RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REFERENCE	**RECPAB_25_0826_FORINFO_01**
STATUS	**FOR INFORMATION**
PAGES	**12**

SERVICE PROVIDER ASSURANCE

AUTHORED BY: MARY MONYEI, SERVICE PROVIDER ASSURANCE, REC CODE MANAGER.

REVIEWED BY: ANTON MODEN, PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE LEAD, REC CODE MANAGER

FOR INFORMATION 	The Centralised Registration Service (comprised of CSS, CSS CA and SO) experienced 7 failures in July, these is a significant decline compared to previous months but otherwise the performance continues to meet standards required under the Code. EES and GRDS continue to perform well, although there were further missed SLAs with GES and ERDS failing two metrics each.

1 KEY UPDATES

1.1 OVERVIEW OF PERFORMANCE OF REC SERVICES (JULY 2025)

An overview of performance by REC Service Providers is set out below. For further detail, a summary of open Performance Assurance Techniques relevant to Service Providers is included in section 2.

REC Service Provider	Total number of SLAs in place	Number of SLAs not reported[1]	Number of SLAs below requirement[2]	Trend since last month[3]
Central Switching Service (CSS)	24	0	1	↓
CSS Certificate Authority	4	0	0	=
Switching Operator	19	0	6	↓
Electricity Registration Data Service (ERDS) Provider	344	0	2	=
Gas Registration Data Service (GRDS) Provider	20	0	0	=
Electricity Enquiry Service (EES)	44	0	0	=
Gas Enquiry Service (GES)	33	0	2	↑

- The Centralised Registration Service (comprised of CSS, CSS CA and SO) missed one SLA from CSS and three from SO this month.
- GES and ERDS continued to perform below the requirements of the REC reporting 2 failures in July 2025 respectively.

Further information on SLA failures and PATs applied can be found in section 2.

[1] This excludes cases where no events occurred, therefore, the service provider had nothing to report.
[2] The RAG rating is as follows:
- Red rating denotes 5 or more Performance Level failures.
- Amber denotes 2-4 failures.
- Green denotes 0-1 failures.

[3] The arrows depicts if the count of SLAs missed have increased or decreased in comparison to the previous month. Therefore, reduction on number of failures is noted in green and an increase in number of failure is noted in red.

1.2 IMPACT OF R0080 INCIDENT ON THE CRS PROVIDER SUBMISSION

The Switching Operator has informed the Code Manager that the July performance summary submitted is affected by the R0080 incident detailed in **RECPAB_25_0729_FORINFO_02 - CRS Provider Performance Update Jan 2025 - June 2025**. This incident generated 120,859 SLA measurement points in July. Due to ServiceNow's 35,000-row export limit, DCC cannot currently export the complete dataset. The CRS Provider has excluded all tickets related to the R0080 incidents for the July performance. They will notify the Code Manager and submit an updated performance report for July once they are able to export and analyse the related incidents.

1.3 POTENTIAL CSS ISSUE NOTED DURING MHHS ASSURANCE

Please see section 1.3 of RECPAB_25_0826_XX – Qualification for further detail on an issue the Code Manager has identified with registration details held in CSS not matching those within EES.

2 PERFORMANCE OF REC SERVICES IN JULY 2025

2.1 SWITCHING SERVICE PERFORMANCE

2.1.1 CENTRAL SWITCHING SERVICE (CSS)

Performance Levels				Contextual Statistics				RAG Rating	
Service Definition	Met	Missed	N/A		July 2025	June 2025	Trend	Month	Rating
Service Availability	2	0	1	Switches	926,815	1,370,785	↓	July 2025	
Service Levels	6	0	5					June 2025	
User Support	5	1	4					May 2025	

Focused Service Levels:

Metric Description	Target	July 2025	June 2025	Change since last month
Percentage of Priority 4 Landmark Switching Incidents Responded to within SLA (1 working day)	100%	99.4%	100%	↓
Up to peak hourly volume what percentage of hours did the CSS Provider process Registration Service Requests with a 90th Percentile time of 6 seconds or less	100%	100%	100%	=

Performance Update:

One failure relates to Priority 4 Landmark Switching Incident Response time where the target is 100%. 1 incident out of 179 incidents breached the response SLA for 1 working day resulting in a performance level of 99.4%. The incident that missed the SLA relates to a system functionality issue where the SLA stop condition failed to trigger after ServiceNow received a response from Landmark Service Desk. The CRS Provider confirmed that the ticket was responded to within SLA and is in discussing with Capgemini and Landmark to prevent recurrence.

The Code Manager is not applying any PATs as the root cause is understood and no significant impact is noted.

2.1.2 CSS CERTIFICATE AUTHORITY

Performance Levels				Contextual Statistics				RAG Rating	
Service Definition	**Met**	**Missed**	**N/A**		**July 2025**	**June 2025**	**Trend**	**Month**	**Rating**
Service Availability	1	0	0	BCDR event in the period?	Nil	Nil	=	July 2025	
Service Levels	0	0	3					June 2025	
				Certificate Compromises	Nil	Nil	=	May 2025	

Focused Service Levels

Metric Description	Target	July 2025	June 2025	Change since last month
Percentage availability of CSS Certificate Authority Service excluding scheduled maintenance periods	99%	100%	100%	=
Certificate Resolution List Updates within 4 hours of a compromise	100%	N/A	N/A	=

Performance Update

- CSS Certificate Authority performance continues to meet target with no missed performance levels for Service Availability.
- There were no events to report on for 3 of the 4 metrics that relate to Certificate Compromises and BCDR.

2.1.3 SWITCHING OPERATOR

Performance Levels				Contextual Statistics				RAG Rating	
Service Definition	Met	Missed	N/A		July 2025	June 2025	Trend	Month	Rating
Service Availability	3	0	0	Switches	926,815	1,370,785	↓	July 2025	
Service Levels	3	6	7					June 2025	
								May 2025	

Focused Service Levels:

Metric Description	Target	July 2025	June 2025	Change since last month
Percentage of Priority 2 Switching Service Requests Resolved within SLA (2 Working Days)	100%	73.68%	73.17%	↑
Percentage of Priority 3 DCC Switching Incident Resolved within SLA (3 Working Days)	90%	66.67%	96.97%	↓
Percentage of Priority 3 DCC Switching Incidents Resolved within SLA (6 working days)	100%	88.33%	100%	↓

Other Missed SLAs:

- User Support Metrics:
  - Percentage of Priority 4 DCC Switching Incidents Responded to within SLA (1 working day): July 2025 performance 99.34% vs 100% target.
  - Percentage of Priority 4 DCC Switching Incidents Resolved within SLA (10 working days): July 2025 performance 94.95% vs 95% target.
  - Percentage of Priority 4 Switching Service Requests Resolved within SLA (10 Working Days): July 2025 performance 28.57% vs 100% target.

Performance Update:

6 metrics that breached the SLA in June relate to the SO service desk performance.

These failures largely occurred due to an influx of tickets received. A re-run of data is currently being derived and analysed to include all instances related to the R0080 incident. However, the Code Manager has been informed that overall performance against metrics, including the re-run of data, has not been materially affected.

One failure relates to Priority 2 Switching Service Requests where 10 out of 38 requests were not resolved within the SLA of 2 working days. In this case, DCC have informed that the tickets that breached the SLA were categorised as Non-production impacting, the tickets were PKI certificate requests for the testing platform and not for the live platform.

The second failure relates to Priority 4 Switching Service Requests where 5 out of 7 requests was not resolved within the SLA of 10 working days. In this case, DCC have informed that the ticket that breached the SLA was categorised as Non-production impacting, 4 out of the 5 ticket relates to a CSS testing request for the Pre-Production environment while the remaining one ticket relates to an offboarding request.

For the Priority 3 Switching incidents, 1 out of 6 failed to meet the 3WD SLA, and 2 out of 6 failed to meet the 6WD SLA. DCC have informed that the failures were caused by the duplicate messages sent due to the REC Change R0080 release. The spike in volume of incidents is because of the R0080 release which also led to the failure of Priority 4 switching incidents where 2 out of 303 incidents were not responded to within the SLA of 1 working day.

The last failure relates to Priority 4 Switching Incidents where 19 out of 376 incidents were not resolved within the SLA of 10 working days. Majority of the incidents was categorised as Non-CSS impacting as they were raised for information purposes only.

2.1.4 ELECTRICITY RETAIL DATA SERVICES (ERDS)

Performance Levels				Contextual Statistics				RAG Rating	
Service Definition	Met	Missed	N/A		July 2025	June 2025	Trend	Month	Rating
Service Availability	84	0	0	Switches	601,951	821,572	↓	July 2025	
Service Levels	252	0	0					June 2025	
User Support	0	2	6					May 2025	

Focused Service Levels:

Metric Description	Target	July 2025	June 2025	Change since last month
Percentage of Priority 4 ERDS Switching Incidents Responded to within SLA (1 working day)	100%	93.33%	86.96%	↑
Percentage of Priority 4 ERDS Switching Incidents Resolved within SLA (10 working days)	100%	92.50%	97.96%	↓

Performance Update:

User Support

There were two SLA failures in July 2025, the User Support SLA failure relates to 'Priority 4 Switching Incidents', for which the target is 100%.

- **Response Time**: 2 out of 30 incidents were not responded to within 1 working day. The contributors were Eclipse Power Network Limited and Lastmile with 1 failure respectively.
- **Resolution Time**: 3 out of 40 incidents were not resolved within 10 working days. The contributors were Eclipse Power Network Limited, Lastmile and Indigo Power Limited accounting for 1 incident each.

The User Support performance reporting is not self-reported by ERDS but reported centrally by the CRS Provider as one metric for response and one for resolution for each priority level across all ERDS Providers. The Code Manager has reached out to DCC to investigate the failure of one Eclipse incident and three Indigo incidents in previous months and are still awaiting an update. We have followed up on this at the monthly performance review call.

Since the root cause for Lastmile and Eclipse is not clear, the Code Manager will apply a Notification PAT to the Service Providers to validate the information, understand the root cause and any action taken by the ERDS Providers to prevent further SLA breach.

The Code Manager will continue to monitor the performance and issue an action plan should we notice that performance is not improving and the volume of tickets breaching SLA increase.

2.1.5 GAS RETAIL DATA SERVICE (GRDS):

Performance Levels				Contextual Statistics				RAG Rating	
Service Definition	**Met**	**Missed**	**N/A**		**July 2025**	**June 2025**	**Trend**	**Month**	**Rating**
Service Availability	3	0	0	Switches	324,864	549,213	↓	July 2025	
Service Levels	9	0	0					June 2025	
User Support	2	0	6					May 2025	

Focused Service Levels:

Metric Description	Target	July 2025	June 2025	Change since last month
Percentage Service Availability for the receipt and acknowledgement of Market Messages from the CSS Provider (excluding scheduled maintenance)	99.75%	100%	100%	=

Performance Update:

GRDS has no missed performance levels for July 2025. This is consistent with their performance last month.

2.2 ENQUIRY SERVICE PERFORMANCE

C&C provide Electricity Enquiry Service (EES) and Xoserve provide Gas Enquiry Service (GES). Since CSS go-live, C&C and Xoserve have reported against the SLAs in the relevant service definitions. The chart below sets out the overall performance against these SLAs for these services in July 2025

2.2.1 EES

Performance Levels				Contextual Statistics				RAG Rating	
Service Definition	**Met**	**Missed**	**N/A**		**July 2025**	**June 2025**	**Trend**	**Month**	**Rating**
Service Availability	5	0	0	Number of Switches	601,951	821,572	↓	July 2025	
Service Levels	20	0	0	Online Enquiries	7,220,136	6,548,159	↑	June 2025	
User Support	17	0	2	API Calls	43,680,056	41,065,661	↑	May 2025	

Focused Service Levels:

Metric Description	Target	July 2025	June 2025	Change since last month
At or below peak hourly volume what percentage of hours did the online portal provide a mean response time to a query from an EES User of 5 seconds or less	100%	100%	100%	=
At or below peak hourly volume what percentage of hours did the online portal provide a 90th percentile response time to a query from an EES User of 8 seconds or less	100%	100%	100%	=

Performance Update:

EES maintained its 100% performance record in July 2025, meeting all performance levels as was done in June 2025.

2.2.2 GES

Performance Levels				Contextual Statistics				RAG Rating	
Service Definition	Met	Missed	N/A		July 2025	June 2025	Trend	Month	Rating
Service Availability	3	0	1	Number of Switches	324,864	549,213	↓	July 2025	
Service Levels	19	2	0	Online Enquiries	3,834,047	3,616,127	↑	June 2025	
User Support	5	0	3	API Calls	20,881,049	18,994,493	↑	May 2025	

Focused Service Levels:

Metric Description	Target	July 2025	June 2025	Change since last month
Percentage of instances where data not required within the supply point switching API and accepted by the CDSP before 0400 hours was made available to authorised by 0900 hours on the same day	100%	99.59%	99.72%	↓
Percentage of instances where data required within the supply point switching API was made available to authorised persons within 2 hours of update being accepted from the relevant Shipper	100%	88.76%	84.15%	↑

Performance Update:

Latency Measures

In July 2025, there were two SLA failures which relate to metrics that the GES Provider was previously not able to report on, but now resolved by GES Re-platforming. Upon GES discussion with RECCo on data transition methodology for latency measures; a new target has been agreed with RECCo for the impacted metrics and RECCo have submitted a request to update the Service Specification through the REC Change. Xoserve will continue to report using the current framework set out in the GES Service Definition until the REC Change is implemented. The Code Manager will continue to track this action.

There is also an action from July (RECPAB_25_0729_04) due in October 2025, for RECCo to provide an update to PAB on medium-term and long-term plans to tackle persistent performance issues related to GES architecture complexities, including the impact of project Trident.

3 UPDATE ON DIRECT ASSURANCE

GES Direct Assurance:

- The Code Manager has commenced the annual Direct Assurance for GES reporting covering the period January to December 2024. We are currently waiting for a response from Xoserve to address a few questions. The draft report is currently being reviewed and will be shared with Xoserve to confirm factual accuracy.

DCC Direct Assurance:

- The Code Manager has commenced the direct assessment of the accuracy of reporting for Quarter 1 of 2025-26 (01 April to 30 June 2025). We have received the evidence requested and it is currently going through review.

4 DATA RECEIVED

Data type	Status of submission for July 2025
Central Switching Service (CSS)	
CSS Certificate Authority	
Switching Operator	
Electricity Registration Data Service (ERDS) Provider	
Gas Registration Data Service (GRDS) Provider	
Electricity Enquiry Service (EES)	
Gas Enquiry Service (GES)	

The due date for Service Providers to submit their performance reporting is the fifth working day of the month. The Code Manager can confirm that we received the submissions from the Service Providers as of the due date.