RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

01	Proposal Plan
02	**Consultation**
03	Final Recommendation

CHANGE REPORT

R0224 – AGILE REPORTING WITHIN CSS

DOCUMENT VERSION	V1.1
PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION DATE	26 March 2027
IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH	BIG BANG

RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	Technical Expert Panel	**CHANGE PATH**	Self-Governance
PRIORITY STATUS	High	**URGENCY**	Standard
IMPACTED STAKEHOLDERS	CSS Provider, REC Code Manager		

LEAD ANALYST	TECHNICAL LEAD (SOLUTION LEAD)	ASSURANCE LEAD	SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT
HOLLY LAW	FINN DEACON	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 reporting change easier to achieve.

CODE MANAGER MINDED TO POSITION

The Code Managers minded to position is that the Technical Expert Panel:

- **APPROVE** the proposed change solution;
- **APPROVE** the proposed implementation approach; and
- **APPROVE** the proposed implementation date of 26 March 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 Impact Assessment 5
10 Business Case Assessment 6
11 Appendix 7
12 Glossary 7

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

BACKGROUND

1 SUMMARY

As part of the impact assessment process for R0115 Frequency and content of CSS reports on switching via the DCC portal, it was identified that it is very costly and time consuming to make reporting changes within the CSS architecture. 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 Proposal 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.

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

REC SERVICE PROVIDERS
CSS Provider

RECCO / REC CODE MANAGER
Code Manager

RECCO / REC CODE MANAGER
Code Manager

MHHS
There no impacts to MHHS

4 CROSS-CODE IMPACTS

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

5 PROPOSAL PLAN

Milestone	Activity	From	To
Definition		**01 Oct 24**	**31 Dec 25**
	Solution Development	Complete	Complete
	Service Provider impact assessment	Complete	Complete
Change Proposal		**01 Jan 26**	**24 Mar 26**
	Business Case Assessment	Complete	Complete
	Consultation	February	March
	Solution Refinement	March	March
	Final Determination	March	March
Voting		**25 Mar 26**	**25 Mar 26**
	Appeal Window	March	April

6 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

R0224 has been discussed in three Technical Change Workshops (TCWs), held on 1 October 2024, 5 November 2024, and 11 February 2025.

Further closed TCWs have taken place throughout the Service Provider impact assessment period where solution refinement took place on the overall end-to-end basis of the solution.

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.

SOLUTION

8 PROPOSED SOLUTION

R0224 will implement a functionality which allows agile reporting within the CSS ecosystem, by creating a functionality that consolidates all necessary data into a single, centralised database.

The key principles for the new agile reporting functions, including process diagrams of the end-to-end solution are detailed in Section 3 of Business Case Assessment report here.

9 SUMMARY OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT ACTIVITY

SERVICE PROVIDER IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

The CSS Provider completed a Service Provider Impact assessment, which has been summarised below.

CSS SERVICE PROVIDER	• Design costs: £236,714.62, Build costs: £131,462.09, Test costs: £82,824.13 • Total upfront cost: £450,460.84 • Whilst there are no costs associated with individual report requests, there are additional ongoing costs to manage the associated systems and functions. • Total ongoing costs: £338,444 annually • The approach proposed as a solution for this requirement does not need to align to a formal release cycle and therefore can be deployed outside of the standard release cadence. • The earliest implementation would be March 2026 due to design, build and test and other planned CSS changes.

10 BUSINESS CASE ASSESSMENT

COSTS

COSTS	DESIGN/ BUILD COSTS	TESTING COSTS	ONGOING OPERATIONAL COSTS
SERVICE PROVIDERS	£368,176.62	£82,824.13	£338,444 PER ANNUM

BENEFITS

TANGIBLE BENEFITS	2027	2028	2029	2030	BENEFITS CONFIDENCE
0 REPORTS PER YEAR	-£678,904.84	-£228,444	-£228,444	-£228,444	TBC through consultation
3 REPORTS PER YEAR	-£428,904	£21,556	£21,566	£21,566	
6 REPORTS PER YEAR	-£68,904	£381,556	£381,556	£381,556	
9 REPORTS PER YEAR	£291,096	£741,556	£741,556	£741,556	

INTANGIBLE BENEFITS	BENEFITS DESCRIPTION
REDCUCED PRODUCTION TIME FOR REPORTING	Near real-time reporting will be available to CSS Users for the first time, meaning that the functionality and usefulness of the CSS will be greatly enhanced (R0115 took around 18 months to deliver, this will be reduced to approx. 2 weeks)
INCREASED PRODUCTIVITY	Ensures that resources are not ill-placed generating reports instead of progressing other changes to improve the CSS.

COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS

The tangible benefits have been based on an estimated saving of £120,000 per report requested (as demonstrated with R0115) and the upfront costs being deducted from the first year.

The benefits of this change are greatly increased the more reports are requested. There is a need for more bespoke/custom reporting within CSS and we believe that this doesn't currently happen because time and cost are seen as barriers. There is expected to be an uptake in the number of reports generated, meaning we will hit that key three reports per year to break even on ongoing costs.

The appetite for future reporting if this functionality were available, will be determined through consultation.

Appendix

CHANGE PROPOSAL	Link
SOLUTOION REPORT/ BENEFIT CASE	Link
CONSULTATION REGISTER	Link

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.