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	V1.0
PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION DATE	TBD
IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH	TBD

RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	Metering Expert Panel[1]	**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
LYDIA BENTLEY	SOPHIA LOGIE	VAISHNAVI SHARMA	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

[1] Provisional Responsible Committee – To be confirmed at close of solution development

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 solutions 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 CHANGE PLAN UPDATE

		Previous		Proposed	
Milestone	**Activity**	**From**	**To**	**From**	**To**
Definition		**12 Jan 25**	**30 Apr 25**	**01 May 25**	**31 July 25**
	Code Manager Assessment	January	April	-	-
	Solution Development	January	April	May	June
	Solution Refinement	April	April	June	July
	Business Case Assessment	April	April	July	July
	Impact Assessment	April	April	July	July

The Code Manager has conducted a round of Definition activities during which the solution development activities have been conducted. However, due to the complexity of the Issue (based on its broad scope and wide-ranging impacts on multiple classes of REC Party & Service Provider) it is necessary to conduct a further round of Definition activities in order to iterate upon the solution development activities conducted to date.

3 COMMITTEE ACTIONS

Committee Members are invited to take the following actions:

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