RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

01	Proposal Plan
02	Impact Assessment
03	Consultation
04	Final Recommendation

CHANGE REPORT

I0224 – AGILE REPORTING WITHIN CSS

DOCUMENT VERSION	V1.0
PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION DATE	TBD
IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH	TBD

RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	Technical Expert Panel	CHANGE PATH	Self-Governance
PRIORITY STATUS	High	URGENCY	Standard
IMPACTED STAKEHOLDERS	CSS Provider, CSS Users (Indirect)		

LEAD ANALYST	TECHNICAL LEAD (SOLUTION LEAD)	ASSURANCE LEAD	SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT
LYDIA BENTLEY	MAXIME VAN EYSEREN	VAISHNAVI SHARMA	GLENN SHEERN
Click to send an email	Click to send an email	Click to send an email	Click to send an email

OVERVIEW

Current Central Switching Service (CSS) design elements do not readily allow for agile changes to the CSS in response to needs from CSS Users, the Code Manager, or the broader market. This Issue seeks to explore ways of making CSS technical change easier to achieve.

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

CONTENTS

1 Summary 3
2 Problem Statement 3
3 Impacts 3
4 Cross-Code Impacts 4
5 Proposal plan 4
6 Stakeholder Engagement 5
7 Priority Status and Urgency 5
8 Appendix 5
9 Glossary 6

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

BACKGROUND

1 SUMMARY

As part of the impact assessment process for R0115, it was identified that it is very costly and time consuming to make reporting changes within the CSSarchitecture. As such, the Code Manager would like to explore enabling agile reporting within the CSS ecosystem, by creating a functionality that consolidates all necessary data into a single, centralised database.

The Code Manager has managed previous REC Change that demonstrates the assertions relating to time and cost made above. R0115, for example, took over one year and six months from the change request being raised, to implementation, at a total cost of £126,307.64 for design, build, test and deployment. As such, end-users of the reports can potentially experience major delays on operations that rely on timely data. This can lead to frustration and decreased satisfaction.

As the number of change request increases, the current CSS architecture may struggle to keep up with the increasing volume and complexity of reporting changes. This could exacerbate the existing problems and lead to even longer delays and higher costs. The significant resources required for each change request prevent other changes from being implemented and the resources could be better utilised elsewhere. The current system's demands on time and money may divert resources from other strategic initiatives or innovations.

2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Current CSS arrangements mean that REC Changes designed to facilitate access to CSS data are more onerous that they need to be. Current arrangements are costly and have relatively long lead-times. This Issue seeks to explore changing the way that the CSS data can be accessed.

3 IMPACTS

CONSUMERS
None

REC SERVICE PROVIDERS
CSS Provider

RECCO / REC CODE MANAGER
Code Manager
REC Performance Assurance (RPA) (Specifically)

REC PARTIES AND SERVICE USERS
CSS Users (Indirect)

REC DOCUMENTS / PRODUCTS
Central Switching Service Definition (TBC)

MHHS DESIGN	MHHS DATA SPECIFICATION	MHHS CODE DRAFTING
N/A	N/A	N/A

Firstly, this Issue aims to provide a positive impact to anyone who utilises the CSS, or requires access to CSS Data. By expediting novel methods of access to CSS data, this Issue will provide benefits across the market.

The impact on Switching means that Consumers are directly affected by this Change. Additionally, there is an impact on both the CSS Provider, as this Change directly refers to CSS architecture and systems, with a resulting impact on CSS Users.

Changes are likely to be centred on the CSS Definition document, but this assumption may be subject to change, as the solution is refined following impact assessment.

Additionally, there will be an indirect positive impact on the REC Code Manager. This Issue aims to allow the Code Manager to more readily make changes within the CSS, which will reduce FTE expenditure on CSS Change, as well as reducing central system costs going forward. Further, there is a specific impact on the REC Performance Assurance (RPA) function of the Code Manager. RPA have confirmed that the changes required to achieve this Issue's problem statement will likely have a direct impact on the Performance Assurance Framework and how RPA deliver services in relation to it.

4 CROSS-CODE IMPACTS

The Code Manager has not identified any cross-code impacts at this stage.

5 PROPOSAL PLAN

Milestone	Activity	From	To
Definition		**06 Jan 25**	**31 Mar 25**
	Impact Assessment	January	March
	Solution Development	January	March
	Legal Review	March	March
Change Proposal		**01 Apr 25**	**24 Jun 25**
	Business Case Assessment	April	April
	Consultation	April	May
	Solution Refinement	May	May
	Final Determination	June	June
Voting		**25 June 25**	**25 June 25**
	Appeal Window	June	June

6 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

The Code Manager will engage on an ad hoc basis with relevant industry forums, including, but not limited to, the Technical Change Workshop, Change Issues Group, and the REC Issues Group.

7 PRIORITY STATUS AND URGENCY

PRIORITISATION MATRIX

Category	Significance / Resource impacts / Urgency	Further selection / breakdown	Score (0-3)	Weighting	Weighted Score
Impacts	Consumer Impact	Direct	0	27	0
	Retail Markets Impact	Innovation and Market Arrangements	3	17	50
	RECCo / REC Party / REC Service Provider Impact	Operational Effectiveness and Efficiencies	3	7	20
		Legal and Regulatory Compliance	1	14	14
Resource	Complexity / Effort / Duration		2	9	18
Strategic Alignment	Contribution to/ Alignment with the objectives of the REC		3	17	25
	Contribution to/ Alignment with RECCo's Forward Work Plan		1		8
Urgency *(The need to progress a change to meet a targeted date)*		Other Planned Activity	2	10	20
				Overall Priority Score (rounded)	156

Priority Score	Priority Status
171 and above	Critical
151 to 170	High
101 to 150	Medium
0 to 100	Low

Priority Status	HIGH
Change Proposal Type	STANDARD

Urgent Change Proposals meet the Criteria for Urgency as set out by Ofgem

This Issue has been given a priority status of High, based on a score of 156. This score has been calculated as follows:

- Retail Market Innovation & REC Service Provider Operational Efficiency have both been given a score of three, indicating major impact. This is because this Issue represents an opportunity to substantially improve the agility of CSS systems. This Issue would make the CSS more receptive to change, allowing for much more dynamic and efficient response to emerging needs within the REC.
- Contribution to REC Objectives has been given a score of three, indicating major impact. This is because this Issue aims to provide significant improvements to the efficiency in the operation of a REC Central system, as well as driving an evolution in the operation of the REC.
- Complexity/Efford/Duration has been given a score of two, indicating moderate complexity.

All other metrics have been given a score of zero or one, as appropriate.

8 APPENDIX

CHANGE PROPOSAL	Link

9 GLOSSARY

TERM	DEFINITION
Central Switching Service	means the Systems and processes provided or procured by the CSS Provider for the purpose of providing the Address Management Service and the Registration Service.
CSS Provider	means the DCC when performing functions under or in relation to this Code (but always excluding its functions under the Smart Energy Code and its roles as CSS Systems Integrator, SI Provider and Switching Operator), including in respect of the Central Switching Service and including in effecting the design, build and testing of any System that will allow it to perform functions under this Code after the CSS Go-Live Date. This role is the CSS Procurer and Manager function as described in the E2E Data Migration Plan, E2E Integration Plan, E2E Post Implementation Plan, E2E Testing Plan, E2E Transition Plan: Implementation Approach and E2E Transition Plan: In-Flight Switches Approach.
CSS User	means each organisation which is Qualified to use the CSS, together with each Switching Data Service Provider (other than the CSS Provider) the categories of which are set out in the Central Switching Service Schedule.
Performance Assurance Framework	means the Performance Assurance Schedule and the documents, processes and arrangements established pursuant to the Performance Assurance Schedule, for the purposes of (or in relation to) the monitoring and assurance of roles and obligations undertaken by REC Service Users and REC Service Providers pursuant to this Code.