RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

NON-CONFIDENTIAL CONSOLIDATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES

R0157 – REMOVAL OF FACSIMILE AS A METHOD OF CODE COMMUNICATION

On 09 February 2024, the Code Manager issued a consultation to industry to seek feedback on the Preliminary Change Report for R0157.

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	27/02/2024
RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	Change Panel
LEAD ANALYST	James Hardy

DATE CONSULTATION ISSUED	09/02/2024
RESPONSE DEADLINE	23/02/2024

Question 1:	Do you agree with that the proposed solution resolved the problem statement? If not, please provide rationale.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
SSE (Energy Supplier)	SSE agrees that the proposed solution resolves the problem statement.	
Anonymous (Metering Equipment Manager)	Yes.	

Question 2:	Do you believe that the date items for Contact Fax Number (DI50237 and DI92293) should be removed as part of the solution? If so, please state how.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
SSE (Energy Supplier)	The data items referencing Contact Fax Number should be removed. We are happy to take RECs guidance on how this should be carried out.	Noted.
Anonymous (Metering Equipment Manager)	As an enduring data flow post MHHS, there is argument to say that removing the data item D0150237 from the MM00236 as part of this change would make sense. However, as the data item is currently viewed as optional then removing it would increase development and testing requirements to account for the change in the MM00236 format and version number. Additionally, the change would be considered as affecting the MHHS Programme and may cause a delay in the full implementation date to prevent increased development during the MHHS Qualification period on both the new and legacy systems. Essentially, as it is an optional field, removing it would cause more work and therefore increase the cost to implement this solution.	Thank you for your response. As part of the proposed solution, the Code Manager will be taking into consideration the cost, and operational requirements, of removing the data items and whether it is a justifiable option at this stage. As with all Change Proposals, the impact on the MHHS Programme will be considered. We will further consider the points you raise, and will set out our further thoughts, and decision, in the Final Change Report.

Question 3:	Do you agree with the proposed implementation date of November 2025? If not, please provide rationale and your preferred date.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
SSE (Energy Supplier)	SSE has no objection to the date of November 2025, but we do not see any reason why this cannot be implemented earlier than the proposed date.	Thank you for confirming you have no objection to the November 2025 date. As part of the initial and preliminary assessment, the Code Manager considered a range of possible dates, but the proposed implementation date of November 2025 has been proposed for the following reasons. Firstly, this allows the REC a stronger chance to align with other industry codes, whose change will require a longer lead time than any REC solution, secondly, it will also allow the MHHS Programme to go-live and reduce any possible impacts on this, and finally, with the transmission of the PSTN continuing until December 2025, we believe it is appropriate to allow market participants to continue to use this option, whilst it is still more widely available. This will also give market participants enough lead time, and notice, to update any methods of communication, where required.
Anonymous (Metering Equipment Manager)	Yes.	

Question 4:	Do you expect there to be an impact on your operational processes as a result of this change? If so, please provide details.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
SSE (Energy Supplier)	We do not believe there will be an impact on our operational processes.	
Anonymous (Metering Equipment Manager)	No.	

Question 5:	Do you expect to experience any financial impact as a result of this change? If so, please provide details.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
SSE (Energy Supplier)	No.	
Anonymous (Metering Equipment Manager)	If changes to the MM00236 are approved then we would incur a cost to develop, test and deploy on all our MM00236 receiving systems.	Noted. Potential costs to parties will be taken into consideration ahead of, and in, the Final Change Report.

Question 6:	Do you anticipate any benefits to your organisation as a result of this change? If so, please provide details.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
SSE (Energy Supplier)	No.	
Anonymous (Metering Equipment Manager)	No.	

Question 7:	Do you have any other comments relating to this Change Proposal?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
SSE (Energy Supplier)	We believe that the removal of items should be the normal course of action when they become obsolete to ensure that the REC documentation remains as concise as possible.	Noted.
Anonymous (Metering Equipment Manager)	No.	