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

R0193 – ADD ENUMERATION VALUES TO THE DI51035 – COMMUNICATIONS PROVIDER DATA ITEM

DOCUMENT VERSION	V1.0
PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION DATE	27 June 2025
IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH	Big Bang

RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	Technical Expert Panel	**CHANGE PATH**	Self-Governance
PRIORITY STATUS	Low	**URGENCY**	Standard
IMPACTED STAKEHOLDERS	MOAs, DNOs, Energy Suppliers		

LEAD ANALYST	TECHNICAL LEAD (SOLUTION LEAD)	SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT
CAROLINE FREIMULLER	WILL MARSHALL	HELEN FOSBERRY
Click to send an email	Click to send an email	Click to send an email

OVERVIEW

This change proposes to add the valid list of Communications Providers as Enumeration Values to Data Item DI51035, as after the go live of Elexon Modification P442 they will no longer be held in Market Domain Data (MDD).

RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE DECISION

On 27 November 2024, in line with the Code Manager recommendation, the Technical Expert Panel voted to:

- **APPROVE** the proposed change solution;
- **APPROVE** the proposed implementation approach; and
- **APPROVE** the proposed implementation date of 27 June 2025.

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

CONTENTS

Responsible Committee Decision 1
1 Summary 3
2 Problem Statement 3
3 Impacts 3
4 Cross-Code Impacts 3
5 Proposal plan 4
6 Stakeholder Engagement 4
7 Priority Status and Urgency 5
8 Summary of Analysis Undertaken 6
9 Proposed Solution 6
10 Summary of Impact Assessment Activity 8
11 Risks, Assumptions, Issues and Dependencies 9
12 Business Case Assessment 10
13 Case for Change 10
14 Summary of Consultation Responses 11
15 Summary of Amendments Made Following Consultation 11
16 Appendix 12
17 Glossary 12

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

BACKGROUND

1 SUMMARY

As part of the implementation plan of Elexon Modification P442, Communications Provider will be removed from MDD. To ensure the valid list of Communications Providers is maintained, Elexon have raised a change to the REC to add this list as Enumeration Values to the Communication Provider Data Item (DI51035).

2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

For the industry to maintain an ongoing list of valid Communications Providers after it is removed from MDD, Enumeration Values will be added to the Communication Provider Data Item (DI51035).

3 IMPACTS

REC PARTIES AND SERVICE USERS
MOAs, DNOs, Energy Suppliers

REC DOCUMENTS / PRODUCTS
Data Specification

MHHS DESIGN
No impacts

MHHS DATA SPECIFICATION
No impacts

MHHS CODE DRAFTING
No impacts

4 CROSS-CODE IMPACTS

There are no cross-code impacts associated with this change. Although this change has been raised by Elexon and the implementation date of Elexon Modification P442 will help inform the implementation timescales of this change, they are not directly linked.

5 PROPOSAL PLAN

Milestone	Activity	From	To
Definition		**25-Jul-24**	**10-Oct-24**
	Change Issues Group	05-Sept-24	05-Sept-24
	Party Impact Assessment	September	October
	Solution Refinement	October	October
Change Proposal		**11-Oct-24**	**26-Nov-24**
	Business Case Assessment	October	October
	Consultation	October	November
	Final Determination	November	November
Voting		**27-Nov-24**	**27-Nov-24**
	Appeal Window	28-Nov-24	12-Dec-24

6 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

This change was presented at the Change Issues Group (CHIG) on 05 September 2024, so the Code Manager could get feedback from Parties on three key questions. These were:

- Do Parties foresee any potential issues, data cleanse activity or system updates which may be required from adding Enumeration Values to this data item?
- Is this change simple enough that Parties would be happy for the Code Manager to proceed straight to consultation, or would they feel a Party impact assessment is appropriate?
- Would Parties be happy with a February 2025 release (which the Code Manager estimates would be ~three months between the final vote and implementation), or would a June 2025 release be more appropriate for a data flow change?

Feedback from the CHIG was clear that Parties did want a Party impact assessment as well as a consultation period.

Of the 18 Parties who submitted a response to the Code Manager poll around potential release dates, four preferred a February 2025 release, seven a June 2025 release and seven had no preference.

There was discussion around potentially including cleanse activity of the Communications Providers list within this change. This was taken away for discussion between the Code Manager and Elexon.

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

7 PRIORITY STATUS AND URGENCY

PRIORITISATION MATRIX

Category	Significance / Resource impacts / Urgency	Further selection / breakdown	Score (0-3)	Weighting	Weighted Score
Impacts	Consumer Impact	Indirect	0	27	0
	Retail Markets Impact	Innovation and Market Arrangements	1	17	17
	RECCo / REC Party / REC Service Provider Impact	Operational Effectiveness and Efficiencies	2	7	13
		Legal and Regulatory Compliance	1	14	14
Resource	Complexity / Effort / Duration		1	9	9
Strategic Alignment	Contribution to/ Alignment with the objectives of the REC		0	17	0
	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)	53

Priority Status	LOW
Change Proposal Type	STANDARD

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

SOLUTION

8 SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDERTAKEN

Following suggestions from the CHIG, two possible solutions were taken to Party impact assessment. These are detailed in the solution document here.

- Solution option A is to implement what is currently held in MDD with no changes.
- Solution option B is to implement a proposed cleansed version, which was provided by Elexon.

The Code Manager used the Party impact assessment to determine which of the solutions to take forward, and to capture any impacts foreseen by Parties from changing the list of valid Communications Providers. More detail on the Party impact assessment is available in section ten.

9 PROPOSED SOLUTION

The Code Manager is taking forward solution option B, implementing a cleansed version of the Communications Providers list. The proposed solution is below.

Data Item Information

Data Item Reference	DI51035
Item Description	The unique market-wide reference for a provider of network communications equipment
Local Catalogue Reference	J1709
Data Item Owner	Retail Energy Code Company
Logical Length	4
Decimal Length	0
Physical Length	4
Data Type	String
Data Type Format	Edifact Level B DTS Variant
Data Item Notes	

Data Item Enumeration

Enumeration Value	Enumeration Description
ASLH	ASL Holdings Limited
BTEL	BT (Fixed)
CUST	Dummy ID for Customers
OTWO	O2
ROAM	Dummy ID for Roaming SIMs
VODA	Vodafone Ltd
BTEE	BT (EE)
WIRE	Wireless Logic

TELU	Telenor
PELI	Pelion

The difference to what is currently held in MDD are:

- The amendment of BT to BT (Fixed), to illustrate this refers to BT providing fixed broadband connections, not their cellular sim business;
- The removal of ONGE (Orange);
- The removal of TMOB (T-Mobile);
- The addition of BTEE (BT (EE)), showing that BT bought EE;
- The addition of WIRE (Wireless Logic);
- The addition of TELU (Telenor); and
- The addition of PELI (Pelion).

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT

10 SUMMARY OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT ACTIVITY

10.1 SERVICE PROVIDER IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

No Service Provider impact assessment was required as part of this change.

10.2 REC PARTY IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

A Party impact assessment was conducted from 19 September to 11 October 2024. A total of five responses were received from three Metering Equipment Managers (MEMs) and two Energy Suppliers. One of these responses was submitted anonymously. The public responses have been published here.

ENERGY SUPPLIERS	• Both Energy Suppliers supported the Change Proposal, and preferred solution option B – the cleansed version of what is currently held in MDD. • One Energy Supplier highlighted the need for a data cleanse to ensure that any values being removed are not held against an active meter. • Neither Energy Supplier commented on whether they felt any further changes/additions were needed to the proposed list of Communications Providers. • One Energy Supplier confirmed they would require a three-month lead time between approval and implementation; the other six months and specified a June 2025 release would be their preference. • No specific costs were provided by either Energy Supplier, although one confirmed any costs incurred would be minimal. • One Energy Supplier confirmed they saw a benefit in implementing this change, specifically the cleansed list, as it would provide more up to date information of Communications Providers. • One Energy Supplier confirmed they felt the change should be made, the other did not comment on this question.
METERING EQUIPMENT MANAGERS	• Two MEMs supported the Change Proposal, and preferred solution option B – the cleansed version of what is currently held in MDD. • One MEM was supportive of adding Communications Providers as Enumeration Values but would prefer a blend of the solution options where the new values are added but no values are removed. • No further changes/additions were called out as being needed to the proposed list of Communications Providers.

	• One MEM confirmed they would require a six-to-eight-week lead time between approval and implementation, another three months, and one provided no comment to this question. • One MEM confirmed there would be no costs from implementing this change, one that there would be one off development and testing costs but no on-going costs, and one provided no comments on this question. • All three MEMs confirmed they saw benefits from this change in allowing greater transparency between MEMs when inheriting meters/comms, better visibility of the valid set of Communications Providers and a formal process for any changes. • Two MEMs believed the change should be made weighing up the costs and benefits. One MEM believed the required cleanse, if solution option B were implemented, would mean the costs outweigh the benefits. • One MEM did provide feedback that this change should have been raised earlier, so it could have gone live alongside or before the valid set of Communications Providers was removed from MDD.

11 RISKS, ASSUMPTIONS, ISSUES AND DEPENDENCIES

11.1 RISKS AND ISSUES

NO.	RISK	NOTES	MITIGATION
R0193.R001	Parties are unable to complete a cleanse of this data item to align with the new values.	n/a	The Code Manager is proposing a June 2025 release. This should allow seven months between approval and implementation; longer than any Party said they required in their impact assessment response.

11.2 ASSUMPTIONS AND DEPENDENCIES

No assumptions or dependencies have been identified as part of this Change Proposal.

12 BUSINESS CASE ASSESSMENT

12.1 COSTS

There are no costs for central systems providers identified as part of this change.

Two respondents to the party impact assessment confirmed there would either be no or minimal costs to their business from implementing this change. One respondent said they would have one off development and testing costs which are undefined at this time, but no on-going costs.

12.2 BENEFITS

INTANGIBLE BENEFITS	BENEFITS DESCRIPTION
INDUSTRY MAINTAINS A VALID LIST OF COMMUNICATIONS PROVIDERS	All respondents to the impact assessment saw benefit in the list of valid Communications Providers being maintained within the industry.
THE LIST OF VALID COMMUNICATIONS PROVIDERS CAN BE CLEANSED AND EASILY UPDATED	The process for adding or removing Communications Providers from an Enumeration Values list is less restrictive than in MDD – MDD requires the company to submit forms to add or remove themselves, which will not be required if they are held in an Enumeration Values list. This allows any Party or the Code Manager to add or remove Communications Providers (subject to the change process) when they are aware of companies entering or exiting the market.

12.3 COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS

As there are no central system costs and any costs to Parties are expected to be minor, and there are two intangible benefits associated with this change, the Code Manager believes there is a positive case for change.

The Code Manager is aware that the implementation of a Communications Providers list which is not a duplicate of that currently held in MDD will require Parties to do a data cleanse, to ensure any market messages that contain values that are not on or are flagged to be removed from the Enumeration Values are updated. However, we believe that this data cleanse will in the long-term benefit industry by ensuring that the Communications Provider data item is as up to date as possible. The Code Manager believes by providing seven months between voting and the proposed implementation date, enough time has been provided for Parties to complete this cleanse. This will be validated as part of the consultation.

13 CASE FOR CHANGE

The Code Manager considers there is a positive case for change for implementing this Change Proposal on the basis that the proposed solution:

- Appropriately resolves the problem statement;

- Has no central system costs, minimal costs to Parties and has proportionate effort required for implementation; and
- Delivers positive outcomes for Market Participants in keeping a list of valid Communications Providers within the industry.

14 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

A consultation was circulated on 24 October 2024 to obtain views on the Change Report (For Consultation). In total one response was received from an Energy Supplier. The key themes from these responses have been summarised and set out below.

14.1 COMMENTS ON THE SOLUTION

The respondent confirmed they agreed with the proposed solution.

14.2 CASE FOR CHANGE AND CODE MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION

The respondent agreed with the Code Managers assessment that this Change be subject to the self-governance change path and approval by the Technical Expert Panel.

14.3 IMPLEMENTATION DATE AND APPROACH

The respondent agreed with the Code Managers proposed implementation date and approach, but did ask how any required data cleanse would work.

The Code Manager has confirmed that the Communications Provider has already been removed from MDD, so there is currently no valid list in industry. This means MOAs could start a data cleanse using the new Data Enumerations list as soon as it is approved. The proposed implementation date allows seven months between approval and implementation for this activity.

However, it is within the MOAs gift to decide how and when they undergo this data cleanse activity, so it will be vital for Energy Suppliers to liaise with their MOAs to ensure the data cleanse happens at a pace both Parties are comfortable with.

15 SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS MADE FOLLOWING CONSULTATION

No amendments have been made to the solution following consultation.

Since the discussions held at the Change Issues Group, the Communications Provider has been removed from MDD. The Code Manager has evaluated the implementation date of June 2025 in light of this, as it leaves industry with no valid list of Communications Providers for nine months, but believes that the seven month gap between approval and implementation is required for Parties to conduct any necessary data cleanses.

16 APPENDIX

CHANGE PROPOSAL	Link
CONSOLIDATED IMPACT ASSESSMENT RESPONSES	Link
CONSOLIDATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES	Link

17 GLOSSARY

TERM	DEFINITION
Data Item	means the most granular level of data defining a specific attribute in respect of a data type, the permissible values for which are defined and controlled in the Data Item Catalogue.
Data Item Enumerations	means permitted values associated with specific Data Items.
Distribution Network Operator (DNO)	means a person holding an Electricity Distribution Licence.
Energy Supplier	means a person which is either or both an Electricity Supplier and/or a Gas Supplier.
Market Domain Data (MDD)	means, the central repository of reference data maintained in both gas and electricity for use by respective Market Participants.
Meter Operator Agent (MOA)	means a Party which has Qualified in that role under the Qualification and Maintenance Schedule. Where used in respect of a particular Metering Point, it means the MOA Appointed by an Electricity Supplier in accordance with the Metering Operations Schedule. The MOA is accountable for the installation, replacement, repair and maintenance of electricity Metering Equipment (either itself or by an EMO), and the MOA must also therefore be Accredited under the Metering Accreditation Schedule.