RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REFERENCE	**RECPAB_26_0825_FORINFO02**
STATUS	**For Information**
PAGES	**24**

RECCO REVIEW OF IT PERFORMANCE AND CAPACITY MANAGEMENT FOR REC SERVICES

WRITTEN BY JOHN BRIGNELL, HEAD OF IT SERVICES, RECCO

REVIEWED BY MARK LOVEDAY, DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS, RECCO

For Information	This paper sets out the findings of RECCo's first review of REC service providers' IT capacity management and performance for the 2025-26 financial year (April to March), and confirms the actions RECCo is taking. The PAB is invited to note the findings and comment on the actions set out.

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper reports RECCo's review of REC Service Providers IT performance and capacity management for the 2025-26 financial year.

Overall the position is sound. The Enquiry Services provided by C&C and Xoserve met their service levels, with full availability and no service credits, though both saw occasional minor SLA misses of the kind to be expected over a year, and C&C had a significant incident in October 2025 following the MHHS release. DCC's Switching/Central Registration Services met their defined availability targets throughout, with some service-request handling underperformance before the CRS Improvements Plan 2025/26 took effect. The REC Portal missed its availability target on several occasions and is being replaced by the Digital Services Platform, which introduces a materially stronger performance framework. Payment Method Levelisation, a monthly settlement service, operated reliably through the year but without formal IT performance provisions, which are being introduced. The actions RECCo is taking are set out in Section 8.

1.1 OVERALL ASSESSMENT (RAG)

Service	Service Provider	Status	Summary
Electricity Enquiry Services (EES / SDES / GDCC)	C&C	**Meets/Exceeds**	Strong: 100% availability and no service credits in 2025-26.
Gas Enquiry Services (GES)	Xoserve	**Meets/Exceeds**	Strong: contractual KPIs substantially met; REC alignment completes June 2026.
Central Registration Service (CRS): Central Switching Service (CSS) / CSS Certificate Authority (CA)	DCC	**Meets/Exceeds**	100% availability.
CRS: Switching Operator (SO)	DCC	**Meets with partial gap(s)**	Service-request handling underperformed; improvement plan now delivering.
REC Portal	Talan	**Transitional**	Missed 99.9% target five times; being replaced by the DSP.
PML Levelisation	Capgemini	**Meets with partial gap(s)**	REC-codified financial settlement; formal IT SLAs being introduced via the April change request.

Service	Service Provider	Status	Summary
Digital Services (DSP), new	Capgemini	N/A	TARGET: Step-change framework: 99.9% availability, [12], 12 KPIs.

Assessment key (full criteria in Appendix B). Meets/Exceeds: obligations met with comprehensive, proportionate controls. Meets with partial gap(s): obligations substantially met, but with some shortfalls during the year or controls to strengthen, not material to overall delivery. Material gap: a gap in IT performance provisions requiring action. Transitional: service being replaced through a controlled migration. Future state: new service, not yet live. Ratings are applied in proportion to each service's scale and criticality.

2 BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

The 2025 to 2026 Performance Assurance Operating Plan (PAOP) gives RECCo the opportunity to update the Performance Assurance Board (PAB) on how effectively REC services are planned and managed, through a review of their IT capacity management and performance. It confirms how performance is monitored and how each provider is performing against its defined targets and service levels. RECCo has also reviewed planned changes and new areas for improvement.

This paper sets out the findings from RECCo's review. For each REC service provider, we reviewed its obligations for IT performance and capacity management, how performance is monitored, how it is performing against targets, and any planned changes.

2.1 REVIEW SCOPE

The review covers:

- RECCo's approach to IT performance and capacity management
- REC obligations delivered by service providers, and how RECCo monitors them
- Performance against defined service levels
- How well service providers meet their contractual obligations to RECCo
- Planned changes that could affect service performance or capacity, and opportunities to improve

Security and data protection are addressed in a separate paper and are not covered here. Change management performance is also out of scope of this review.

[2] APDEX is an easy to understand approach to converting response times into an easy to understand metric between 0 and 1. In this context it improves the way we communicate about responsiveness.

2.2 SERVICE PROVIDERS COVERED

- Enquiry services: C&C Group (Electricity Enquiry Service, Secure Data Exchange Service, Green Deal Central Charging Database) and Xoserve (Gas Enquiry Service)
- The Central Registration Service (CRS), delivered by the Data Communications Company (DCC) covering three code roles/services: Switching Operator (SO), Central Switching Service (CSS) Provider, and CSS Certificate Authority (CSS CA)
- Code Manager service providers: Talan (REC Portal and professional services) and Capgemini (technical services)
- RECCo, including RECCo Market Schemes (Payment Method Levelisation)

2.3 REVIEW APPROACH

We structured the review around three user needs:

- Is the service available?
- Is the service responsive?
- If the service fails, how is it fixed, how quickly, and how are users kept updated?

For each service, we reviewed the REC service definition obligations, any contractual service levels (where relevant), how performance is monitored and reported, performance against targets, and any gaps or areas for improvement.

Performance data in this paper is drawn from RECCo's monthly Operations Management Information reports for the 2025-26 financial year (April 2025 to March 2026), supplemented by provider performance reporting.

3 RECCO APPROACH TO IT PERFORMANCE AND CAPACITY MANAGEMENT

RECCo manages IT performance and capacity through three mechanisms.

REC-codified obligations

Both the Central Registration and Enquiry Services, including Green Deal and SDES, have REC requirements they must deliver. For the CRS, our review has focused on DCC's roles as Switching Operator (SO),Central Switching Service and CSS CA Provider, where obligations are defined within several REC Schedules and each individual Service Definition. For the Central Enquiry Services, obligations are set out in the EES and GES Service Definitions and in the commercial contracts with C&C and Xoserve. Together these set the availability, incident response, capacity management, business continuity and reporting requirements for each service.

Commercial contracts

RECCo contracts with C&C Group (EES, SDES, and GDCC), Xoserve (GES), and the new Digital Services provider include detailed SLAs. These set targets, explain how performance is measured, set out service credits, and define reporting requirements. The contractual SLAs meet or exceed the REC service definition requirements.

Performance assurance oversight

The REC Performance Assurance Board receives Performance Assurance Reporting Catalogue (PARC) regular reporting from DCC for CRS and contractual reporting from other service providers. Schedule 26 Switching Service Management - section 10 set out he Switching Operator coordination role for demand and capacity management across all Switching Data Service Providers (SDSPs).

4 ENQUIRY SERVICES

4.1 ELECTRICITY ENQUIRY SERVICE (EES) AND SECURE DATA EXCHANGE SERVICE (SDES)

Provider: C&C Group Holdings Limited

Contract: Restated agreement, effective 18 July 2025 (Amendment Agreement Number Three)

Assessment: Meets/Exceeds. The SLA framework is comprehensive and the contractual targets exceed REC requirements.

4.1.1 REC OBLIGATIONS AND CONTRACTUAL COVERAGE

The table below summarises the key IT performance and capacity obligations from the EES Service Definition and how these are addressed in the C&C contract:

Area	REC Service Definition	Contract SLA (Schedule 3)	Assessment
Service Availability	EES: 99% (08:00-18:00 WDs) CSS interface: 99.75% DIP interface: 98%	99.75% monthly (exceeds REC requirement)	**Exceeds**
Incident Response	P1: 30min / 4hr P2: 1hr / 24hr P3: 3WH / 3WD P4: 1WD / 10WD	Matches REC for switching Same targets for non-switching 24/7 service desk	**Meets**
BCDR[3]	RTO[4]: 4hr target / 8hr max RPO[5]: 30 minutes	Matches REC Annual BCDR test Annual SO BCDR test	**Meets**
Capacity	16,000 concurrent users 4M searches/month Peak daily: 163,328 switches	Matches REC volumes	**Meets**
Response Times	CSS msgs: 20min mean / 25min 90th (avg vol) Portal: 3s mean / 6s 90th API: 3s mean / 6s 90th	Matches REC targets API latency: best endeavours 250ms	**Meets**

[3] BCDR refers to Business Continuity Disaster Recovery arrangements.
[4] RTO is the recovery time objective – i.e. the maximum time it should take to restore the service to full operation
[5] RPO is the recovery point objective. This refers to the maximum amount of data that can be lost if there is an issue. It's described in a period of time, as this is linked to the backup response.

Area	REC Service Definition	Contract SLA (Schedule 3)	Assessment
Service Credits	N/A (commercial matter)	1% per 1% below 99% availability DR: 5% per day over 48hr Cap: 50% monthly charges	Robust regime
Reporting	Monthly to Code Manager	SLA reports by WD5 Management reports by WD10 P1/P2 incident reports within 2WD	**Meets**

4.1.2 MONITORING ARRANGEMENTS

C&C provides monthly SLA performance reports to the RECCo Portal by the fifth working day after month end. It provides monthly management reports by the tenth working day. C&C communicates unplanned outages on its status hub website and directly to the Code Manager and Switching Operator. For Priority 1 and Priority 2 incidents, C&C provides a summary report within two working days and a full root cause analysis within ten working days.

4.1.3 PERFORMANCE AGAINST SLAS

Performance across the 2025-26 financial year was strong. EES availability was 100% in every month, against the 99.75% target, and portal and API response times recorded no failed KPI hours in ten of twelve months. The exceptions were August 2025, when the online portal missed its 90th percentile response time target for two hours in the early morning (overnight enquiry volumes are very low, so a small number of slow responses breached the percentile measure), and October 2025, with around one hour of missed portal and API response time KPIs. The August event had no reported customer impact while the October misses related to the major incident described further below.

The monthly EES KPI success rate ranged between 82% and 93%. The misses were concentrated in the MHHS-related measures (synchronous validation of meter points via the DIP) and were marginal: typically a single message or small batch processed fractionally over target following delays in the Microsoft Azure service bus, with messages re-queued and processed successfully. A reporting issue between December 2025 and February 2026, where retried messages overwrote response timestamps, overstated some failures; C&C has corrected its reporting to measure from the DIP interface. Mitigations for the underlying service bus delays remain under investigation.

No service credits were triggered during the year, and no Priority 1 or Priority 2 incidents affecting the EES were reported through monthly MI reporting. A log-in issue affected some portal users on 22 September 2025; all messages received through the portal were responded to within SLA timescales.

In early October 2025, a Priority 2 major incident affected the EES API and online portal. Following a routine server reboot for security updates in late September, SQL Server recalculated its query execution plans and selected inefficient plans for several EES database queries, raising CPU utilisation and causing slow responses and timeouts between 1 and 3 October. Twenty-one customers reported difficulties and none raised a formal complaint. C&C resolved the incident by rewriting the affected stored procedures, with no recurrence since. Because the service remained available throughout, the incident registered in routine performance reporting only as marginal response-time misses. The annual BCDR test was completed in line with the contractual requirement, with no adverse findings reported.

Source: C&C monthly SLA and management reports, April 2025 to March 2026.

4.1.4 ASSESSMENT

The C&C contract sets out a comprehensive framework for IT performance and capacity management for EES and SDES. Across all measured areas, the contractual SLAs meet or exceed the REC service definition requirements. The service credit regime creates meaningful commercial consequences for underperformance, up to a cap of 50% of monthly charges.

The 2025-26 performance data confirms that C&C met the key SLAs overall, with consistently full availability and no service credits.

The most significant operational event in the year was the October 2025 major incident described above. Although it did not breach the credit-bearing SLAs, it caused several days of degraded service and customer-reported difficulties before C&C completed root cause analysis and corrective action.

The one recurring issue is the Azure service bus delay affecting DIP message processing times, which caused repeated marginal KPI misses from December 2025.

C&C has implemented reporting corrections and alerting, and is assessing development options to mitigate the service bus delays. RECCo will track this through monthly performance reporting.

4.2 GAS ENQUIRY SERVICE (GES)

Provider: Xoserve Limited

Contract: Restated agreement, effective 18 July 2025 (Amendment Agreement Number One)

Assessment: Meets/Exceeds. This largely mirrors the EES framework and adds network quality and Reasonable Use Limit provisions.

4.2.1 REC OBLIGATIONS AND CONTRACTUAL COVERAGE

The Xoserve GES contract has the following key provisions:

Area	REC Service Definition	Contract SLA (Schedule 6)	Assessment
Service Availability	99.75% monthly	99.75% monthly (matches REC)	**Meets**

Area	REC Service Definition	Contract SLA (Schedule 6)	Assessment
Incident Response	P1: 30min / 4hr P2: 1hr / 24hr P3: 3WH / 3WD P4: 1WD / 10WD	Matches REC for switching Same targets for non-switching 24/7 service desk	**Meets**
BCDR	RTO: 4hr target / 8hr max RPO: 30 minutes	Matches REC Annual BCDR test Annual SO BCDR test	**Meets**
Capacity	750 concurrent portal users 120 concurrent API connections Peak daily: 118,272 switches	Matches REC volumes [67]: 5,000 calls/min, 200/sec 80% RUL notification threshold	**Exceeds**
Response Times	CSS msgs: 20min mean / 25min 90th Portal: 3s mean / 6s 90th API: 3s mean / 6s 90th	Matches REC targets Subject to RUL relief mechanism	**Meets**
Network Quality	Not specified in REC SD	Bandwidth: ≥5mbps Latency: ≤150ms Jitter: ≤30ms Packet loss: ≤1%	**Exceeds**
Service Credits	N/A (commercial matter)	Points system with escalating multipliers: 1.5x / 2x / 5x Cap: 5% of total charges	Robust regime
Reporting	Monthly to Code Manager	Performance by WD5 Management reports by WD10	**Meets**

[7] Reasonable Use Limit – i.e. the system is designed to perform to a certain standard within specified reasonable use.

Area	REC Service Definition	Contract SLA (Schedule 6)	Assessment
		Major incident: 2WD summary, 15WD RCA	
CDSP Data Processing	Switching data: within 4hr Non-switching: by 09:00	98% within 4hr (switching) 99% by 09:00 (non-switching)	**Meets**

4.2.2 PERFORMANCE AGAINST SERVICE LEVELS

GES availability was 100% in eleven of twelve months during 2025-26, against the 99.75% target, with no failed portal and API response time KPI hours. In October 2025, availability fell to 99.44% following a global Microsoft cloud incident, with service resumed within one hour; performance remained above the service credit threshold. No service credits were triggered across the year and no Reasonable Use Limit events were reported.

Contractually, Xoserve met between 92% and 100% of its KPIs each month. The recurring 'missed' KPIs in REC-level reporting were the two data latency measures, which are definitional rather than operational: the restated July 2025 contract updated these measures to reflect the requirements and capabilities of the system, and Xoserve has consistently met the contractual definitions (for example, switching data available within 4 hours 98% of the time). REC Changes R0277 and R0299 will align the GES Service Definition with the contract, with deployment expected in June 2026; until then, the RPA-reported KPIs show as missed.

Operational issues during the year were limited. A Priority 2 incident on 16 June 2025 exceeded its resolution timescale because a previous fix had to be rolled back and data caught up. Intermittent delays to the 15-minute CSS data update measure were caused by Microsoft Azure platform issues (a global Azure Data Factory incident in June 2025 and Databricks cluster issues in early 2026), each affecting a small fraction of message volumes; Xoserve has implemented Microsoft's recommendations and raised tickets for the residual issues.

The annual BCDR test was completed as required, with no adverse findings reported, and BCDR recovery metrics were met throughout the year.

Source: Xoserve monthly performance and management reports, April 2025 to March 2026.

4.2.3 ASSESSMENT

The Xoserve contract provides a robust framework for IT performance and capacity management for GES. The Reasonable Use Limit mechanism and network quality requirements add protections that are not included in the C&C contract. The escalating service credit multipliers also discourage repeat failures.

The 2025-26 performance data confirms that Xoserve substantially met its key contractual KPIs, with no service credits; the only availability miss was caused by a global cloud provider incident in October 2025.

The apparent sustained underperformance on data latency reflects outdated REC Service Definition measures rather than service degradation.

Completing REC Changes R0277 and R0299, expected in June 2026, will close this reporting mismatch.

4.3 GREEN DEAL CENTRAL CHARGING DATABASE (GDCC)

Provider: C&C Group (under Part B of the EES contract)

Assessment: Meets/Exceeds. A low activity service with proportionate provisions

GDCC is a low-activity service. It supports 11,795 live Green Deal Plans and has a maximum of 60 active users. The REC service definition requires 99% availability from 09:00 to 17:00 on working days. The contract includes incident response targets (Critical incidents: 30 minutes to respond and 2.5 working hours to resolve). It also includes a disaster recovery plan that requires the service to be restored within 24 hours after a catastrophic loss. Overall, these provisions are proportionate to the service's scale and criticality.

No GDCC outages, incidents or performance concerns were reported through the monthly Operations MI reporting during 2025-26.

5 CENTRAL REGISTRATION SERVICE (CRS)

DCC obligations for IT performance and capacity management are set out in the REC. They are mainly in Schedules 25 and 26, the Switching Service Management Schedule, and the individual service definitions. RECCo does not manage these through a direct commercial contract. Oversight is therefore delivered through the performance assurance framework and PARC reporting, rather than through contractual SLAs with service credits.

5.1 CENTRAL SWITCHING SERVICE (CSS)

Provider: DCC (as CSS and CSS Certificate Authority Provider)

Governing documents: REC:

- Schedule 25 Central Switching Service (CSS) v1.3,
- Schedule 26 Switching Service Management v1.3,
- CSS Service Definition v1.4;
- CSS Certificate Authority Service Definition v1.1

Assessment: Meets/Exceeds. REC obligations are defined and met, and performance is monitored through PARC and DCC reporting.

5.1.1 REC OBLIGATIONS

The table below summarises the key IT performance and capacity obligations from the CSS and CSS CA Service Definitions (SD):

Area	REC Obligation	How Monitored	Assessment
CSS Availability	99.75% overall availability (SD 4.2) 99.99% connection availability (SD 4.2) No maintenance 16:00-01:00	PARC monthly reporting REC Portal Performance Dashboard	**Exceeds**
CSS CA Availability	99% availability (SD 4.2)	Monthly report to Code Manager	**Exceeds**
Incident Response	Via SO Priority (P) 1-4 structure (SD 5.2) Major Incident Best Practice (Category 3 Document)	Switching SMS SO quarterly reports to PAB	**Meets**
BCDR	Registration: RTO 4hr/8hr, RPO 15min Address Mgmt: RTO 4hr/8hr, RPO 60min CSS CA: RTO 4hr/8hr, RPO 30min	Annual BCDR testing	**Meets**
Capacity Management	Non-Functional Capacity (SD 7.10-7.11) MHHS Migration Volumes (SD 7.12) SDSP ensures capacity (Sch 25 - 10.6)	SDSP monitors demand vs capacity Annual review by SO (Sch 25, 10.8)	**Meets**
Demand Management	Report exceptional demand (Sch 25 S.10) SO coordinates across all SDSPs (Sch 25, S.10)	SO collates headroom info Notifications via Switching Portal	**Meets**
Reporting	Monthly to Code Manager Quarterly to PAB via SO (Sch 25, 14.2)	PARC monthly reporting DCC Monthly Commentary Reports	**Meets**

Note on 2025-26 assessment: ratings reflect PARC-reported performance. CSS and CSS CA availability were 100% in every month (targets 99.75% and 99.99%). Incident service levels were met, with only marginal Priority 4 variance

(response and resolution 99 to 100%); Priority 1 and 2 incidents were rare, with no sustained misses. No BCDR event was invoked during the year.

5.1.2 MONITORING ARRANGEMENTS

Performance is monitored through monthly PARC reporting (available through the REC Portal Performance Dashboard) and DCC commentary reports, which set out service level failures for the month. Additionally the Switching Operator provides quarterly reports to the PAB that summarise service review findings and progress on improvement initiatives.

5.1.3 PERFORMANCE

CSS Switching service availability (combined) was 100% in every month of 2025-26 against the 99.75% / 99.99% targets, the switch request success rate was 100% throughout, and supplier-chosen switch duration averaged around 4.2 days against the five-day upper threshold. CSS service levels were strong all year, with isolated marginal misses: single hours in May, September and November 2025 where spikes or batched messages pushed registration request processing seconds over target, and one P4 incident in July 2025 where the response was made on time but the tracking trigger failed.

All CSS CA and CSS Service Levels were met, including the Availability, Responsiveness and BCDR categories. Service level failures were experienced under the User Support performance assurance category, which covers incident response and resolution and the fulfilment of switching service requests. Two are of note: first, the June 2025 R0080 release duplicate-message incident, which affected overall incident resolution until an interim mitigation was implemented, with an enduring fix deployed later in 2025 and no further duplicate-message issues since; and second, a technical incident management platform issue during July and August 2025 which required performance results to be restated. Corrective actions for all failures are described in the Switching Operator section (4.2) below. Switching Incentive Regime (SIR) performance charges related to the confirmed failures ranged from circa 4.5% (Q1, April to June 2025) to 30% (later quarters, provisional and subject to PAB approval).

CSS capacity is managed against the non-functional requirements and MHHS migration volumes under the CSS service definition (7.10 to 7.12); switching services operated within capacity throughout the year, with no capacity-related incidents reported.

Source: PARC reporting and DCC Commentary Reports, April 2025 to March 2026.

5.2 SWITCHING OPERATOR (SO)

Provider: DCC (as licensed Smart Metering Communication Company Licensee, SO REC role).

Governing documents: Switching Operator Service Definition v1.5; Switching Service Management Schedule (REC Schedule 26) v1.3.

Assessment: Meets with partial gap(s). Obligations are defined, but we need to confirm that the capacity oversight role is working as intended.

5.2.1 REC OBLIGATIONS

The table below summarises the key IT performance and capacity obligations from the SO Service Definition:

Area	REC Obligation	How Monitored	Assessment
Availability	Switching Portal: 99.9% Switching Service Management System (SMS): 99.9% Maintenance: max 4hr/month No maintenance 16:00-01:00	PARC monthly reporting Switching Portal on-demand reports	**Exceeds**
Incident Response	Priority 1: 30min / 4hr P2: 1hr / 24hr P3: 3WH / 3-6WD P4: 1WD / 10-20WD	Switching SMS tracking Major Incident best practice doc	**Meets**
BCDR	RTO: 4hr target / 8hr max RPO: 15 minutes	Annual SO BCDR test coordinated	**Meets**
Capacity Oversight	SD 1.5(c): Collate capacity/headroom across all SDSPs Match to expected MP activity Annual max capacity review (Sch 25, 10.8)	SO quarterly reports to PAB Each SDSP responsible for own capacity	**Meets**
Demand Coordination	Sch 25 S.10: coordinate exceptional demand across all SDSPs Publish criteria for advance reporting Highlight availability limitations to MPs	Notifications via Switching Portal SO coordination role	**Meets**
Reporting	Sch 25 S.14: defined standard reports Quarterly summary to PAB	PARC reporting Performance Dashboard	**Meets**

Area	REC Obligation	How Monitored	Assessment
	On-demand reports via Switching Portal		

Note on 2025-26 assessment: ratings reflect PARC-reported performance. Switching Service availability was 100% in every month and incident response was met (Priority 3 100%, Priority 4 99 to 100%). Incident resolution and switching service requests were variable: Priority 3 incident resolution ranged 67 to 100% and Priority 4 resolution 90 to 100%; switching service requests ranged more widely (Priority 2 67 to 100%, Priority 3 95 to 100%, Priority 4 0 to 100%), recovering to target by March 2026. These are the failures reflected in Switching Incentive Regime charges and addressed by the CRS Improvement Plan (see section 5.2).

5.2.2 PERFORMANCE

Switching Operator service level success ranged from 50% (July 2025) to 100% across the year, with failures concentrated in lower-priority incident resolution and test-environment service requests. The causes were predominantly administrative and tooling-related rather than service-affecting: the ServiceNow tickets not being closed as work completed, previously closed incidents reopening automatically due to a system fault, test slots booked beyond SLA windows, and the absence of a 'stop the clock' mechanism for requests awaiting action by parties. DCC and the RPA confirmed minimal market or consumer impact from these events.

Performance improved materially through the year as the CRS 2025-26 Improvement Plan improvements were determined and delivered. DCC deployed a real-time dashboard enabling them to engage proactively with stakeholders before a ticket reaches its response or resolution service level, introduced monthly failure reviews with resolvers, and completed a cleanse of aged Switching Service Requests in February 2026. A REC change to introduce a new REC Priority 5 service level, covering User Support Switching Service Requests raised for training and test tickets, together with auto-routing and standardised templates delivered through the Small Change process, is expected to address the residual failure causes. By March 2026 only one service level was missed.

This is the area of weakest service level performance across the review period and the only one carrying a financial consequence through the SIR. RECCo will continue to monitor it closely with DCC and confirm the improvement plan is delivering a sustained recovery.

The annual maximum capacity review under Schedule 25 (10.8) provides ongoing capacity assurance, and no capacity concerns were raised during the year.

Source: PARC reporting, April 2025 to March 2026.

6 CODE MANAGER SERVICES AND MARKET SCHEMES

6.1 REC PORTAL

Provider: Talan (formerly Gemserv)

Contract: REC Professional Services Agreement, 15 September 2020. Extended to 31 August 2028.

Assessment: Transitional. In the process of being replaced by the Digital Services Platform

The REC Portal is governed by the RPS contract. This includes one availability target of 99.9% (24 hours a day, 7 days a week). The contract also includes helpdesk targets (2 hours for an initial response, 1 working day to move to second line, and 3 working days to resolve). However, it does not include response time targets, capacity thresholds, or business continuity and disaster recovery objectives for the portal infrastructure.

The portal is being replaced by the Digital Services Platform (see section 7). This transition needs careful management to maintain continuity of service.

The REC Portal missed its 99.9% availability target in five months of 2025-26. Three misses were marginal: April 2025 (99.7%, memory spikes at off-peak times), June 2025 (99.7%, an unannounced global platform update by Liferay, the Portal platform host) and August 2025 (99.8%, ten instances of downtime), each drawing a service credit.

The most significant event was October 2025, when high volumes of bot scraping activity consumed excessive memory and caused repeated server outages between 1 and 8 October, reducing availability to 90% for the month; a 1.5% service credit was applied. A repeat event in November (99.6%, bot-triggered requests to the Committees area of the Portal) attracted a 1.0% service credit under the repeat failure multiplier.

Mitigations were applied: a permanent extension of server memory from 1 November, restructuring of the document store to remove conflict errors, and authentication controls on Committee documentation to block bot traffic. Availability returned to target from December onwards. The Code Manager received no negative user feedback through the service desk, but five misses in a year, including a sustained October outage, underline the limits of the current platform and support the case for the transition to the Digital Services Platform and its stronger performance framework.

The DSP build is under way, with soft launches and user acceptance testing ahead of phased releases: Release 0.1 (9 June 2026), Release 0.2 (18 August 2026), Release 0.3 (14 October 2026), Release 1.0 go-live (18 November 2026) and Release 1.1 (8 December 2026), followed by hypercare to 16 February 2027. REC Portal availability reporting continues until cutover completes.

6.2 PAYMENT METHOD LEVELISATION (PML)

Provider: Capgemini (under RTS contract, via Change Requests)

REC basis: REC Schedule 31 (Payment Method Levelisation Reconciliation)

Assessment: Meets with partial gap(s). The service performed reliably through 2025-26 but lacks formal IT performance SLAs, which are being introduced through the April change request.

6.2.1 THE SERVICE

The Payment Method Levelisation Reconciliation system manages monthly financial transfers between domestic energy suppliers. The aim is to remove the prepayment meter premium. The requirements are set out in REC Schedule 31. RECCo must issue statements to each Domestic Supplier within 15 working days of the monthly data submission deadline. RECCo must also

redistribute reconciliation amounts within 30 working days of each period end. If a supplier does not pay, this is an Event of Default. Ofgem is notified and the PAB is informed.

The system went live on 1 April 2024. It processes monthly data submissions from all domestic energy suppliers. Suppliers submit CSV files to a designated SharePoint location. The platform is hosted in Azure and uses a microservices architecture.

6.2.2 IT PERFORMANCE AND CAPACITY PROVISIONS

Operational support is provided through a change request to the Capgemini RTS contract. The main IT assurance activity is a six-monthly technology review by a solution architect. This review checks whether components are supported, perform as expected, and remain suitable for ongoing operation.

- There are no contractual provisions for:
- Service availability targets;
- Incident response or resolution commitments;
- Business continuity or disaster recovery targets;
- Capacity management or monitoring; or
- Performance reporting beyond the technology review.

6.2.3 GAP ANALYSIS

There is a mismatch between how critical the service is and how mature its IT governance is. PML Reconciliation is a REC obligation with financial settlement impacts, Ofgem oversight, and Event of Default provisions. However, it currently operates without formal IT performance management. By comparison, the enquiry services have comprehensive SLA frameworks.

Some risks are reduced by how the system works. It runs batch processing on a monthly cycle, serves a small number of users, and is hosted in Azure, which can scale. However, if the system is unavailable during the key window around the monthly data submission deadline (around the 15th), or when statements are generated, RECCo could miss its REC Schedule 31 obligations.

6.2.4 PERFORMANCE

The Levelisation service performed reliably throughout 2025-26. Capgemini's processing measures (portfolio submissions processed on time, scheme outturns calculated accurately and on time, and invoices and credit notes issued accurately and on time) were reported at 100% in every month. No system incidents, outages or processing failures were reported through monthly MI reporting.

Funds processed grew from around £3.8 million per month in spring 2025 to around £6.5 million per month by early 2026. The issues recorded during the year related to supplier-side data submissions (late or incorrect portfolio data, handled through the scheme's proxy-data arrangements) and scheme-design clarifications with Ofgem, not to the platform.

The 2025 technology review found no technical risks with the Azure-native platform; all components remain in managed support and none are approaching redundancy. A small number

of low-risk improvement opportunities were identified, principally automating selected reporting and supplier-contact updates, which are being progressed through a change request.

6.2.5 RECOMMENDATION

RECCo is introducing proportionate IT service management provisions for the Levelisation system that match its financial criticality, through the next operational service year change request in April. These will cover:

- A defined availability target, particularly during the monthly processing window;
- An incident response and escalation process;
- Basic business continuity and disaster recovery arrangements; and
- Regular capacity monitoring and reporting.

These could be implemented through an amendment to the existing Capgemini RTS Change Request or through a new Change Request, without requiring a full re-procurement.

7 FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

7.1 DIGITAL SERVICES PLATFORM

Provider: Capgemini UK Plc (new contract, separate from RTS)

Contract signed: 1 July 2025

The Digital Services Platform (DSP) is a new service that will replace the REC Portal, which is currently provided by Talan. It is a step change in how IT performance and capacity are governed compared with the current portal arrangements.

7.1.1 KEY IT PERFORMANCE PROVISIONS

The table below summarises the key IT performance KPIs in the DSP contract:

KPI	Target Performance Level	Measurement
KPI1a: Availability (API Gateway)	99.90% or greater	Monthly
KPI1b: Availability (Digital Ecosystem)	99.90% or greater	Quarterly
KPI2: Response Times (APDEX)	Top 20% pages: APDEX >0.8 80% least used pages: APDEX >0.5	Monthly
KPI3: Severity 1 Incident Resolution	95% resolved in 4 hours 100% resolved in 1 Working Day	Monthly

KPI	Target Performance Level	Measurement
KPI4: Severity 2 Incident Resolution	95% resolved in 1 Working Day 100% resolved in 2 Working Days	Monthly
KPI5: Severity 3 Incident Resolution	95% resolved in 3 Working Days 100% resolved in 5 Working Days	Monthly
KPI6: Severity 4 Incident Resolution	95% resolved in 6 Working Days 100% resolved in 10 Working Days	Monthly
KPI7: Change Mgmt Response Times	Responses within agreed timescales	Monthly
KPI8: Impact Assessment Quality	0 IAs rejected due to unacceptable quality	Monthly
KPI9: Release Success	100% releases completed on time, all changes implemented successfully	Monthly
KPI10: Unauthorised Change	0% unauthorised operational change rate	Monthly
KPI11: Problem Mgmt (Priority 1)	Root cause investigation: 5 Working Days Remediation plan: 10 WD after RCI	Monthly
KPI12: Problem Mgmt (Other)	Root cause investigation: 30 Working Days Remediation plan: 30 WD after RCI	Monthly

Performance Incentives

The DSP contract is the first RECCo service provider contract to include performance incentive bonuses for exceeding targets on selected KPIs, in addition to service credits for underperformance. This provides a balanced carrot-and-stick approach.

7.1.2 IMPACT ON OVERALL IT PERFORMANCE AND CAPACITY POSITION

The transition from the REC Portal to the DSP will significantly strengthen RECCo's overall IT performance and capacity management position for Code Manager services. However, the DSP does not replace the Enquiry Services (C&C and Xoserve), DCC services, or the Levelisation system, which will continue under their existing arrangements.

The DSP is in build through 2026, delivered in two-week sprints across workstreams covering the Digital REC, change management, performance assurance, committees, news and events, external services and user navigation. Functionality is released in phases, each preceded by user acceptance testing and a soft launch: Release 0.1 (9 June 2026), Release 0.2 (18 August 2026), Release 0.3 (14 October 2026), Release 1.0 go-live (18 November 2026) and Release 1.1 (8 December 2026).

Hypercare runs from go-live to 16 February 2027. The phased release and soft-launch approach manages continuity risk by validating each capability with users before cutover from the REC Portal.

Performance during and after migration will be monitored against the contractual KPI framework set out above, alongside continued REC Portal availability reporting until the transition completes. We propose that the first DSP performance review is reported to the PAB after go-live (see Recommendation 4).

8 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 SUMMARY TABLE

Service	Provider	Key Finding	Assessment
EES / SDES / GDCC	C&C Group	Comprehensive SLA framework. 100% availability and no service credits in 2025-26.	**Meets/Exceeds**
GES	Xoserve	Contractual KPIs substantially met in 2025-26; REC alignment completes June 2026.	**Meets/Exceeds**
CRS: Central Switching Service & Certificate Authority (CSS / CSS CA)	DCC	100% availability in 2025-26. No commercial leverage.	**Meets/Exceeds**
CRS: Switching Operator	DCC	Service request handling underperformed in 2025-26; CRS improvement plan now delivering mitigating actions to resolve.	**Meets with partial gap(s)**
REC Portal	Talan	Missed 99.9% target five times in 2025-26; credits applied. Being replaced by DSP.	**Transitional**

Service	Provider	Key Finding	Assessment
PML Levelisation	Capgemini	REC-codified financial settlement; formal IT SLAs being introduced via the April change request.	**Meets with partial gap(s)**
Digital Services (DSP) (NEW)	Capgemini	99.9% availability, APDEX, 12 KPIs, incentive bonuses. Step-change.	**Future state**

8.2 ACTIONS

1. PML Levelisation

RECCo is introducing proportionate IT service management provisions for the Levelisation service. The next operational service year change request, in April, will add SLAs covering system availability and incident response timescales, and the existing annual technology review already checks that the implemented technology continues to meet requirements without introducing risk. RECCo will consider the proportionality of formal business continuity and disaster recovery arrangements in April.

2. DCC Services

RECCo assesses DCC's capacity management as broadly adequate and will continue to monitor it, including the annual review under section 10.8 of the Switching Service Management Schedule. RECCo will also work with RTS and RECCo colleagues to agree a consistent approach for assessing capacity in future reviews.

3. Digital Services transition

RECCo is ensuring the migration plan from the REC Portal to the DSP sets clear performance baselines and cutover criteria, and is monitoring performance closely during the transition. RECCo will include the Digital Services provider in the regular performance review cycle, schedule the first DSP performance review after go-live, and consider how Levelisation IT governance should evolve as the scheme matures.

8.3 DELIVERY PLAN

RECCo has agreed owners and target dates for each action with the relevant service delivery managers and providers, and will track progress through routine performance assurance reporting. Each action is in progress.

Actions before next report	Owner	Target date	Status
PML: next operational service year change request (April) adds availability and incident response SLAs; annual technology review already in	Jennifer Bridges / John Brignell	April (service year CR)	In progress

place; BCDR proportionality to be considered in April			
Agree a consistent capacity assessment approach with RTS and RECCo colleagues for future reviews; DCC capacity currently assessed as broadly adequate	Claire Hemmens / John Brignell	With future review cycle	In progress
Include DSP in the regular review cycle; first DSP review after go-live	John Brignell	Next review cycle	In progress

9 NEXT STEPS

RECCo requests PAB Members to NOTE the findings of this review and COMMENT on the proposed actions and next steps.

RECCo has agreed owners and delivery timelines for each action with the relevant RECCo Service Delivery Managers and REC Service Providers, and will track progress through established, routine performance assurance reporting.

We propose to provide the PAB with annual updates. The next will include the first year of the Digital Services Platform, incorporating DSP performance reports as well as progress against the recommendations above.

APPENDIX A: REC REFERENCES

The table below lists the principal REC documents and versions governing each service in scope.

Service	Governing REC documents (version)
Enquiry Services (EES / SDES)	EES Service Definition v4.2; Secure Data Exchange Service Definition v2.0; C&C restated contract, Schedule 3
Green Deal Central Charging Database (GDCC)	Green Deal Central Charging Database Service Definition v2.0; C&C contract, Schedule 3 Part B
Gas Enquiry Service (GES)	GES Service Definition v1.4; Xoserve restated contract, Schedule 6

Central Switching Service (CSS)	CSS Service Definition v1.4; REC Schedules 25 – Central Switching Service REC Schedule 26 - Switching Service Management v1.3
CSS Certificate Authority (CSS CA)	CSS Certificate Authority Service Definition v1.1
Switching Operator (SO)	SO Service Definition v1.5; REC Schedule 26 - Switching Service Management v1.3
REC Portal	REC Professional Services Agreement (Talan)
PML Levelisation	REC Schedule 31 (PML Reconciliation); Capgemini RTS contract (Change Requests)
Digital Services Platform (DSP)	Capgemini Digital Services contract

APPENDIX B: ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Each service in this paper is given an overall assessment, shown on a red, amber and green (RAG) basis. The assessment reflects three things together: how fully the service met its IT performance and capacity obligations during the year; how robust and proportionate the supporting controls are (service levels, monitoring, incident management, business continuity and capacity management); and the materiality of any shortfall in the context of the service's scale and criticality.

The underlying service-level data is reported through PARC and provider reporting against defined performance standards, for example whether each measure exceeds, meets or fails its target. RECCo's overall assessment aggregates this performance rather than reporting each individual measure.

Meets/Exceeds (green): the service met its obligations across the year. Controls are comprehensive and proportionate. Any issues were minor and did not materially affect service delivery.

Meets with partial gap(s) (amber): the service substantially met its obligations, but with some shortfalls during the year, or one or more controls that need strengthening or verification. The shortfalls were not material to overall delivery and are being addressed.

Material gap (red): a gap in IT performance provisions serious enough to require action. No service is currently assessed at this level.

Transitional (amber): the service is being replaced through a controlled migration and is assessed against the transition rather than a steady state.

Future state (grey): a new service that is not yet in live operation; the targets shown are contractual.

Ratings are applied proportionately. A control gap on a smaller, lower-frequency service, such as the monthly batch Payment Method Levelisation process, carries less risk than the same gap on a large, high-volume, high-availability service such as the Central Switching Service, and the assessment reflects this context.