RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC ISSUE SUBMISSION FORM (COPY)

1 PERSONAL DETAILS

PROPOSER NAME *(Mandatory)*	April Harbour
COMPANY *(Optional)*	REC Technical Services
COMPANY TYPE *(Optional)*	Code Body/Administrator
TELEPHONE NUMBER *(Optional)*	
EMAIL ADDRESS *(Mandatory)*	April.harbour@capgemini.com

2 ISSUE SUMMARY

ISSUE TITLE *(Mandatory)*	Clarification on Detailed Impact Assessment Activities
WHAT IS THE ISSUE YOU ARE SEEKING TO SOLVE? *(Mandatory)*	The first complex technical change R0067 (Introduction of CSS Refresh Functionality) encountered a number of challenges within the design and implementation process, the change was scheduled for implementation on the 6th December 2023, however, the change was deployed with defects and was not fully operational until February 2024. Following that session, the Code Manager held discussions, and a formal Lessons Learned session with all Service Providers and identified a number of challenges with the technical change process. Some of these challenges can be attributed to the timing of the detailed design, Detailed Impact Assessments (DIA) and party impact assessments. These issues are detailed below:
WHAT IMPACT IS THIS HAVING? *(Mandatory)*	1. Lack of Clarity Where Service Providers and impacted parties are dependent on each other, it's is difficult for them to properly impact assess a change when there is no clarity on the design at the point of

	detailed impact assessment and party impact assessments are issued. 2. Limited Feedback Where design happens post a change being approved, there is no formal opportunity for impacted stakeholders to provide feedback and amends for the design to ensure that it meets their needs. 3. Misalignment Where designs are not shared early, assumptions can be made by all impacted parties, this can be discovered late in the development phase which may cause rework and or delays to testing / deployment. 4. High Contingency Costs Where there is uncertainty over design, Service Providers built in a high degree of contingency costs to ensure they have sufficient commercial coverage when completing a DIA. 5. Inaccurate timelines Completing an end-to-end implementation timeline as part of a DIA without having certainty on design can result in longer timelines being provided, lengthening the Change Process overall.
WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER TO BE AN EFFECTIVE SOLUTION? *(Mandatory)*	The Code Manager is proposing a new approach with the lead Service Provider completing design up front as part of the DIA. The decision to undertake design will be based on the level of complexity of the change and the strength of the business case. The changes will be assessed on a case-by-case basis, if the change is a suitable candidate for design as part of the DIA, a Technical Design Authority recommendation will be created. This will then be presented to the Relevant Committee for approval to release the funds for design as part of the DIA. Where the committee do not approve the release of funds, the change will continue down the standard change route and design will be completed following the approval of the full change proposal.
IS THERE ANY BACKGROUND INFORMATION OR CONTEXT TO THE ISSUE THAT WOULD BE USEFUL? *(Optional)*	This approach was initially trialled with R0080. The recommendation was completed by the TDA, views sought from the Technical Expert Panel and RECCo approved the release of funds for the Service Provider to complete the design as part of the DIA. The detailed design documents were then able to be shared with industry at the Party Impact Assessment stage and highlighted a number of clarifications required within the design. This enabled the documents to be updated in advance of approval and ensure that the design was fit for purpose across the industry. The full change has subsequently been approved and is on track to be released in June 2025. This change seeks to formalise

	the committee approval to release funds to complete design as part of the DIA.
DOES THIS ISSUE RELATE TO AN EXISTING ISSUE RAISED OR AN EXISTING CHANGE PROPOSAL? IF SO, PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF THE ISSUE OR CHANGE PROPOSAL.	R0080 – Improvements to 'Failed to Deliver' Messages The Design as part of the DIA approach was successfully trialed in R0080.

3 CONSUMER IMPACTS

WHICH CONSUMER TYPES WILL BE IMPACTED BY THIS ISSUE? *(Mandatory)*	☐ All ☐ Electricity ☐ Gas ☐ Domestic Prepayment ☐ Domestic Credit ☐ Microbusiness ☐ Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) ☐ Industrial and Commercial (I&C) ☒ Other (please specify in the Additional information box below)
WHAT IMPACT WILL THIS ISSUE HAVE FOR THESE CONSUMERS? *(Mandatory)*	☐ Switching experience ☐ Billing accuracy ☒ Trust and confidence ☐ Safety ☐ Security of supply ☐ Ability to pay ☐ On site experience ☐ Other (please provide details in the Additional information box below)
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION *(Optional)*	This change will improve the quality of complex technical changes that are delivered through the REC. Indirectly, it will improve speed and efficiency of complex technical changes using the design first approach.

4 CODE IMPACTS

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

Does this Issue relate to or impact:

THE REC OR REC SCHEDULES? *(Optional)*	☐ Main Body ☐ Schedule 1 - Interpretations and Definitions Schedule ☐ Schedule 3 - Accession Agreement ☐ Schedule 4 - Company Governance ☒ Schedule 5 - Change Management ☐ Schedule 6 - Performance Assurance ☐ Schedule 7 - Energy Theft Reduction ☐ Schedule 8 - Unbilled Energy Code of Practice ☐ Schedule 9 - Qualification and Maintenance ☐ Schedule 10 - Charging Methodology ☐ Schedule 11 - Prepayment Arrangements ☐ Schedule 12 - Data Access ☐ Schedule 13 - Transfer of Consumer Data ☐Schedule 14 - Metering Operations ☐ Schedule 15 - Metering Accreditation ☐ Schedule 17 - Secure Data Exchange ☐ Schedule 18 - Green Deal Arrangements ☐ Schedule 19 - Market Exit and Supplier of Last Resort ☐ Schedule 22 - Market Stabilisation Charge ☐ Schedule 23 - Registration Services ☐ Schedule 24 - Switching Data Management ☐ Schedule 25 - Central Switching Service ☐ Schedule 26 - Switching Service Management ☐ Schedule 27 - RMP Lifecycle Schedule ☐ Schedule 28 - Related Metering Points ☐ Schedule 29 - Address Management ☐ Schedule 30 - Resolution of Consumer Facing Switching and Billing Issues ☐ Schedule 31 – Prepayment Method Levelisation Reconciliation
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION *(Optional)*	

OPERATIONAL DOCUMENTS *(Optional)*	☐ Consolidated Metering Code of Practice (CoMCoP) ☐ Cross Code Steering Group Terms of Reference ☐ Performance Assurance Board Terms of Reference

	☐ Performance Assurance Report Catalogue ☐ REC Change Panel Terms of Reference
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION *(Optional)*	

SERVICE SPECIFICATION *(Optional)*	☐ Central Data Service Provider Further Services Service Definition ☐ Central Switching Service Definition ☐ CSS Certificate Authority Service Definition ☐ Electricity Enquiry Service - Service Definition ☐ Electricity Retail Data Service Definition ☐ Gas Enquiry Service Definition ☐ Gas Retail Data Service Definition ☐ Green Deal Database Service Definition ☐ Secure Data Exchange Service Definition ☐ Switching Operator Service Definition
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION *(Optional)*	

API TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION *(Optional)*	☐ EES API Technical Specification ☐ GES Meter Asset Enquiry API Technical Specification ☐ GES Supply Point Switching API Technical Specification ☐ GES Supply Point Enquiry API Technical Specification
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION *(Optional)*	

THE DATA SPECIFICATION *(Optional)*	☐ Data Access Matrix ☐ Data Item Catalogue ☐ Market Message Catalogue ☐ Standards Definition ☐ Supply Number Format
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION *(Optional)*	

CENTRAL SYSTEMS OR REC SERVICES? *(Optional)*	☐ Central Data Service Provider Further Services ☐ Central Switching Service (CSS) ☐ CSS Certificate Authority ☐ Electricity Enquiry Service ☐ Electricity Retail Data Service ☐ Electricity Theft Tip Off Service ☐ Gas Enquiry Service ☐ Gas Retail Data Service ☐ Green Deal Central Charging Database ☐ Secure Data Exchange Service ☐ Switching Operator
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION *(Optional)*	

REC PARTIES AND/OR MARKET PARTICIPANTS? *(Optional)*	☐ AMR Service Providers ☐ Data Aggregators ☐ Data Collectors ☐ DCC ☐ Distribution Network Operators ☐ Energy Suppliers ☐ EES Users ☐ Gas Transporters ☐ GDCC Users ☐ GES Users ☐ Green Deal Finance Parties ☐ Green Deal Providers ☐ Meter Asset Providers ☐ Metering Equipment Managers ☐ Shippers ☐ Third Party Intermediaries ☐ Virtual Lead Party ☐ Other (please provide details in the Additional Information box)
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION *(Optional)*	

OTHER INDUSTRY CODES? *(Optional)*	☐ Balancing & Settlement Code (BSC) ☐ Distribution Code Use of System Agreement (DCUSA) ☐ Smart Energy Code (SEC) ☐ Uniform Network Code (UNC) ☐ Independent Gas Transporter Uniform Network Code (IGT UNC)
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION *(Optional)*	

DOES THIS ISSUE IMPACT A SIGNIFICANT CODE REVIEW? *(Optional)*	No
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION *(Optional)*	

5 ISSUE PROGRESSION

DO YOU BELIEVE THIS ISSUE PROPOSAL MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR 'URGENCY' AND SHOULD BE PROGRESSED UNDER AN URGENT TIMETABLE? **IF SO, PLEASE PROVIDE JUSTIFICATION?** *(Optional)*	No
ARE THERE ANY REQUIRED TIMESCALES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS ISSUE? *(Option)*	None
ARE THERE ANY REQUIRED TIMESCALES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS ISSUE? *(Option)*	None
ARE YOU AWARE OF ANY DEPENDENCIES ASSOCIATED WITH THIS ISSUE WHICH MAY	None

IMPACT ITS PRIORITY OR PROGRESSION TIMETABLE? *(Optional)*	

6 ATTACHMENTS

ATTACH/PROVIDE ANY SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED WITH THE FORM	Change Management v3.5 RedLine for IA Clarifications (1).doc