RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REFERENCE	RECCHIG_25_0703_04
STATUS	FOR DISCUSSION

I0196 - REVIEW OF METERING ASSET DATA TRANSFERRED FROM MAMS TO THE CDSP

BY LYDIA BENTLEY

1 PURPOSE

This paper seeks to initiate discussions on the solution for I0196. The Information Request conducted by the Code Manager in February 2025, and the follow up discussions with industry stakeholders has informed the Code Manager's approach to the solution for I0196. Now, feedback is sought from industry, with a view to developing and iterating the solution.

2 BACKGROUND

This issue was raised by the REC Performance Assurance (RPA) function of the REC Code Manager. Following investigative work, underpinned by case studies, RPA believe there is a need to improve a number of processes to pertinent to MAMs (and Metering more broadly) that contribute to gas data quality issues. High fidelity communication of gas data such as changes in MAM appointment status, details of modifications to Metering Assets and information pertinent to Switches is essential to ensuring data confidence and successful Consumer outcomes.

The Code Manager aims to explore mechanisms by which critical information transmitted from the MAM to the Central Data Switching Provider (CDSP) via the Supplier/Shipper may be validated or enriched to ensure accuracy. This Issue is expected to have a broad scope and will function as a general review of multiple industry processes found within Schedule 14 – Metering Operations and beyond. The Code Manager aims to identify, in a data-led approach, areas in which improvements to ensure accurate gas data transmission can be applied.

3 PROPOSED SOLUTION

3.1 INFORMATION REQUEST SUMMARY

The Code Manager conducted an Information request in February 2025. Parties were asked where in the "MAM>Supplier>Shipper>CDSP" progression, in their view, mismatches between gas Data Items were likely to originate. Parties were also asked what processes they felt were most to result in mismatches. Lastly, Parties were asked to give their view on the relative criticality of mismatches; which processes and operations resulted in the most damaging mismatches. The Code Manager followed up on certain responses to better inform the approach to solution development.

3.2 SOLUTION APPROACH

The Code Manager is looking at rejections of relevant Market Messages. These include, but are now limited to:

ONJOB	ORJOB
ONAGE	ONUPD
ONDET	ORDET

The Code Manager is exploring what happens when these Market Messages are sent but are rejected by the recipient. Responses to these Market Messages are sent in the MM40020 – "Response" Market Message. Where a rejection is sent, the reason for this will be sent in the DI40152 – "Response Code" Data Item.

The Code Manager would like to strengthen requirements surrounding responses to rejections of Market Messages related to gas Metering Asset data. A cross-code approach is being explored, where strengthened requirements relative to rejections are applied to both the REC and the UNC to ensure that Suppliers and Shippers are equally obligated.

3.3 NEXT STEPS

The Code Manager would like to work with the REC Change Issues Group (CHIG) to develop a solution relating to the rejection of relevant RGMA flows. The Code Manager is open to a dedicated workgroup if it is felt by CHIG members that this would better serve the development of this solution.

4 QUESTIONS FOR THE CHANGE ISSUES GROUP

- Do you have any views of the Code Manager's decision to pursue RGMA rejections outcomes as the main focus of solution development for I0196?
- Do you have any views on the proposed solution approach?
- Do you think a workgroup would be appropriate for I0196, or should this be discussed in this forum only?