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

R0122 SDEP REVIEW IMPROVEMENTS (2) - USABILITY

DOCUMENT VERSION	1.0
PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION DATE	25 June 2027
IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH	BIG BANG

RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	TECHNICAL EXPERT PANEL	**CHANGE PATH**	SELF- GOVERNANCE
PRIORITY STATUS	STANDARD	**URGENCY**	STANDARD
IMPACTED STAKEHOLDERS	Energy Suppliers, DNOs		

LEAD ANALYST	TECHNICAL LEAD (SOLUTION LEAD)	SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT	MARKET DESIGN LEAD
HOLLY LAW	POPPY PARK	LORNA MALLON	APRIL HARBOUR
Click to send an email	Click to send an email	Click to send an email	Click to send an email

OVERVIEW

Following a comprehensive review, the Code Manager has identified functionality improvements with the Secure Data Exchange Portal (SDEP) system.

CODE MANAGER RECOMMENDATION

The Code Manager recommends that the Technical Expert Panel:

- **APPROVE** the proposed change solution;
- **APPROVE** the proposed implementation approach; and
- **APPROVE** the proposed implementation date of 25 June 2027.

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

CONTENTS

1 Summary 3
2 Problem Statement 3
3 Impacts 3
4 Cross-Code Impacts 3
5 Proposal plan 4
6 Stakeholder Engagement 4
7 Priority Status and Urgency 4
8 Proposed Solution 5
9 Summary of Impact Assessment Activity 5
10 Business Case Assessment 7
11 Summary of Consultation Responses 8
12 Release plan 9
13 Appendix 11
14 Glossary 11

BACKGROUND

1 SUMMARY

After a comprehensive review, the Code Manager identified functionality enhancements to the SDEP system. These improvements will make the system easier to use by enabling better workflow and query filtering, and by improving notifications sent to Parties, helping them resolve issues more efficiently. Feedback from SDEP users was that filtering options are limited to particular attributes, reporting does not provide all information required and notification emails contain minimal supportive information for the parent communication.

2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Market Participants require functionality that improves efficiency, reporting and allows Consumer issues to be addressed sooner and more accurately.

3 IMPACTS

REC SERVICE PROVIDERS
SDEP Service Provider

REC PARTIES AND SERVICE USERS
Energy Suppliers
Distribution Network Operators

REC DOCUMENTS/ PRODUCTS
Secure Data Exchange Schedule
SDES User Guide

MHHS DESIGN
No Impact

MHHS DATA SPECIFICATION
No Impact

MHHS CODE DRAFTING
No Impact

There will be no impacts to Market-wide Half-Hourly Settlement as the intention is to implement post M8/M10, as this will be after the implementation of the new ECOES platform that is required for MHHS.

4 CROSS-CODE IMPACTS

There are no Cross-Code impacts.

5 PROPOSAL PLAN

Milestone	Activity	From	To
Definition		**01 Apr-25**	**31 Jan-26**
	Solution Analysis	Complete	Complete
	Solution Development	Complete	Complete
	Service Provider Impact Assessment	Complete	Complete
	Party Impact Assessment	Complete	Complete
Change Proposal		**01 Feb-26**	**29 Sep-26**
	Business Case Assessment	Complete	Complete
	Consultation	Complete	Complete
	Solution Refinement	Complete	Complete
	Consultation	July	August
	Final Determination	September	September
Voting		**30 Sep-26**	**30 Sep-26**
	Appeal Window	01 Oct	14 Oct

R0122 was raised in May 2023 but delayed by the MHHS programme change freeze. This was due to limited capacity of the SDEP Service Provider to support solution development and impact assessments, competing MHHS implementation activities, and the long lead time required for a valid commercial impact assessment. The SDEP Service Provider is now in a position to contribute to solution development and to impact assess, so we are progressing this change.

6 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Stakeholder engagement was carried out before the change was raised in May 2023 as part of a wider SDEP review. Workshops were held with SDEP users who developed the requirements for this change.

These requirements were taken back to the June 2025 Change Issues Group (CHIG) to confirm that they are all still needed and relevant, before a Service Provider impact assessment was issued.

7 PRIORITY STATUS AND URGENCY

The Code Manager is proposing this Change Proposal be given an Urgency Status of Standard and a Prioritisation Category of Standard.

The Code Manager believes this Change Proposal:

- Does not meet the Ofgem criteria for Urgency;
- Has Limited or no SDS relevance when compared to other Standard changes
- Delivers useful but broadly comparable benefits to other Standard changes

- Has a medium complexity as it requires technical changes to SDEP.

SOLUTION

8 PROPOSED SOLUTION

The proposed solution will enhance SDEP functionality by delivering a more streamlined and intuitive method for users to manage and progress communications. The solution includes:

- Enhanced filters and configurable raw-data extracts;
- Automated trigger-based communication statuses;
- Improved visibility of escalation status and applicable SLA timelines;
- Configurable automatic owner assignment and enhanced user/ access management functionality;
- Improved MPID search functionality and additional communication reference fields;
- Automatic archiving; and
- Improvements to field readability and list-view layouts.

An illustrative 'early design' per the requirements has also been generated to support user's understanding of how the requirements would look to be introduced within SDEP which can be found on the R0122 Change Proposal Page on the REC Portal.

The full solution is detailed in the solution development report.

The proposed amendments to the Secure Data Exchange Service Definition can be found here.

PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT

9 SUMMARY OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT ACTIVITY

9.1 SERVICE PROVIDER IMPACT ASSESSMENT

An impact assessment was issued to the SDEP Service Provider on 23 September 2025, the response is summarised below:

SDEP SERVICE PROVIDER	• The total costs to the Service Provider of delivering this solution are £96,575 (£6,750 Design, £54,400 Build, £26,500 Testing, £8,925 Project Management). • Timescales for delivery are: 78 days Design and Build, 35 days Testing and 10.2 days Project Management. • Mock ups for elements of functionality have been provided in a separate requirements document which will be available for Party impact assessment.

9.2 REC PARTY IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

A Party impact assessment was conducted from 19 December 2025 to 16 January 2026. In total five responses were received from 3 Energy Suppliers and 2 DNOs. The non-confidential responses have been published here.

ENERGY SUPPLIERS & DNOS	• Across all Parties, there is clear endorsement of the overall intention to improve SDEP usability, efficiency, and automation. • The changes are "positive", "welcome", and "supportive" of improving communication and reducing query lead times. • Users value enhancements that promote process clarity and reduce manual intervention. Dashboard & Reporting • Downloadable filters and raw data extracts were viewed as helpful. • Ability to filter and quickly understand workloads is valued, however, two respondents expressed that a true dashboard would still be preferable over just filters. Readability & Screen Layout • Two Parties reported no concerns. • SSE and OVO both stressed the need for key information—such as full query text, MPxN/MPAN/MPRN and description fields—to remain fully visible, with OVO additionally recommending reducing large icons and whitespace to prioritise information density Archiving & Data Retention • Most parties agree 12 months is a reasonable timeframe, however SSE requested warning prompts before auto-archiving & OVO proposed a "do not close" option for complex or exceptional cases. Other • All respondents supported automating trigger-based statuses • Auto-assignment of owners is seen as helpful by all Parties • Ability for MAUs to manage access widely supported. • The minimum lead time was ASAP and the longest 3-6 months. • Most Parties responded that implementing the proposed solution would not incur any costs to their business, one responses that they cannot accurately determine costs as this stage.

10 BUSINESS CASE ASSESSMENT

10.1 COSTS

COSTS	DESIGN/ DEVELOPMENT COSTS	IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	ONGOING OPERATIONAL COSTS
PARTIES	N/A	£0	£0
SERVICE PROVIDERS	£96,575	£0	£0

REC BUDGET APPROVAL SECURED FOR CENTRAL SYSTEM COSTS	14 April 2026

10.2 BENEFITS

TANGIBLE BENEFITS	
IMPROVED EFFICIENCY AND WORKFLOW CONSISTENCY	Automation of statuses, improved navigation, clearer layouts, and reduced manual steps help teams process and track queries more quickly, supporting reduced lead times.
IMPROVED DATA MANAGEABILITY	Archiving old queries and introducing data retention periods would improve system performance and ensure data remains relevant and manageable.

INTANGIBLE BENEFITS	BENEFITS DESCRIPTION
IMPROVED VISIBILITY AND INSIGHT	Downloadable filtered views, access to configurable raw data, and clearer reporting metrics would enable teams to better understand workloads, monitor performance and allocate resources effectively.
REDUCED MANUAL HANDLING AND COMMUNICATION MANAGEMENT ERRORS	Features such as automatic owner assignment, clear visibility of key fields (e.g. MPAN/MPRN), and potential safeguards for mis-routed queries contribute to fewer incorrectly raised or mismanaged communications.
BETTER USER EXPERIENCE	Parties appreciated the cleaner UI, improved consistency, and removal of unnecessary manual steps—leading to easier day-to-day use and less training effort.
POSITIVE OVERALL IMPACT ON CUSTOMER SERVICE	Faster resolution, better visibility, and reduced errors is expected to improve Consumer outcomes.

10.3 COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS

The proposed R0122 SDEP Usability Improvements aim to enhance communication efficiency, reduce manual processing, improve data visibility, and streamline workflow management across all SDEP Users. All five responding Parties expressed strong support for the change, identifying multiple operational and customer-service benefits that outweigh the £96,575 implementation cost. Party Impact Assessment responses demonstrated support for the change and identified a range of anticipated operational and customer-service benefits. The Code Manager considers these benefits, together with the efficiencies arising from the solution, to provide a positive case for the implementation cost.

10.4 SELF GOVERNANCE

The Code Manager considers there is a positive case for change for implementing this Change Proposal on the basis that the proposed solution:

- Appropriately resolves the original Problem Statement;
- The cost and effort of implementing and operating the proposed solution is proportionate and cost-effective; and
- The proposed solution delivers positive outcomes for Consumers and efficiencies in the operation of the retail energy market.

11 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

11.1 CONSULTATION ON TECHNICAL SOLUTION

A consultation was circulated on 27 February 2026 to obtain views on the Change Report (For Consultation). This consultation was on the proposed changes to SDEP only. In total six responses were received from three DNOs and three Energy Suppliers. The key themes from these responses have been summarised and set out below. The non-confidential responses have been published here.

11.2 SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

All respondents were supportive of the proposed solution, the implementation approach of big bang and agreed with the Code Manager's assessment of the costs and benefits for this change.

All respondents were supportive of the Code Manager’s recommendation that this Change Proposal should be approved for implementation on 06 November 2026, providing that the migration plan, guidance, FAQ’s and updates to the SDEP User Guide have been provided well in advance of this date. As there is currently only a three-week period planned between testing completion and implementation, the proposed implementation date has been moved to allow enough time for this to happen.

11.3 CONSULTATION ON LEGAL TEXT

A second consultation was issued on 31 July 2026 to gather feedback on the changes to the Secure Data Exchange Service Definition. In total six responses were received from two DNOs, three Energy Suppliers and one confidential response. The key themes from these responses have been summarised and set out below. The non-confidential responses have been published here.

11.4 SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

No respondent identified any concerns or amendments required to the legal text, several confirmed that the drafting appropriately reflected the intended solution.

One respondent sought clarification on the operation of the new SLA indicator and whether Parties would be expected to automatically chase or escalate cases after five Working Days. The Code Manager clarified that the indicator is intended as a visibility tool rather than a mandatory trigger for escalation, and that the existing Schedule 30 escalation process remains unchanged.

One respondent raised a request for clear guidance on automatic owner assignment and reassignment, the Code Manager provided assurance that appropriate SDEP User guidance on new functionality will be made available prior to the solution implementation which explains how owner assignation should be managed.

One respondent queried for further information on how the 12-month archiving requirement will apply to existing communications at implementation. The Code Manager clarified a migration plan is under development with the SDEP Service Provider which will provide Parties with further information, including on how this requirement will apply at the point of solution implementation. The respondent additionally raised concerns regarding the accuracy and reconciliation of existing SDEP reporting outputs and sought clarification on how reporting accuracy will be validated under the R0122 solution. The Code Manager clarified that the new reporting functionality is intended to improve users' ability to manage and analyse communication; any issues under existing reporting or identified post implementation should be raised and recorded and may inform future SDEP reviews and enhancements.

In summary, over the course of both consultations undertaken respondents are supportive of the solution and legal text changes required that would be implemented as part of R0122. A fundamental theme throughout both consultations is many respondents expressed the need for guidance documents, training, webinars and visibility of a migration plan to be made available ahead of the solution's implementation, which will be covered by the Release Plan, detailed in Section 12.

12 RELEASE PLAN

Feedback received through both consultations highlighted the importance of providing Parties with clear guidance and sufficient visibility of the migration arrangements ahead of implementation of R0122.

To support implementation readiness, the Code Manager will provide Parties with the necessary supporting materials three months minimum prior to implementation, including

guidance documents, updated FAQs and updates to the SDEP User Guide. Webinars and training sessions will also be provided to support Parties in understanding the new functionality and preparing for the changes.

The Code Manager will work with the SDEP Service Provider to develop the proposed migration plan and will actively engage with Parties on the migration approach ahead of implementation. This engagement will provide Parties with visibility of the proposed arrangements, including the treatment of existing communications, and provide an opportunity for Party feedback to be considered as the migration approach is finalised.

Through the provision of supporting materials, training and continued engagement on the migration plan, the Code Manager will support Parties in preparing for the change and help ensure a seamless transition to the new SDEP functionality ahead of the proposed implementation date of 25 June 2027.

13 APPENDIX

CHANGE PROPOSAL	Link
CONSOLIDATE IMPACT ASSESSMENT RESPONSES	Link
CONSULTATION REGISTER	Link
CONSOLIDATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES (TECHNICAL SOLUTION)	Link
CONSOLIDATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES (LEGAL TEXT)	Link

14 GLOSSARY

TERM	DEFINITION
Secure Data Exchange Portal	means the portal of that name which forms part of the Secure Data Exchange Service.
SDEP User	means an entity that is entitled to use the Secure Data Exchange Portal in accordance with the Secure Data Exchange Schedule.