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

I0198 – GAS MEMS MOVE TOWARDS A SINGLE INTERFACE FOR KEY MARKET MESSAGES

DOCUMENT VERSION	1.0
PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION DATE	TBD
IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH	TBD

RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	Change Panel[1]	CHANGE PATH	Self-Governance
PRIORITY STATUS	Medium	URGENCY	Standard
IMPACTED STAKEHOLDERS	Metering Asset Managers, Gas Suppliers, CDSP, Shippers[2]		

LEAD ANALYST (SOLUTION LEAD)	TECHNICAL LEAD	SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT
LYDIA BENTLEY	BETH BROWN	GLENN SHEERN
Click to send an email	Click to send an email	Click to send an email

OVERVIEW

Studies conducted by the REC Performance Assurance (RPA) function of the REC Code Manager have concluded that gas market data fidelity may be improved by reducing the frequency of missed messages between Metering Asset Managers and other REC Parties. This Issue seeks to explore mechanisms by which a reduction in the number of permissible communication methods used by MAMs could support the data quality improvement objective.

[1] Interim Responsible Committee
[2] Non-REC Party Service User

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

CONTENTS

1 Summary 3
2 Problem Statement 3
3 Impacts 4
4 Cross Code Impacts 4
5 Proposal plan 5
6 Stakeholder Engagement 5
7 Priority Status and Urgency 5
8 Appendix 6
9 Glossary 7

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

BACKGROUND

1 SUMMARY

Metering Asset Managers (MAMs) are permitted within the REC to communicate Market Messages via up to three methods: the Data Transfer Network (DTN), the Information Exchange (IX), or via email. Whilst some Market Messages and scenarios mandate one method only, many scenarios (especially those found in Schedule 14 – Metering Operations) allow for a MAM to communicate via any of the three aforementioned methods. Whilst this provides flexibility for MAMs to adapt to differing requirements across diverse business scenarios, it also presents challenges in assuring the quality of gas market data.

Following investigative work conducted by the REC Performance Assurance (RPA) team, it has been determined to be likely that having a spread of viable communication options may result in gas data quality issues. For example, if a MAM sends a Market Message to another MAM using a method that the receiving MAM does not use, it is likely that the message will be missed. Additionally, it was also determined that having a spread of viable methods makes REC Performance Assurance (RPA) activities harder to achieve. This determination was made as a result of RPA investigation, summarised in a paper presented to the REC Issues Group, found here.

As such, this Issue was raised so that the Code Manager can investigate the possibility of reducing the number of viable communication methods from three to one. In the original submission, and investigative work led by RPA, it was suggested that IX is the best candidate for a primary communication method – Reasoning for this can be found in the REC Issues Group paper linked above. Additionally, due to the size, impact and complexity of such a change, the scope of this Issue is limited only to exploring interim solutions that might facilitate an eventual move to a single method.

2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

MAMs communicate with each other, and with other parties, using up to three possible methods as they send Market Messages in line with their obligations in the REC. It has been suggested that moving to a single communication method might help mitigate gas data quality issues. This Issue seeks to explore an interim solution to facilitate this.

3 IMPACTS

CONSUMERS
All Consumers - Indirect

REC SERVICE PROVIDERS
CDSP

REC PARTIES AND SERVICE USERS
MAMs
Gas Suppliers
Gas Transporters
Shippers
MAPs

REC DOCUMENTS / PRODUCTS
Schedule 14 – Metering Operations
Schedule 30 – Resolution of Consumer Facing Switching & Billing Issues

MHHS DESIGN
N/A

MHHS DATA SPECIFICATION
N/A

MHHS CODE DRAFTING
N/A

The Code Manager anticipates that there will be changes to MAM communication protocols may result in a slight indirect impact on Consumers. Whilst Consumers are relatively insulated from changes to back-end processes such as the ones being examined in this Issue, it is conceivable that changes in behaviours relating to Consumer Metering Asset arrangements may be felt.

MAMs will be the most impacted REC Party. This is because this Issue is centred on MAM communication methods, and is likely to propose a solution that will require MAM engagement. The other REC Users listed below MAMs have an indirect, yet consequential impact, as groups who receive communications from MAMs. There are ongoing discussions about broadening the scope of the Issue to include Gas Suppliers, who are also permitted to communicate via the same three methods as MAMs in Schedule 14 – Metering Operations. As part of planned solution development activities, the Code Manager will make a determination about whether to bring Gas Suppliers in scope; this will be reflected in future Change Reports.

The Code Manager anticipates that the Central Data Service Provider (CDSP) will have an interest in the progression of this Issue, but at this stage of solution development it is currently unclear if they will be formally impacted or not. Whilst the Code Manager expects that they will not be impacted, this will be confirmed as the Issue develops.

4 CROSS CODE IMPACTS

The Code Manager does not anticipate that there will be any formal cross-code impact. However, it is possible that I0198 may be of interest to the Independent Gas Transporter Uniform Network Code (IGT-UNC) due to the potential impact on Market Messages and the IX, which may be pertinent to Shippers.

5 PROPOSAL PLAN

Milestone	Activity	From	To
Definition		**17-Dec-24**	**31-Mar-25**
	Solution Development	December	March
	Legal Review	March	March
	Impact Assessment	March	March
	Solution Refinement	March	March

6 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

The Code Manager plans to work closely with MAMs to ensure that their views and operational requirements are represented and acknowledged during solution development. Additionally, the Code Manager plans to engage more widely with industry during the progression of this Issue, at forums including, but not limited to: Change Issues Group (CHIG), Association of Meter Operators (AMO), Gas Operational Metering Forum (G-OMF), and the REC Metering Expert Panel in their role as critical friend to the Code Manager.

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	1	27	27
	Retail Markets Impact	Innovation and Market Arrangements	2	17	33
	RECCo / REC Party / REC Service Provider Impact	Operational Effectiveness and Efficiencies	2	7	13
		Legal and Regulatory Compliance	0	14	0
Resource	Complexity / Effort / Duration		2	9	18
Strategic Alignment	Contribution to/ Alignment with the objectives of the REC		1	17	8
	Contribution to/ Alignment with RECCo's Forward Work Plan		0		0
Urgency *(The need to progress a change to meet a targeted date)*		Other Planned Activity	0	10	0
				Overall Priority Score (rounded)	100

Priority Score	Priority Status
171 and above	Critical
151 to 170	High
101 to 150	Medium
0 to 100	Low

Priority Status	LOW
Change Proposal Type	STANDARD

Urgent Change Proposals meet the Criteria for Urgency as set out by Ofgem

This Issue has a priority status of Low, based on a score of 100. This score has been calculated as follows:

- Complexity/Effort/Duration has been given a score of two, indicating moderate complexity. This is reflective of the complexity of the overarching objectives of the Issue (i.e., supporting a long-term reduction in the number of permissible Communication methods), balanced against the lesser relative complexity of an interim solution.
- Operational Effectiveness & Efficiency has been given a score of two, indicating moderate impact. This is because this Issue aims to explore interim solutions that should result in better execution of REC Processes pertinent to MAMs via a reduction in missed Market Messages.

- Retail Market Impact: Innovation & Market Arrangements has been given a score of two, indicating moderate impact. This is because this Issue aims to explore solution options that will improve how MAMs interact with each other and innovates how escalations regarding missed Market Messages may be approached.
- All other metrics have been given a score of zero or one, as appropriate.

8 APPENDIX

CHANGE PROPOSAL	Link
APRIL REC ISSUES GROUP: GAS MEM PRESENTATION	Link

9 GLOSSARY

TERM	DEFINITION
Metering Asset Manager	means a Party which has Qualified in that role under the Qualification and Maintenance Schedule. Where used in respect of a particular Supply Meter Point, it means the MAM Appointed by a Gas Supplier in accordance with the Metering Operations Schedule. The MAM is accountable for the installation, replacement, repair and maintenance of gas Metering Equipment (either itself or by an AMI), and the MAM must also therefore be Accredited under the Metering Accreditation Schedule.
Central Data Service Provider	means the 'Central Data Service Provider' appointed by Gas Transporters pursuant to standard special condition A15 (Central Data Service Provider) of the Gas Transporter Licences
Market Message	means a structured communication sent between two Market Participants in the form and with the content required (and as otherwise specified) by the Data Specification.
DTN	has the meaning given to that expression in the Data Transfer Services Agreement
IX	defined by Xoserve as “Information Exchange (IX) allows our customers to securely transfer files across the gas industry through a virtual gateway.”