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

I0180: CLARITY ON USE OF ON HOLD FOR SWITCHING ISSUES, INCLUDING THE OBLIGATIONS OF CSS USERS

DOCUMENT VERSION	1.0
PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION DATE	TBC
IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH	BIG BANG

RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	CHANGE PANEL	CHANGE PATH	SELF-GOVERNANCE
PRIORITY STATUS	MEDIUM	URGENCY	STANDARD
IMPACTED STAKEHOLDERS	CENTRAL SWITCHING SERVICE PROVIDER, CENTRAL SWITCHING SERVICE USERS		

LEAD ANALYST	TECHNICAL LEAD	SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT
GEORGIANA SEVERIN	MAXIME VAN EYSEREN	ANDY KNOWLES
Click to send an email	Click to send an email	Click to send an email

OVERVIEW

This proposal seeks to introduce additional obligations on Central Switching Service (CSS) Users to engage with the Switching Incident resolution process.

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 4
7 Priority Status and Urgency 5
9 Proposed Solutions 5
10 Draft Legal Text 6
12 Key Risks Issues Assumptions and Dependencies 6
17 Appendix 7
18 Glossary 7

BACKGROUND

1 SUMMARY

Within the CSS system, some Switching Incidents are on hold waiting for resolution**.** The CSS Service Desk team have a process to chase every three days, escalate and make phone calls. However, the incident cannot be closed until confirmation is received from the end-user and information is verified from their systems.

There are issues engaging with Suppliers within the incident management process, issues with the correct contact details being held and that tickets are assigned to an individual person rather than an organisation.

The Switching Operator puts these tickets on hold, which is an approved business process from the Switching Programme. This is not reflected in the obligations on Switching Data Service Provider (SDSP) or other REC Service Providers, where there is no on hold concept. Further there are no obligations on CSS Users to respond in a defined timeframe. This means that the REC obligations do not reflect current practice, and many tickets remain open much longer than necessary.

Note. This does not apply to Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) and SDSPs with service desks and is more specifically, Energy Suppliers. This is because they already have defined Service Level Agreements in place.

2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

A lack of obligations is causing issues with open tickets relating to missing messages. Tickets placed on hold also require significant additional work for the Switching Operator, which could either be released as a cost saving or it could result in time freed up for improvement activities.

3 IMPACTS

REC SERVICE PROVIDERS
Switching Operator

RECCO / REC CODE MANAGER
REC Performance Assurance

REC PARTIES AND SERVICE USERS
Energy Suppliers

REC DOCUMENTS / PRODUCTS
Schedule 26
CSS Service Definition
Switching Operator Service Definition

MHHS DESIGN	MHHS DATA SPECIFICATION	MHHS CODE DRAFTING
No Impact	No Impact	No Impact

REC Performance Assurance have assessed this change against the Performance Assurance Framework (PAF) and other related processes and have highlighted that this will have an impact on the services provided by the Performance Assurance Team.

4 CROSS CODE IMPACTS

No cross-code impacts have been identified.

5 PROPOSAL PLAN

Milestone	Activity	From	To
Definition		**01-August-24**	**31-July-25**
	Solution Development	August-24	January-25
	Service Provider Impact Assessment	February-25	April-25
	Solution Refinement	April-25	June-25
	Party Impact Assessment	June-25	July-25

The Code Manager is only planning as far as Service Provider and Party impact assessment and will analyse the outcome of these before determining next steps and associated timescales.

6 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

This issue was raised by the REC Performance Assurance team with a high-level summary of a potential solution option. Initial discussions were held with the Switching Operator (SO) and further options were identified.

This issue was then presented at the Change Issue Group on the 01 August and a high-level overview of option 1 (proposed by RPA) was provided and a high-level overview of option 2 was provided (proposed by the SO) however little feedback was received, but the general view was that both options should be explored.

The Code Manager has since identified an additional option.

The Technical Design Authority also identified a fourth option, which would look at automating the closing process of tickets.

The intention is to issue all four options for Party and Service Provider Impact Assessment to determine preference of which option to progress to consultation.

7 PRIORITY STATUS AND URGENCY

Category	Significance / Resource impacts / Urgency	Further selection / breakdown	Score (0-3)	Weighting	Weighted Score
Impacts	Consumer Impact	Direct	1	27	27
	Retail Markets Impact	Retail Risk(s)	2	17	33
	RECCo / REC Party / REC Service Provider Impact	Operational Effectiveness and Efficiencies	1	7	7
		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		1	17	8
	Contribution to/ Alignment with RECCo's Forward Work Plan		0		0
Urgency *(The need to progress a change to meet a targeted date)*		Other Planned Activity	0	10	0
				Overall Priority Score (rounded)	108

Priority Status	MEDIUM
Change Proposal Type	STANDARD

SOLUTION

9 PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

The Code Manager has identified three solution options to address the issue raised, which will be issued for impact assessment.

Option 1

Introduces a new clause within Schedule 26, setting out Market Participant responsibilities for the resolution and closure of Switching Incidents.

The Code Manager would require reporting from the Switching Operator to identify parties that are disengaged with the process and be subject to Performance Assurance Techniques.

Option 2

Defines an approach to provide CSS Users with a timeframe to respond to incidents and enables the Switching Operator to close the incident, after an agreed period of no response.

Option 3

Offers a hybrid approach of option 1 and 2 setting timescales for Market Participants to provide a positive response, however if this lapses, and the Switching Operator have chased and there is no response then the Switching Incident can be closed.

Option 4

Introduces an automated system within which the System Operator would follow a standard protocol for closing on hold Category 3 and 4 tickets after a certain amount of time has lapsed with no response from a User.

A solution overview document can be found here.

To support the Impact Assessment, the Code Manager has provided an indicative summary of the expected reporting requirements. Please note: These are indicative requirements only based on Option 1 of the solution. The specific requirements such as, but not limited to the

format, template or frequency of the report will be specified as the PARC changes are further developed.

10 DRAFT LEGAL TEXT

The legal text changes to deliver the proposed solutions can be found:

Option 1

Option 2

Option 3

12 KEY RISKS ISSUES ASSUMPTIONS AND DEPENDENCIES

12.1 RISKS AND ISSUES

NO.	RISK	NOTES	MITIGATION
	There is a risk that automatically closing tickets from the DCC service desk impacts Landmark service agent performance measures and reporting if any new category field affects existing downstream processing.	This only relates to Solution Option 4.	

12.2 ASSUMPTIONS AND DEPENDENCIES

NO.	ASSUMPTION	NOTES	HOW/WHEN TO VALIDATE
	There is an assumption that an automated closure mechanism is available to synchronise DCC service desk and no changes are required to Landmark service desk as a consequence of this change.	This only relates to Solution Option 4.	During Service Provider impact assessment.

17 APPENDIX

CHANGE PROPOSAL	Link
SOLUTION OVERVIEW DOCUMENT	Link

18 GLOSSARY

TERM	DEFINITION
Central Switching Service (CSS)	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.
Consumer	means any person supplied (or seeking a supply) of Energy at an RMP (whether or not that person also exports or is seeking to export electricity at an RMP).
CSS Users	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.
Energy Supplier	means a person which is either or both an Electricity Supplier and/or a Gas Supplier.
Switch	means a change to the Registered Supplier for an RMP.
Switching Data Service Providers (SDSP)	means the CSS Provider, the SMDSP (in respect of the services provided under the Smart Energy Code), the Enduring Change of Supplier Service Provider (in respect of the services provided under the Smart Energy Code), the Gas Retail Data Agent, the Electricity Retail Data Agents, and the Enquiry Service Providers.
Switching Incident	means an issue that arises with a System or process forming part of the Switching Arrangements that has been working but is no longer working or is not working correctly.
Switching Operator	means the DCC in performing the role of managing the co-ordination of the CSS Provider and the other Switching Data Service Providers, including the mechanisms for Users to report incidents and access service management support, from the CSS Go-Live Date.
TDA	means the Technical Design Authority.