Manager confirmed that it would not, as the affected reports were generally obtained on demand for specific analysis or deep dives.

The Code Manager suggested that the amendment could be aligned with the annual PARC review in the autumn, subject to the Change team confirming whether bundling the amendments would be more efficient.

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the removal of the concerned Address Management reports from the PARC, and for the REC Change to progress.

*BB and VC left the meeting.*

DRAFT

## 9. PARTY ASSURANCE UPDATE

The Code Manager presented the Party Assurance Paper, including updates on the 2025-26 Annual Rating publication, quarterly peer comparison on Erroneous Switch levels and Smart Meter Installation Survey results, outcomes from this quarter's TDIS Verification activities,

The Code Manager confirmed that parallel assurance activity with the incoming Party Assurance service provider produced broadly consistent conclusions and proposed techniques. A small number of cases would have received a Notification PAT rather than an Enquiry PAT; however, Enquiry PATs were used to obtain current information for future monitoring.

The Code Manager identified gaps in reconciliation data submitted by Gas Meter Asset Managers, preventing a complete market view. Information Request PATs will be issued to non-reporting parties to establish the reasons for non-submission and expected delivery dates.

Final TDIS debits and credits for 2025–26 had been published. Two late Supplier submissions were considered: one was processed because the data was usable, while the other was excluded after repeated attempts to support the supplier to correct materially non-compliant files proved unsuccessful. Confirmed theft volumes fell overall compared with the previous year, driven mainly by a reduction in domestic cases, while non-domestic cases increased. The Code Manager highlighted assumptions within the theft target methodology, particularly those relating to smart meters, would benefit from further review including in the next iteration of the Theft Estimation Methodology. Payments under the revised arrangements comprised performance-based payments, site visits and qualifying desktop activity.

The SEC Representative raised concerns regarding tamper alerts and requested confirmation of the appropriate RECCo contact.

TDIS verification activities this quarter identified duplicate investigations reported by two Parties as a result of internal case transfers. The duplicates were removed from the 2025–26 calculations and the findings will inform future process-assessment targeting. Suppliers had also challenged the definition of Confirmed Energy Theft; RECCo will consider a Change to amend the definition of determination of Confirmed Energy Theft which currently requires an indication of theft via a desktop review of consumption levels, regardless of the extent of other compelling evidence of theft being present, such as site visit report and/or photographic evidence of theft including illegal connection/bypass or meter tampering. For the avoidance of doubt, Suppliers will still be required to provide an assessment of unrecorded units. Deep dives with selected parties identified good practice and improvement opportunities, but no material process concerns.

In response to the list of PATs that the Code Manager proposed as part of the monthly data review, a PAB Member sought clarification on the wording relating to unjustified objections, noting that objections may only be raised on permitted grounds and not solely because a customer remains in contract or has an outstanding balance. The Code Manager acknowledged that additional context would have improved the summary.

The Code Manager confirmed that final queries from the query window had resulted in a handful of amendments to annual ratings before publication.

Additionally, following the publication of the paper three Parties ratings were revised. One Party was changed from Improvement Required to Performingafter further information was received to confirm their engagement with TDIS. For the other two, the update was made from Improvement Required to Performing with Minor Concerns after corrected data was provided by RECCo in relation to the Party's PML (Payment Method Levelisation) payment with the revised rating based on the former having received an Action Plan PAT and the latter achieving 40-60% of their theft target.

The PAB:

DRAFT

- **NOTED** the PATs applied by the Code Manager in line with the Performance Assurance Methodology and Techniques Document. (Section 1).
- **NOTED** Gas MAMs that have not provided the required CDSP Reconciliation data will be issued an Information Request PAT to confirm why they have not yet provided it, and when they will do so. (Section 4).
- **NOTED** that RECCo have requested that the REC Code Manager process TDIS submissions from two Suppliers that did not provide their submissions via the correct file type in the REC Portal. (Section 5).

## 10. CRS PERFORMANCE CHARGES

The Code Manager provided an update on the application of CRS (Central Registration Service) performance charges for the current period.

The Code Manager confirmed that the paper summarised the CRS Provider's reported performance under the established REC performance charge regime. The Provider had been given an opportunity to submit clarifications, disputes or challenges before the recommendation was presented, but none were received. The PAB was therefore asked to formally approve the performance charges set out in the paper.

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the Performance Charges applied to the CRS Provider for the quarter ended 30 June 2026 in line with the REC Performance Charge regime introduced from 1 April 2023 and the Performance Charges scale approved by PAB in March 2026.
- **NOTED** that no exemption request was submitted by the CRS Provider for this period.

The PAB Chair recalled the earlier discussion on the continuation of performance charges and noted the forthcoming transfer of the licence to DCC2 (a SECCo subsidiary) on 2 November 2026.

Performance for July to September 2026 will be considered in due course. As previously discussed, the related REC Change is expected to remove performance charges as of 1 October 2026 because the new not-for-profit entity would have no margin at risk.

## 11. REVIEW OF SDEP AND ESCALATIONS UNDER THE REC

The Code Manager presented the completed review of SDEP (Secure Data Exchange Portal) and escalations under the REC, noting comments received prior to the meeting and including key findings and recommendations.

The Code Manager advised that the review assessed the operation of SDEP and the REC escalations process through Party interviews, service-provider data and an industry survey. The work was undertaken with the planned re-procurement of the SDEP service and future functionality changes in mind.

The review found that SDEP was not always used as intended, including cases being raised through the wrong route or process type, which delayed resolution and could affect consumers. Case-management functionality was also limited, particularly in relation to reporting, bulk actions, ticket visibility and closure tracking. In addition, inconsistent user practices resulted in incomplete

DRAFT

information, duplicate cases, avoidable correspondence and occasional sharing of sensitive information outside SDEP.

Recommendations included improving case-management and reporting functionality, simplifying case submission and providing better assurance data. Good-practice guidance had also been developed covering ticket types, data protection, case management and effective communications.

Subject to PAB approval, the recommendations will inform RECCo's forthcoming SDEP work and the guidance will be published on the REC Portal as a non-mandatory resource. The guidance may be updated following Party feedback and implementation of REC Change R0122.

A PAB Member commended the well written paper.

The Code Manager confirmed that the guidance had been circulated with the meeting papers and, as a non-mandatory guidance document, could be updated as required.

The Code Manager emphasised that the long-standing SDEP issues continued to affect consumers and market participants. Although a full resolution would require technical system changes, the guidance represented an interim step to mitigate impacts pending delivery of the required functionality.

PAB Members welcomed the guidance but expressed concern that long-standing SDEP issues and REC Change R0122 had progressed too slowly. They noted that guidance could mitigate impacts only temporarily and requested continued focus on delivering the necessary technical improvements.

The Code Manager agreed that technical changes were required to address the root causes and confirmed that the guidance was an interim measure. Members emphasised that the issue should retain clear visibility and be assigned to an appropriate governance forum if it did not fall within the PAB's remit.

A PAB Member described the guidance as useful and confirmed that comments submitted before the meeting reflected discussions with other Parties.

The Code Manager advised that the issue would be raised through Party meetings, discussed with the incoming Party Assurance service provider and considered for wider communication through an appropriate forum or the REC Bulletin.

The PAB Chair asked how the impact of the guidance would be measured before and after publication. The Code Manager explained that limited platform functionality and incomplete reporting for Performance Assurance purposes prevented reliable end-to-end tracking, particularly because cases lacked a clear closure status. Although additional reporting could be commissioned, this would incur significant cost and could divert resources from system changes. PAB Members recognised that improved functionality was required before meaningful outcome reporting could be established.

The Code Manager recommended retaining the issue on the Retail Risk Register from 1 September 2026.

PAB Members observed that persistent operational issues could be deprioritised for regulatory and transformation initiatives despite potentially significant unquantified costs. They requested clearer distinction between risks and realised issues and asked whether RECCo maintained a comprehensive issues register linked to the Change process.

The PAB Chair confirmed that an issues log existed but was not comprehensive. PAB Members discussed the need for clearer ownership and a route for operational issues to be monitored and, where appropriate, progressed into the Change process.

**NEW ACTION:** RECCo to confirm clear ownership and ongoing governance for the SDEP challenges and limitations, including how they will be monitored and progressed.

DRAFT

The SEC Representative offered to provide an overview of the SEC's existing risk and issues arrangements and their transition into the new Performance Assurance framework. The PAB Chair agreed that this would be useful.

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the recommendations set out in the paper to be shared with the REC Code Manager and RECCo.

## 12. SERVICE PROVIDER ASSURANCE UPDATE

The Code Manager presented key insights on the performance of REC Services over the last quarter covering the period from 01 May 2026 to 31 July 2026.

The Code Manager reported that Service Provider performance from May to July was broadly consistent with previous periods. CSS and CSSCA recorded no failures, while GRDS experienced a single July failure caused by Microsoft Azure timeouts.

EES and ERDS performance declined, including a configuration issue that caused closure messages to be sent at incorrect times. The affected DNO was working with the relevant provider to resolve the issue. Failures affecting GES had been addressed through an implemented Change, following which service performance improved.

Direct assurance of CRS, RPS and RTS identified minor reporting inconsistencies, including metrics recorded as 100% where not applicable should have been reported. These matters were raised with the relevant service providers and Code Managers.

A PAB Member asked whether the reported failures had caused consequential impacts for service users. The Code Manager confirmed that no such impacts had been identified beyond the previously discussed CSS07000 notification incident (item 7 on the PAB agenda).

The PAB:

- **NOTED** the update.

## 13. PROPOSED CHANGES TO SMART DCC ACCESS CATEGORIES

The Code Manager requested approval to update the category naming for roles currently held by Smart DCC and the addition of data items within the Electricity DAM (Data Access Matrix).

The Code Manager proposed extending Smart DCC's existing purposes for accessing the Electricity and Gas Enquiry Service portals to cover the full range of its obligations and operational responsibilities as CRS Provider and Smart Meter Communication Licensee. The changes would support the investigation and resolution of issues affecting consumers and market participants and remove unnecessary administrative barriers.

The proposal included renaming the relevant access categories from Switching Service Desk to CRS Provider and from SMETS Service Desk to Smart Meter Communication Licensee, together with adding the data items specified in the paper to the relevant Data Access Matrix and supporting documents.

The Code Manager and RECCo concluded that the proposed category names and additional data fields would not increase security or data-protection risks. The existing assurance approach would therefore be retained. A formal industry consultation was not considered necessary, and implementation was proposed for 11 September 2026.

A PAB Member asked how Parties would be informed of the rationale for the changes.

The Code Manager confirmed that the Category 3 Change and its rationale would be communicated through the REC Bulletin when raised and again on implementation. Parties would have an opportunity to comment during the two-week period before implementation, although no formal consultation would take place.

The PAB:

- **APPROVED** the Code Manager's proposed alterations to the Electricity Data Access Matrix;
- **APPROVED** the Code Manager's proposed alterations to the Gas Data Access Matrix;
- **APPROVED** the Code Manager's proposed alterations to Appendix 1;
- **APPROVED** the Code Manager's proposed alterations to the Service User Categorisation and Assessment Document; and
- **APPROVED** the Code Manager's proposed implementation date for 11 September 2026.

### 14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The PAB Chair noted the consultation on Data Coordination roles and that it would be useful for PAB Members to look at this due to the overlap with PAB responsibilities, particularly with respect to data cleanse.

Further, the PAB Chair noted the communication from the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) and the recent consultation on requiring non-domestic suppliers to have a smart meter in place for new fixed-term contracts, and that the Government will be announcing their decision on this matter soon.

## NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting of the PAB will be held in-person on 29 September 2026.

DRAFT