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

NON-CONFIDENTIAL CONSOLIDATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES

R0158 - AMENDMENT TO THE 'SUPPLIER REGISTRATION REPORT (MAP)' REPORT METHODOLOGY

On 15 March 2024 the Code Manager issued a consultation to industry to seek feedback on the Preliminary Change Report for R0158.

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	V1.0
RESPONSE TYPE	NON-CONFIDENTIAL
DATE ISSUED	12 April 2024
RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	Technical Expert Panel
LEAD ANALYST	Lydia Bentley

DATE CONSULTATION ISSUED	15 March 2024
RESPONSE DEADLINE	05 April 2024

Question 1:	Do you agree the proposed solution resolves the problem statement? If not, please provide rationale.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Calisen Metering (Meter Asset Provider) Non-Confidential	We are supportive of the proposed solution as this will provide us with more data on metering assets which benefits our processes.	Thank you.

Question 2:	Do you agree that proposed changes to the wording of the Gas Enquiry Service Definition achieve the desired outcome of restoring the intended functionality of the “Supplier Registration Report (MAP)”?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Calisen Metering (Meter Asset Provider) Non-Confidential	We agree that the change should help achieve the desired outcome. However, we are mindful that the data is only helpful where it is provided and we would seek for greater focus on ensuring the MAP_ID is provided and where provided is accurate.	During the progression of this Change, the Code Manager has worked closely with the CDSP (aka the proposer) to understand the issue and to develop a solution. We have identified a need for a broader review of MAP access to data to ensure that existing MAP data is accurate and high quality. We recognise the respondents feedback and will consider this during this broader review, as we cannot consider it within the relatively narrow scope of R0158.

Question 3:	Do you have any other comments on the proposed solution or legal text changes?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Calisen Metering (Meter Asset Provider) Non-Confidential	No additional comments.	Thank you.

Question 4:	Do you agree with the Code Manager's preliminary assessment that the proposed solution would constitute a positive case for change?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Calisen Metering (Meter Asset Provider) Non-Confidential	We agree with this assessment.	Thank you.

Question 5:	Do you agree with the proposed implementation date and approach? If no, please provide rationale	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Calisen Metering (Meter Asset Provider) Non-Confidential	We agree and are supportive of this change being introduced as soon as possible.	Thank you.

Question 6:	Do you have any other comments relating to this Change Proposal?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Calisen Metering (Meter Asset Provider) Non-Confidential	As previously highlighted we face challenges from the lack of provided MAP_IDs for gas meters, which impact our data processing and billing. Work has begun to investigate where the data fails and is not provided, but this has made slow progress and interim loads of data have had to be completed to 'fill in the gaps' which should not be the enduring process. Those accountable for providing the MAP_ID should be held to account when it is not provided or is invalid.	See response to Q1.