RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

CHANGE PROPOSAL EXTENSION TO PLAN

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

DOCUMENT VERSION	V2.0
PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION DATE	TBD
IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH	TBD

RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	Metering Expert Panel.	**CHANGE PATH**	Self-Governance
PRIORITY STATUS	Medium	**URGENCY**	Standard
IMPACTED STAKEHOLDERS	MAMs, Gas Suppliers, CDSP		

LEAD ANALYST (SOLUTION LEAD)	TECHNICAL LEAD	ASSURANCE LEAD	SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT
FLORENTINA MONEA	ELLA MCGUIRE	KAT HIGBY	ANNE JACKSON
Click to send an email	Click to send an email	Click to send an email	Click to send an email

1 CHANGE OVERVIEW

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 mismatches where Data Items are held differently by different REC Users. 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, and they will record the same Data Item for a given Metering Asset differently. Additionally, it was also determined that having a spread of

viable methods makes RPA led data gathering exercises relating to MAM actions harder to achieve.

Due to the size, impact and complexity of such a change, the scope of this Issue is limited only to exploring an interim solution that might facilitate an eventual move to a single method. This interim solution will take the form of a communications register, where MAMs may record which of the three methods they use to communicate with other Parties. This will aid in missed Market Message resolution and support self-service Data Item mismatch resolution.

2 CODE MANAGER RECOMMENDATION

The Code Manager recommends that the Metering Expert Panel:

- **REVIEW** the extension to plan for I0196; and
- **APPROVE** the extension to plan for I0196.

3 CHANGE PLAN UPDATE

		Previous		Proposed	
Milestone	Activity	From	To	From	To
Definition		01 May 25	31 July 25	**01 May 25**	**[On Hold]**
	Solution Development	May 25	Jun 25	May 25	-
	Solution Refinement	Jun 25	Jul 25	Jun 25	-
	Legal Review	-	-		
	Impact Assessment	Jul 25	Jul 25		
Change Proposal		-	-	**[On Hold]**	**[On Hold]**
	Business Case Assessment				
	Consultation				
	Solution Refinement				
	Final Determination				
Voting		-	-	**[On Hold]**	**[On Hold]**
	Appeal Window				

To date, I0196 has undergone two distinct “phases” of Solution Development. The first phase, covered by the V2.0 of the Change Report, included various scoping and analysis exercises designed to understand the scale of the underlying issue and to determine the best way that the problem statement might be addressed. The second phase, which has taken place in the intervening period to date, has focussed on understanding more about how the proposed solution, namely, a new process to rectify unresolved RGMA Rejections, might be delivered.

The Code Manager conducted a series of Working Groups designed to determine the means by which the Proposed Solution might be realised. At the time of publication, the Code Manager has identified two primary mechanisms by which an improvement to RGMA Rejection handling may be delivered.

However, a dependency has now emerged that must be resolved prior to this Issue becoming a Change Proposal. Work taking in place in parallel at the Uniform Network Code (UNC) in UNC0925R may materially impact I0196. Within the scope of the UNC Modification, RGMA Data quality is also being explored, but with a focus on Shippers, who are parties to the UNC, but not to the REC. As most Suppliers function as their own Shipper, there is a material overlap between the constituency of REC Supplier Parties and UNC Shipper Parties. As a result, it may be necessary for the REC to model their approach to RGMA Data quality to some extent on the (as of yet undetermined) approach taken by the UNC.

The Code Manager proposes that the Issue be placed on hold pending the outcome of the work being conducted in the UNC.