RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

NON-CONFIDENTIAL CONSOLIDATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES

R0202 - PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE REPORT CATALOGUE UPDATES (MHHS)

On 26 March 2025 the Code Manager issued a consultation to industry to seek feedback on the Change Report for R0202 - Performance Assurance Report Catalogue Updates (MHHS).

The purpose of this document is to consolidate the responses and for the Code Manager to answer any questions raised within those responses.

DOCUMENT VERSION	1.1
RESPONSE TYPE	NON-CONFIDENTIAL
DATE ISSUED	22 April 2025
RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	Performance Assurance Board
LEAD ANALYST	Harriet Truss

DATE CONSULTATION ISSUED	26/03/2025
RESPONSE DEADLINE	15/04/2025

Question 1:	DO YOU AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED SOLUTION, NOTING THE REDUCTION IN SCOPE TO MEM REQUIREMENTS ONLY? IF NOT, PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Anonymous Metering Equipment Manager (MEM)	Yes	Thank you for your response.
IMServ Europe Ltd MEM	Yes	Thank you for your response.

Question 2:	DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS SPECIFICALLY ON THE PROPOSAL FOR MONTHLY REPORTING?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Anonymous MEM	We can provide the reports if required.	Thank you for your response.
IMServ Europe Ltd MEM	No	Thank you for your response.

Question 3:	DO YOU AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION TECHNIQUE? IF NOT, PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Anonymous MEM	Yes	Thank you for your response.
IMServ Europe Ltd MEM	Yes	Thank you for your response.

Question 4:	DO YOU AGREE WITH THE CODE MANAGER'S ASSESSMENT OF THE COSTS AND BENEFITS FOR THIS CHANGE?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Anonymous MEM	Yes	Thank you for your response.
IMServ Europe Ltd MEM	Yes – We believe the costs to be minimal and understand the benefits	Thank you for your response.

Question 5:	DO YOU AGREE WITH THE CODE MANAGER'S ASSESSMENT OF THE CHANGE PATH, THAT THIS CHANGE PROPOSAL SHOULD BE SUBJECT TO SELF-GOVERNANCE APPROVAL BY THE REC PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE BOARD?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Anonymous MEM	Yes	Thank you for your response.
IMServ Europe Ltd MEM	Yes	Thank you for your response.

Question 6:	DO YOU AGREE WITH THE CODE MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION THAT THIS CHANGE PROPOSAL SHOULD BE APPROVED FOR IMPLEMENTATION ON 27 JUNE 2025? IF NOT, PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Anonymous MEM	No. The staff resources needed for this change are focussed on MHHS. It would de-risk our MHHS implementation if change R0202 could be postponed until the REC release in November 2025.	We understand challenges on resource contention, however this change was raised to allow monitoring of retail risks relating to MHHS including transition and hence it is important that the data is available to the Code Manager in advance of the programme M10 milestone.
IMServ Europe Ltd MEM	Yes – on the understanding that a first report will not be required until 3 months after implementation as documented	Thank you for your comment. The proposal is for a three-month period, following approval rather than implementation, for provision of data to allow Parties

		time to produce the required output. There is no intent to change this timeline.

Question 7:	DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS RELATING TO THIS CHANGE PROPOSAL?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Anonymous MEM	None	Thank you for your response.
IMServ Europe Ltd MEM	A future change proposal should explore the viability of improving the availability of required data to remove the additional reporting requirement(s) from MEMs providing a greater level of assurance. We acknowledge though that now is not the time for this exploration/assessment and could/should come post MHHS migration	Thank you for your response, we keep under review all data provision requests to balance the need for effective monitoring of Retail Risks with the burden any data provision places on Parties. As noted, following MHHS migration the options for monitoring can be reassessed and the specific nature and frequency of reporting evaluated in the context of the results of Risk Monitoring and level of deviations identified through the provision of the data in scope of this change.