

NON-CONFIDENTIAL CONSOLIDATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES

C3-0042 DATA CLEANSE REPORTING GUIDANCE

On 10 February 2023 the Code Manager issued a consultation to industry to seek feedback on the Category 3 guidance document for data cleanse reporting.

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	10/03/2023
LEAD ANALYST	ANN PERRY

DATE CONSULTATION ISSUED	10/02/2023
RESPONSE DEADLINE	24/02/2023

Question 1:	Do you agree with the proposed change to add the Movement Report to the REC Performance Assurance Dashboard? If not, please provide details	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	RESPONSE	CODE MANAGER COMMENTS
Power Data Associates (Other)	N/C	
SPEN (DNO)	We are supportive of this being monitored via the dashboards.	
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	Yes – this seems appropriate.	
EDF (Energy Supplier)	We agree with the proposal of the change except from the updates to the invalid MEM ID data cleanse ownership. The installing supplier and MEM will not be able to make the updates necessary updates in a scenario where they are no longer the current supplier/MEM. We believe that installing supplier/ MEM and current supplier/ MEM should work together to ensure the data is correct. The report should remain with the current supplier to initiate the action.	Responded to under 'Question 4'
National Grid Electricity Distribution (DNO)	Yes, we agree with the proposed change to add the Movement Report to the REC Performance Assurance Dashboard.	

Question 2:	Do you agree with the proposed change to separate the No Meter MTC Report into two sub-reports? If not, please provide details	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	RESPONSE	CODE MANAGER COMMENTS
Power Data Associates (Other)	N/C	
SPEN (DNO)	Although not a report that this DNO would have visibility of, it seems to add clarity and should make categories easier to work.	
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	<p>Yes, we agree with this report being split into two sub-reports: NoMeterMTC_MSN and NoMeterMTC_NoMSN.</p> <p>However, the NoMeterMTC_NoMSN contents have not been changed as requested. Can we re-request that the Meter Installation Date is replaced with Last Meter Removal Date. This would allow all parties including REC PAB to see the age profile and also identify entries that may just be transitory (delay between MSN update by MEM and MTC update by Supplier). This will also making working the report more efficient for suppliers as they could ignore the transient ones which was one of the drivers for requesting the removal date to be added.</p>	<p>Thanks for the feedback.</p> <p>We understand the potential benefits of your suggestion, however, we are not able to add the 'Last Meter Removal Date' to the reporting as it is not available in the source data used.</p> <p>We are exploring with the EES provider if this additional data could be provided, however in the interests of expediency propose progressing with the current change and will make a further update if this data becomes available.</p>
EDF (Energy Supplier)	Yes	
National Grid Electricity Distribution (DNO)	Whilst we agree with the proposed change to separate No Meter MTC Report into two sub-reports, we question if the Naming convention for:	Thank you for the suggestion. We will be keeping the naming convention as is for consistency.

	<i>[Party Name]_NoMeterMTC_NoMSN_[Date].xlsb</i> is correct, we believe it should read: anything other than a 'no meter MTC'	
--	--	--

Question 3: Do you agree with the proposed change to the process of dealing with exemptions, so that they remain included in the reporting, but flagged instead? If not, please provide details		
RESPONDENT DETAILS	RESPONSE	CODE MANAGER COMMENTS
Power Data Associates (Other)	N/C	
SPEN (DNO)	Yes, we are supportive of this to ensure that while not counted they continue to be tracked.	
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	Yes – seems fine.	
EDF (Energy Supplier)	Yes	
National Grid Electricity Distribution (DNO)	Yes we agree with the proposed change to the process of dealing with exemptions.	

Question 4:	Do you agree with the proposed change to update the recipient of the Invalid Electricity MAP ID report to the Installing Supplier? If not, please	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	RESPONSE	CODE MANAGER COMMENTS
Power Data Associates (Other)	N/C	
SPEN (DNO)	We are supportive of this change.	
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	<p>Invalid MAP Id report – looking at the example report it contains the following data items; Current Supplier, Registration EFD, Company Group Name and Installing Supplier.</p> <p>As this report is only being sent to the Installing Supplier, is it possible to just replace column Current Supplier with Installing Supplier with the two associated columns populated accordingly. This would also minimise any changes to the REC PAB processes in terms of reporting on the reports and remove any potential confusion around which supplier should be receiving and working the report.</p>	<p>Thank you for the suggestion. We will be leaving the 'Current Supplier' field in the report in the case where joint action is required by the Installing and Current Supplier to resolve the error. As a result of another consultation comment, we will also be sending this report out to both the Initiating and Current Suppliers, but it will be made clear the Initiating Supplier is primarily responsible for resolving the issue.</p>
EDF (Energy Supplier)	No – please see our comment to question 1.	<p>Thank you for the feedback. This was discussed at a prior RIG meeting, whereby positive support for this change was received from attendees. We will be leaving the 'Current Supplier' field within the report in the case that a joint action is needed for resolution and providing the report to both Parties.</p>

National Grid Electricity Distribution (DNO)	Yes, we agree with the proposed change to update the recipient of Invalid Electricity MAP ID report to the installing supplier.	
--	---	--

Question 5:		
Do you agree with the addition of Active Relationship Domestic Premise Indicator (DPI) report (Report AR3F)? If not, please provide details		
RESPONDENT DETAILS	RESPONSE	CODE MANAGER COMMENTS
Power Data Associates (Other)	N/C	
SPEN (DNO)	We are supportive of this change.	
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	Yes – seems fine.	
EDF (Energy Supplier)	Yes	
National Grid Electricity Distribution (DNO)	Yes we agree with the addition of Active Relationship Domestic Premise Indicator report.	

Question 6:	Do you agree with the addition of Unmetered Domestic Premise Indicator Report? If not, please provide details	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	RESPONSE	CODE MANAGER COMMENTS
Power Data Associates (Other)	<p>Yes</p> <p>This item was incorrectly set during faster switching, as highlighted to REC during the autumn.</p> <p>An unmetered supply is with a PC=01 does not mean domestic. But it means the Unmetered Supply using the 01 profile on the settlement arrangements. Some other unmetered supplies will be set to PC=08, due to the different shape profile. BSP516 does not apply to unmetered suppliers, unmetered supplies are governed under BSP520. During the migration <i>anything</i> with PC=01 was wrongly set to domestic, this needs correctly.</p> <p>In the vast majority of cases everything unmetered should be set to non-domestic.</p>	Thank you for the feedback and additional information provided.
SPEN (DNO)	We are supportive of this.	
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	Yes – seems fine.	
EDF (Energy Supplier)	Yes	

National Grid Electricity Distribution (DNO)	Yes we agree with the addition of Unmetered Domestic Premise Indicator Report, however question if 'unmeasured supply' has the same meaning as unmetered supply.	Thank you for the feedback. We will update the wording to clarify.
--	--	--

Question 7:	Do you have any other comments?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	RESPONSE	CODE MANAGER COMMENTS
Power Data Associates (Other)	Some of the anomalies identified should be reported to the BSC PAB as well as the REC PAB, as some of the errors are failings under the BSC governance. Can the results of the analysis be shared please.	We understand the benefits of this and it will be considered. Please could you detail the reports that you believe would be of use?
SPEN (DNO)	No other comments.	
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	<p><i>Note: Additional comments were received from a second respondent at British Gas and included here (the first respondent had no additional comments)</i></p> <p>Invalid MAP Id report – looking at the example report it contains the following data items; Current Supplier, Registration EFD, Company Group Name and Installing Supplier. As this report is only being sent to the Installing Supplier I would have just replaced column Current Supplier with Installing Supplier with the two associated columns populated accordingly. I think this would also minimise any changes to the REC PAB processes in terms of reporting on the reports and</p>	Responded to above in line with the relevant consultation questions

	<p>remove any potential confusion around which supplier should be receiving and working the report.</p> <p>No Meter MTC report – as requested this report has been split into two reports; NoMeterMTC_MSN and NoMeterMTC_NoMSN however the NoMeterMTC_NoMSN contents have not been changed as requested. We requested that the Meter Installation Date is replaced with Last Meter Removal Date. This would allow all parties including REC PAB to see the age profile and also identify entries that may just be transitory (delay between MSN update by MEM and MTC update by Supplier). This will also making working the report more efficient for suppliers as they could ignore the transient ones which was one of the drivers for requesting the removal date to be added.</p>	
EDF (Energy Supplier)	N/A	
National Grid Electricity Distribution (DNO)	<p>We believe in 'Key Principles' section the word 'be' should be removed as it currently reads: in the interim data is be shared via the REC Portal, and we feel this does not make sense.</p> <p>Also in section Further Guidance communication tools, ECOES should now state EES.</p> <p>In Section Movement Report, where is states 'the report will allows companies to track themselves' should actually be 'allow companies'</p> <p>Also in Active Relationship Reports Guidance Document, Appendix A – Active Relationship Reports the addition of AR3F report is not redlined and believe it should be.</p>	<p>Thank you for the feedback. We will update the wording accordingly.</p> <p>Regarding the AR3F redlining, apologies, as it was an edit of an embedded diagram, this was not identified as a change by the word processor used.</p>