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

I0198 – METER ASSET MANAGER (MAM) COMMUNICATIONS METHOD REGISTER

DOCUMENT VERSION	1.0
PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION DATE	TBD
IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH	TBD

RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	Metering Expert Panel	**CHANGE PATH**	Self-Governance
PRIORITY STATUS	Low	**URGENCY**	Standard
IMPACTED STAKEHOLDERS	Metering Asset Managers, Gas Suppliers		

LEAD ANALYST (SOLUTION LEAD)	TECHNICAL LEAD	SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT
LYDIA BENTLEY	BETH BROWN	GLENN SHEERN
Click to send an email	Click to send an email	Click to send an email

OVERVIEW

Studies conducted by the REC Performance Assurance team have concluded that gas market data fidelity may be improved by reducing the frequency of missed messages passed from Meter Asset Managers (MAMs) to the Central Data Service Provider (CDSP), via Energy Suppliers & Shippers. This Issue seeks to explore mechanisms by which a record of the communication methods used by MAMs and suppliers could support the data quality improvement objective.

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

CONTENTS

1 Summary 3
2 Problem Statement 3
3 Impacts 4
4 Cross Code Impacts 4
5 Proposal Plan 5
6 Stakeholder Engagement 5
7 Priority Status And Urgency 5
8 Summary Of Analysis Undertaken 6
9 Proposed Solution 7
10 Draft Legal Text 7
11 Appendix 8
12 Glossary 9

BACKGROUND

1 SUMMARY

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 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 team, it has been suggested that having a spread of viable communication options may result in 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 gas market data gathering exercises harder to facilitate.

2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

MAMs communicate with each other, and with other Parties, using up to three possible methods as they send Market Messages in line with their obligations in the REC. It has been suggested that access to multiple communication methods might contribute to gas data quality issues. This Issue seeks to explore a solution to mitigate this.

3 IMPACTS

CONSUMERS
None

REC SERVICE PROVIDERS
None

REC PARTIES AND SERVICE USERS
MAMs
Gas Suppliers

REC DOCUMENTS / PRODUCTS
Schedule 14 – Metering Operations
REC Baseline Statement

MHHS DESIGN
N/A

MHHS DATA SPECIFICATION
N/A

MHHS CODE DRAFTING
N/A

Impact is limited to Energy Suppliers and MAMs, who will be asked to complete, and then review on an as-needed basis, a communications method register to capture how Market Messages are sent and received. The Code Manager does not expect there to be any impact on Service Providers, Consumers, or the MHHS programme.

There will be an impact on Schedule 14 – Metering Operations, where drafting changes will be needed to introduce the Communications Method Register. Additionally, the Code Manager expects that the register will constitute a new Category Three document, so changes to the REC Baseline Statement may be needed.

4 CROSS CODE IMPACTS

None.

5 PROPOSAL PLAN

Milestone	Activity	From	To
Definition		**17 Dec 24**	**16 May 25**
	Solution Development	December	March
	Legal Review	April	April
	Impact Assessment	April	May
	Solution Refinement	May	May
Change Proposal		**17 May 25**	**08 Jul 25**
	Business Case Assessment	May	May
	Consultation	May	June
	Solution Refinement	June	June
	Final Determination	July	July
Voting		**09 Jul 25**	**09 Jul 25**
	Appeal Window	July	July

6 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

The Code Manager plans to work closely with MAMs to ensure that their views and operational requirements are represented and acknowledged during solution development. Additionally, the Code Manager plans to engage more widely with industry during the progression of this Issue, at forums including, but not limited to: Change Issues Group (CHIG), Association of Meter Operators (AMO), Gas Operational Metering Forum (G-OMF), and the REC Metering Expert Panel in their role as critical friend to the Code Manager.

7 PRIORITY STATUS AND URGENCY

PRIORITISATION MATRIX

Category	Significance / Resource impacts / Urgency	Further selection / breakdown	Score (0-3)	Weighting	Weighted Score
Impacts	Consumer Impact	Direct	1	27	27
	Retail Markets Impact	Innovation and Market Arrangements	2	17	33
	RECCo / REC Party / REC Service Provider Impact	Operational Effectiveness and Efficiencies	2	7	13
		Legal and Regulatory Compliance	0	14	0
Resource	Complexity / Effort / Duration		2	9	18
Strategic Alignment	Contribution to/ Alignment with the objectives of the REC		1	17	8
	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)			100
		Priority Status			LOW
		Change Proposal Type			STANDARD

Priority Score	Priority Status
171 and above	Critical
151 to 170	High
101 to 150	Medium
0 to 100	Low

Urgent Change Proposals meet the Criteria for Urgency as set out by Ofgem

This Issue has a priority status of Low, based on a score of 100. This score has been calculated as follows:

- Complexity/Effort/Duration has been given a score of two, indicating moderate complexity. This is reflective of the complexity of the overarching objectives of the Issue

(i.e., supporting a long-term reduction in the number of permissible communication methods), balanced against the lesser relative complexity of an interim solution.

- Operational Effectiveness & Efficiency has been given a score of two, indicating moderate impact. This is because this Issue aims to explore interim solutions that should result in better execution of REC Processes pertinent to MAMs via a reduction in missed Market Messages.
- Retail Market Impact: Innovation & Market Arrangements has been given a score of two, indicating moderate impact. This is because this Issue aims to explore solution options that will improve how MAMs interact with each other and innovates how escalations regarding missed Market Messages may be approached.
- All other metrics have been given a score of zero or one, as appropriate.

SOLUTION

8 SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDERTAKEN

The Code Manager has worked with various industry stakeholder engagement forums, such as CHIG, AMO & G-OMF to develop a solution that meets the needs of industry. CHIG has been used as the primary workshop forum, with discussions on the proposed solution in the December 24 and February 25 meetings.

The Code Manager has invited discussion on different iterations of the proposed solution, specifically focussing on a “spectrum of complexity” for a Communications Method Register. The initial proposal was for a relatively small register, only containing Party name and communications method. Feedback from industry suggested that a more comprehensive register, which contains additional information such as primary and backup communication methods, and methods on a Market Message by Market Message basis, may be useful. As a result of these discussions, the Code Manager has proposed a solution that encompasses some of this additional complexity, that industry have reported may be useful.

8.1 SOLUTION DESIGN PHILOSOPHY

The Code Manager has designed the solution in the expectation that the following goals are achieved:

Capture of data relating to Consumer-appointed MAMs:

The scope of the proposed solution includes a register for MAM<->Supplier communications. Whilst this was not initially in the scope of I0198, it was suggested during forum discussions that these communications should be captured within the proposed register. Whilst it is expected that most MAM to/from Energy Supplier communications will be prescribed under contractual arrangements, it was pointed out that communications sent by Consumer-appointed MAMs to Energy Suppliers would be valuable to catalogue in the register, due to a perceived likelihood for these to contribute to gas data quality issues in the context of the I0198 problem statement.

Capture of data in differential Market Messages obligations:

The Code Manager has designed the register in such a was as to allow for different communication methods for different Market Messages, i.e., IX for an ONJOB, DTN for an

ONDET. Whilst the Code Manager has no expectations for how useful this may or may not be as a functionality of the register, it was reported during initial solution development conversations that this might be helpful.

Communications Method Register as a Category 3 document:

The Code Manager is proposing the Communications Method Register be introduced as a new Category 3 document. This means that changes can be introduced and consulted to ensure that the register evolves in a way that best meets the needs of industry.

Obligations to complete and update the Communications Method Register

The proposed drafting changes to Schedule 14 – Metering Operations to introduce the Communications Method Register into the REC are written in such a way as to not explicitly compel REC Parties to complete the register – merely to request completion instead. The Code Manager's hope and expectation is that the Communications Method Register is a useful document that provides value to its users, and that completion and update of the register is of such mutual benefit to industry that a compelled requirement to do so is redundant.

9 PROPOSED SOLUTION

The Code Manager proposes to introduce two Communications Method Registers. These registers will capture the means by which a REC Party discharges their obligations within Schedule 14 to send Market Messages to other REC Parties. For actions and communications sent from one REC Party to another, Schedule 14 features interface tables that prescribe the "Means" by which these messages are sent. Relevant to this Issue, these means can include IX, DTN, and Email.

The Communications Method Register will sample specific "Actions", as well as their associated "Interfaces". i.e., the required Market Message (e.g., ONJOB, ONUPD), and the recipient and the sender ("From" and "To"). In this way, certain obligated REC Party communication will be captured, with space provided below for REC Parties to indicate the "Means" that they would use to communicate in that scenario, i.e., IX, DTN, or email.

The Code Manager is proposing two registers: One for MAM<->MAM communications, and one for MAM<->Supplier communications. Energy Suppliers and MAMs will be able to record both their primary communication method, and their backup within the register. The Code Manager would expect that the Communications Method Registers will act as "living documents", and will be updated as required by users, in order to provide the greatest mutual value.

The Code Manager proposes that these registers are published on the REC portal, and made available to REC Parties, in order to support in the resolution of missed Market Messages.

10 DRAFT LEGAL TEXT

The legal text changes to deliver the proposed solution to I0198 can be found here.

The legal text is split into two parts:

1) Changes to Schedule 14 – Metering Operations to introduce the Code Manager's intention to provide and maintain a register where MAMs, AMIs and Suppliers may record their communication methods in respect of Market Messages within the schedule.

2) The Communications Method Register – A new Category 3 document, whose purpose is as described above.

The Code Manager is also exploring changes to Schedule 1 – Interpretations & Definitions to introduce an official definition of the Communications Method Register – This will be confirmed ahead of Consultation.

11 APPENDIX

CHANGE PROPOSAL	Link
APRIL REC ISSUES GROUP: GAS MEM PRESENTATION	Link
SOLUTION DOC	Link

12 GLOSSARY

TERM	DEFINITION
Central Data Service Provider	means the 'Central Data Service Provider' appointed by Gas Transporters pursuant to standard special condition A15 (Central Data Service Provider) of the Gas Transporter Licences
Communications Method Register	means the document in which Metering Asset Managers and Gas Suppliers may record the means by which they send Market Messages as part of their obligations as described in Schedule 14 – Metering Operations.[1]
DTN	has the meaning given to that expression in the Data Transfer Services Agreement
IX	defined by Xoserve as “Information Exchange (IX) allows our customers to securely transfer files across the gas industry through a virtual gateway.”
Market Message	means a structured communication sent between two Market Participants in the form and with the content required (and as otherwise specified) by the Data Specification.
Metering Asset Manager	means a Party which has Qualified in that role under the Qualification and Maintenance Schedule. Where used in respect of a particular Supply Meter Point, it means the MAM Appointed by a Gas Supplier in accordance with the Metering Operations Schedule. The MAM is accountable for the installation, replacement, repair and maintenance of gas Metering Equipment (either itself or by an AMI), and the MAM must also therefore be Accredited under the Metering Accreditation Schedule.

[1] Proposed definition.