RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

NON-CONFIDENTIAL CONSOLIDATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES

R0261 ADDITION OF EXPORT FLAG IN D0303 FLOWS

On 27 March 2026 the Code Manager issued a consultation to industry to seek feedback on the Change Report (For Consultation) for R0261 Addition of Export flag in D0303 flows.

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	27 April 2026
RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	REC Technical Expert Panel
LEAD ANALYST	Caroline Freimuller

DATE CONSULTATION ISSUED	27 March 2026
RESPONSE DEADLINE	21 April 2026

Question 1:	Do you agree with the proposed solution? If not, please explain why?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
E. On Next (Energy Supplier)	Yes	Thank you for your comments.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	Although not directly impacted, SSE supports this solution as it simplifies the end to end process.	Thank you for your comments.

Question 2:	Do you agree with the proposed implementation approach (Big Bang)? If not, please explain why?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
E. On Next (Energy Supplier)	Yes, although to avoid a repeat of the issues encountered during the M10 implementation — where flows were failing due to MOPs and MAPs had not configured their DTS Gateway to send or receive the new version of the D0303 flow — REC must provide a clear assurance plan. We require clarity on how REC will ensure all impacted Parties have updated their DTS Gateways to recognize the new version/structure before the go-live date.	Thank you for your comments. The REC Change Team has noted this and passed it over to REC Performance Assurance for consideration. However, MAPs are not REC Parties, so any assurance would be limited to MOAs. The Data Transfer Service (DTS) Gateway is also not governed by the REC, so these concerns will also be flagged to the Data Transfer Services Agreement (DTSA) Administrator. The Code Manager would also like to add there is little to no precedence for assurance being done on individual changes to Market Messages that are not deemed to be high risk (for example, Market Messages involved in Switching). If this is something Parties would like to see implemented, we would recommend this is first discussed at the REC Issues Group to establish a wider appetite.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	Yes.	Thank you for your comments.

Question 3:	Do you agree with the Code Manager's assessment of the costs and benefits for this change?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
E. On Next (Energy Supplier)	Yes	Thank you for your comments.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	As a supplier there are no costs to this change to our systems. However, as there is a change to a dataflow we would imagine there would be some central update costs. As these are listed as zero in the change document, we would be interested to know whether these are not being passed on for this change.	Thank you for your comments. Costs for changes to the Data Transfer Network (DTN) are not captured as central system costs as they are not charged to the REC and do not come out of the REC Change budget. They are captured under the costs to Parties, as they are charged directly by the DTSA for these changes.

Question 4:	Do you agree with the Code Manager's assessment of the Change Path, that this Change Proposal should be subject to Self-Governance approval by the Technical Expert Panel?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
E. On Next (Energy Supplier)	Yes	Thank you for your comments.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	Yes.	Thank you for your comments.

Question 5:	Do you agree with the Code Manager's recommendation that this Change Proposal should be approved for implementation on 06 November 2026? If not, please explain why?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
E. On Next (Energy Supplier)	Yes	Thank you for your comments.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	As this is a system change, we support parties having 6 months to implement this change.	Thank you for your comments.

Question 6:	Do you have any other comments relating to this Change Proposal?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
E. On Next (Energy Supplier)	We would request that REC coordinate closely with Electralink and the Technical Expert Panel to monitor readiness. The industry requires confirmation that proactive testing or validation of gateway configurations will be part of the implementation plan to prevent the "sent/received" failures seen in previous releases.	Thank you for your comments. Please see the Code Manager response to Q2.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	We believe this change could help prevent incorrect meter asset costs being passed to energy suppliers.	Thank you for your comments.