RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

NON-CONFIDENTIAL CONSOLIDATED IMPACT ASSESSMENT RESPONSES

I0193 - ADD ENUMERATION VALUES TO THE DI51035 - COMMUNICATIONS PROVIDER DATA ITEM

On 19 September 2024 the Code Manager issued an impact assessment to industry to seek feedback on the proposed solution for I0193 Add Enumeration Values to the DI51035 - Communications Provider Data Item.

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	1.0
RESPONSE TYPE	NON-CONFIDENTIAL
DATE ISSUED	24/10/2024
RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	Technical Expert Panel
LEAD ANALYST	Caroline Freimuller

DATE IMPACT ASSESSMENT ISSUED	19/09/2024
RESPONSE DEADLINE	11/10/2024

Question 1:	Do you have any comments on the proposed solutions?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power (Metering Equipment Manager)	We understand that because of the decision to remove the Communications Provider Data Item (DI51035) from MDD, there is a requirement that a valid list is maintained. On review of the two options, we do not believe that either provides a preferred solution as there is a value to retaining the old communications provider details, as well as adding the new communications providers details. In support of the process to novate a SIM we use this data to carry automated validation on receipt of the D0268/D0313 flows, which would result in increased manual cleanse should the Enumeration List not be updated will all new communication provider parties in a fluid market.	Thank you for your comments. Based on other responses and the discussion at the Change Issues Group, the Code Manager has decided to pursue solution option B and require MEMs to conduct a cleanse of their systems to remove any outdated Communications Providers. We believe that the seven month lead time between approval and implementation is sufficient for this.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	SSE fully support the proposal to move the Communication Providers into the REC and believe that providing a cleansed version is more appropriate. Any opportunity for the industry to cleanse data is a positive step in ensuring that the data remains up to date and accurate.	Thank you for your comments.
E.ON (Metering Equipment Manager)	We support the moving of enumeration values for communication provider into Communication Provider Data Item (DI51035). As per the solution document this will ensure that a valid list is maintained and any	Thank you for your comments.

	amendments to the values will go through a formal change process, thereby ensuring visibility to impacted parties.	
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	Could you please provide the rationale as to why the proposal is to add Communication Provider to the D151035 Data Item Enumeration values when R0164 has recently been approved which is to remove the Enumeration Values from the 'Communications Method' data item – J0386 – to Elexon Control. Is it not possible to align valid sets for the 2 different communication fields on the same data flows in the same way ?	Thank you for your comments. Elexon have set up a separate method for the approval of new Communications Methods. As they have raised this change, the Code Manager is assuming they do not wish to use the same method for Communications Provider.
Anonymous (Metering Equipment Manager)	No.	Thank you for your comments.

Question 2:	Do you agree the proposed solutions address the problem statement? If not, please provide details.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power (Metering Equipment Manager)	No, please see response to question 1.	Thank you for your comments.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	Yes, we agree the proposed solutions address the problem statement.	Thank you for your comments.
E.ON (Metering Equipment Manager)	Yes, we agree that the proposed solution doe address the problem statement.	Thank you for your comments.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	n/a	n/a
Anonymous (Metering Equipment Manager)	Yes we agree.	Thank you for your comments.

Question 3:	Do you have a preference between solution A (what is currently in MDD) and solution B (a cleansed version of MDD)? Please provide details.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power (Metering Equipment Manager)	As per response to question 1, we do not believe that either is a preference as the solution should retain the old communication parties as well as add the new.	Thank you for your comments.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	SSE prefer Solution B, as we feel that the list of providers should reflect the current communication providers, used by the market. We feel that it would be more appropriate to provide a cleansed version at this point, rather than updating the list at a later date.	Thank you for your comments.
E.ON (Metering Equipment Manager)	Our preference would be Solution B, implementing a cleansed version of what is held in MDD – doing this will avoid the need for a second change to amend the list later and so is more efficient.	Thank you for your comments.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	Option B would be our preference. However, on a side note Suppliers would need to ensure any valid values that are being removed are not in any systems against an active meter.	Thank you for your comments.
Anonymous (Metering Equipment Manager)	Our preference would be solution B; cleansing at this point would reduce the request to cleanse further down the line.	Thank you for your comments.

Question 4:	For solution option B, do we think we have identified all changes that need to be made to the current list of Communications Providers? If not, please provide details.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power (Metering Equipment Manager)	In some instances we use a LAN modem that connects to customers WIFI and we use ROAM 'Dummy ID for Roaming SIMs' The more we use this type of modem, it would be good to have a separate comms type unless WIRE is to be used for this scenario.	Thank you for your comments.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	SSE feel this is best answered by the MEM's.	Thank you for your comments.
E.ON (Metering Equipment Manager)	We are not aware of any other changes that need to be made	Thank you for your comments.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	n/a	n/a
Anonymous (Metering Equipment Manager)	No comment.	n/a

Question 5:	Are there any alternate solutions that would better meet the needs of the problem statement?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power (Metering Equipment Manager)	As per response to question 1, we do not believe that either is a preference as the solution should retain the old communication parties as well as add the new.	Thank you for your comments.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	Not that we are aware of at this time.	Thank you for your comments.
E.ON (Metering Equipment Manager)	No we don't believe there is an alternative solution that would address this issue any better.	Thank you for your comments.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	No.	Thank you for your comments.
Anonymous (Metering Equipment Manager)	No comment.	n/a

Question 6:	What lead time would be required for your business to implement the proposed solution? Please provide justification.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power (Metering Equipment Manager)	N/A	n/a
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	SSE do not believe this is a significant change, therefore we would suggest 3 months from when it is approved.	Thank you for your comments.
E.ON (Metering Equipment Manager)	We would need to do some data cleansing activity to ensure our data aligned to the amened values. We estimate that we would require 6-8 week lead time.	Thank you for your comments.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	We would prefer a lead time of 6 months and for this to be included in the June Major Industry Release, to enable checks and removal of valid values against active meters.	Thank you for your comments.
Anonymous (Metering Equipment Manager)	The end dating of Comms Providers in MDD has already caused us issues, to combat this we have begun the implementation of a solution which would easily accommodate solution B and any future updates to a list of Enumeration Values for item DI51035. However, to ensure that we have covered the requirements accurately, we would require a 3 month lead time.	Thank you for your comments.

Question 7:	Would implementing the proposed solution incur any costs to your business? If so, please provide details.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power (Metering Equipment Manager)	To be impacted assessed.	Thank you for your comments.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	Any costs incurred would be minimal.	Thank you for your comments.
E.ON (Metering Equipment Manager)	Implementing this change will not incur any additional costs	Thank you for your comments.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	n/a	n/a
Anonymous (Metering Equipment Manager)	One off development and testing costs. No ongoing costs would be incurred.	Thank you for your comments.

Question 8:	Do you identify any benefits to your business through the implementation of the proposed solution?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power (Metering Equipment Manager)	We believe there are some benefits to this change in that it allows for better transparency for Meter Operators meters and being able to inherit the meter and comms, although we generally install our own metering and comms after winning a contract. Until that is done however it provides an alternative to keep the flow of data from the existing meter going via DC to Supplier and settlement, so this should be viewed as beneficial. If we were to continue to have existing lists so current records do not need to be changed, this will not provide much benefit or inconvenience.	Thank you for your comments.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	Yes, more up to date information for the communications providers installed would be beneficial as we move to 4G.	Thank you for your comments.
E.ON (Metering Equipment Manager)	It will give us greater visibility of the valid set of enumeration values and a formal process for when they are changed.	Thank you for your comments.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	n/a	n/a
Anonymous (Metering Equipment Manager)	Yes, the main benefit would be overcoming the end-dating of the current Comms Providers in MDD with the implementation of an official list of Enumeration Values.	Thank you for your comments.

Question 9:	Taking into consideration both the costs and the benefits seen by your organisation, do you consider this change should be made?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power (Metering Equipment Manager)	We believe the cleanse required to remove all previous Comms Providers outweighs the potential benefits. As we have already mentioned, we feel the change should go ahead but old comms providers should remain, with new ones being added.	Thank you for your comments.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	Yes we believe it is a positive change.	Thank you for your comments.
E.ON (Metering Equipment Manager)	Yes these changes should be made.	Thank you for your comments.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	n/a	n/a
Anonymous (Metering Equipment Manager)	Yes.	Thank you for your comments.

Question 10:	Do you have any other comments relating to this Change Proposal?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power (Metering Equipment Manager)	None.	n/a
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	We would like MEM's to use this change as an opportunity to cleanse their current data for communications providers.	Thank you for your comments.
E.ON (Metering Equipment Manager)	No other comments.	n/a
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	n/a	n/a
Anonymous (Metering Equipment Manager)	It would have been preferable for this change to have occurred prior to any updates in MDD.	Thank you for your comments.