RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REFERENCE	RECCHIG_25_0206_04
STATUS	FOR DISCUSSION

I0222 - ESME ID UPDATE REJECTIONS

BY LYDIA BENTLEY

1 PURPOSE

This paper aims to gather feedback from interested REC Parties and Users on the solution options for I0222. The Code Manager has worked with industry experts, RECCo, and supportive Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) and Suppliers to understand the problems underlying this Issue, and to explore and develop possible solution options.

The Code Manager will present three solution options in this paper, and we would like to hear views on these in order to inform our decision on which options to move forward.

2 BACKGROUND AND SOLUTION

2.1 BACKGROUND

The ESME ID, and its associated validation, was introduced in R0032, implemented in November 22. More background information can be found in the Change Report for R0032. The issues underlying I0222 result from an unintended consequence of the implementation of the R0033 requirements; these consequences were not highlighted during the R0033 impact assessment process.

Where the ESME ID sent within a Market Message is subject to validation, current ERDA only permit for a single instance of an ESME ID to be used. Validation is conducted at a Distributor level by ERDA. This results in a system where an ESME ID may only appear once in a DNO's portfolio, which can result in unintentional consequences beyond the intended validation effects.

The inability to accept beyond a single ESME ID means that it is not possible, for instance, for a Supplier to re-use a Metering Asset, once removed, in a different property, as the ID remains the same in the new property as the old. This results in both operational difficulties for the Supplier, the DNO, and ERDA, as well as a poor Consumer outcome, as billing and switching processes may be affected.

2.2 SOLUTION

Based on discussions so far the Code Manager has drawn up the following potential solutions to help aid Change Issues Group discussions. Attendees are invited to comment on the potential solutions and make alternative recommendations.

1. Switch off the validation of ESME ID and meter serial number. Currently MPRS does not allow ESME IDs to be reused or associated with any other MPANs, even if the previous meter has been removed. However, the Code Manager notes there are risks associated with this as incorrect duplicates could be accepted.
2. Update it to accept any if the meter the ESME ID is currently installed in has an effective to date – i.e., it has been removed. This would solve the risk in number 1 but may need a longer lead in time.
3. Develop more understanding on ESME IDs remaining associated with MPAN when meter is change. This was highlighted in the sample checking. We are awaiting feedback from those that took part in the sample checking to understand why this would be the case.

NB – The Code Manager expects that these solution options will apply mainly for legacy D0312 Market Messages sent post MHHS go-live. The D0312 is being superseded by the IF-005 as part of the MHHS programme, and will become fully redundant post roll-out.

3 QUESTIONS FOR THE CHANGE ISSUES GROUP

- Which of the three solution options do you prefer?
- Do you have any alternative solutions?
- What impact do you expect these solution options to have on your operations?
- Do you anticipate that any of these options may result in additional costs to implement?
- Do you anticipate there to be any risks associated with any of these solution options?
- Do you have any views on the solution options specifically in the context of the MHHS programme?
- Do you have any other comments on these solution options?