









DCUSA Consultation		At what stage is this document in the process?
<h2>DCP 468</h2> <h3>Remove Redundant DataFlow from DTC/EMDS</h3> <p>Date Raised: 14 November 2025</p> <p>Proposer Name: Mark Bellman</p> <p>Company Name: SP Electricity North West</p> <p>Party Category: DNO</p>		01 – Change Proposal
		02 – Consultation
		03 – Change Report
		04 – Change Declaration
<p>Purpose of Change Proposal</p> <p>D0164 / MM00069 might be a redundant relic from 1998. The Proposer can find no current obligation, nor any right, under DCUSA which would either be discharged or exercised (respectively) by its use. If no longer required, any such redundant data flows should be removed from DTC/EMDS.</p>		
	<p>This document is a Consultation issued to DCUSA Parties and any other interested Parties in accordance with Clause 11.14 of the DCUSA seeking industry views on DCP 468.</p> <p>The Working Group recommends that this Change Proposal should proceed to Consultation.</p> <p>Parties are invited to consider the questions set in section 10 and submit comments using the form attached as Attachment 2 to dcusa@electralink.co.uk by 07 April 2026.</p>	
	<p> Impacted Parties</p> <p>Suppliers/DNOs/IDNOs/CVA Registrants/Gas Suppliers/OTSO Party</p>	
	<p> Impacted Clauses</p> <p>By definition, there is not expected to be any impacted DCUSA clauses.</p>	

Contents		 Any questions?
1	Summary	3
2	Governance	4
3	Why Change?	4
4	Working Group Assessment	5
5	Relevant Objectives	6
6	Impacts & Other Considerations	7
7	Implementation	7
8	Consultation Questions	8
9	Attachments	8
Timetable		 0207 432 3011
Activity	Date	Proposer Mark Bellman
Initial Assessment Report	21 January 2026	 dcusa@electralink.co.uk
Consultation Issued to Parties	March 2026	 mark.bellman@enwl.co.uk
Change Report Approved by Panel	15 July 2026	 07385 009419
Change Report issued for Voting	16 July 2026	
Party Voting Closes	06 August 2026	
Change Declaration Issued	10 August 2026	

1 Summary

What?

- 1..1 The Proposer believes there is at least one dataflow (D0164 a.k.a. MM00069) that has existed since 1998, that meets no codified need, is no longer in use and therefore should be removed from the Data Transfer Catalogue (DTC) / Electricity Market Data Specification (EMDS).
- 1..2 The Proposer has looked for an obligation or right in DCUSA which might be met or exercised by the use of D0164, finding no such need for the flow.
- 1..3 In particularly and considering the title of the flow, the Proposer considered whether it would meet the notice obligations in DCUSA for:
 - Incident Management as outlined in DCUSA 30.13.
 - the flow does not contain a data item for the no. of MSIDs. And 30.13 explicitly states 'by email' rendering a flow unnecessary.
 - Section 2A Clause 25.22 for System Outage.
 - the flow is not sent to 'Connectee'.
 - Section 2B Clause 41.2 & 41.6 for System Outage.
 - the flow is not sent to IDNO or OTSO

Why?

- 1..4 It is evident that existing market participants and code bodies have routinely produced D0164s during testing which are of no value, consuming resources unnecessarily. Secretariat has confirmed from sources within Electralink that:
 - Only 674 instances of D0164 have been sent since April 2012
 - These were sent from MPIDs of 12 IDNOs, 2 DNOs and 3 REC/MRA
 - Of which 565 were from REC/MRA and 32 from IDNOs, all tagged as 'test' flows.
 - Of the remaining 77 instances, 76 were sent in 4 batches
 - on two dates in 2013 (totalling 25) from 1 DNO, and
 - on two dates in 2023 (totalling 51) from 1 IDNO.
 - Although none of these batches were tagged as 'test', given their 'one-off batch' nature, it seems likely they were test, or at least unlikely that they related to actual supply interruptions.
 - That leaves 1, sent by a second DNO which was not tagged as 'test' flow.

- The Proposer considers that it might be worthwhile for Secretariat to ask the two DNOs and the one IDNO to confirm that these 77 flows were indeed not 'live operational' dataflows.
- 1..5 Retaining redundant flows in EMDS runs the risk that they are sent/received erroneously to market participants. This could result in non-value time and effort to assess what it is to be used for.
- 1..6 It is also conceivable that market participants, particularly those new to the industry, could be misled into believing it has a role, worst case developing processes or systems to use it only to find it is of no practical value.
- 1..7 It is a simple principle of efficiency that unnecessary processes should be eliminated. The retention of redundant data flows is a credibility risk for industry, particularly at a time of criticism about complexity in the industry.

How?

- 1..8 The Proposer believes that there are two steps to take here, the first of which is the subject of this Change Proposal and the second of which is initiated by RECCo Panel engagement with this Proposal and progressed under the aegis of their own governance, if, and in the manner in which, they consider appropriate to reassure industry that all flows in EMDS remain in current use.

2 Governance

- 2.1 This CP should be considered a Part 2 Matter. The Proposer considers that the matter of removing a redundant dataflow is not something that warrants Authority determination since it should have no effect on competition.
- 2.2 This consultation is issued for a period of 15 working days.

3 Why Change?

- 3.1 A change to the code is not proposed. Following implementation of DCP462 on 22nd October 2025, the process for amending DCUSA-owned dataflows (DCUSA Messages) follows the change process drafted in clauses 9 – 14 of DCUSA. The Proposer understands that if approved, then the Secretariat will advise REC to make the appropriate changes in EMDS. As for the detailed reasons for the change see Why? In Section 1 above.

Question 1 – Do you understand the intent of the CP?

Question 2 – Are you supportive of the principle of the CP?

4 Working Group Assessment

Working Group Assessment

- 4.1 The DCUSA Panel established a Working Group to assess this CP. Meetings were held in open session and the minutes and papers of each meeting are available on the DCUSA website – www.dcusa.co.uk.

Working Group Discussions

- 4.2 The Working Group discussed the proposal and unanimously agreed with the Proposers solution.
- 4.3 Members agreed that there are no reasons to retain the D0164 flow if it is not used.
- 4.4 For absolute clarity, the Working Group agreed that it would be beneficial to seek wider industry feedback to ensure that the D0164 flow is not used for any reasons that may be unknown prior to progressing this change.

Question 3: Do you believe the D0164 flow is needed?

Question 4: Can you conceive a scenario whereby others may need to use the D0164 flow? If you have used this flow, and the reasons for using these.

- 4.5 The Proposer has looked for an obligation, or right in DCUSA which might be met or exercised by the use of D0164.
- 4.6 Working Group members agreed with the Proposer that there is no such need for the flow that can be found, however, members agreed to seek wider industry feedback for clarity.

Question 5: Are you aware of an obligation or right in DCUSA or anywhere else which might be met or exercised by the use of D0164?

- 4.7 The Proposer stated that there is at least one dataflow (D0164 / MM00068) that no longer meets a codified need and is therefore no longer in use. The Working Group support this and believe that unused flows should be removed from the Data Transfer Catalogue (DTC) / Electricity Market Data Specification (EMDS) to ensure efficiency.

Question 6: Do you agree with the Proposer and Workgroup that retaining unused flows in the DTC / EMDS is inefficient?

- 4.8 The working group noted that it may be beneficial for a wider review of the DTC/ EMDS across all code ownerships to identify if there are any other unused flows. The recommendation is that this is raised at the Cross Code Steering Group (CCSG) initially to see if a wider review could take place.

Question 7: Do you agree that a wider DTC / EMDS review would be beneficial to reassure industry that they do not retain other redundant flows?

5 Relevant Objectives

Assessment Against the DCUSA Objectives

- 5.1 For a DCUSA Change Proposal to be approved it must be demonstrated that it better facilitates the DCUSA Objectives. This CP is being assessed against the DCUSA General Objectives.
- 5.2 The Proposer considers that the following DCUSA General Objectives are better facilitated by this CP:

	DCUSA General Objectives	Identified impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. The development, maintenance and operation by the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of efficient, co-ordinated, and economical Distribution Networks	None
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. The facilitation of effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity and (so far as is consistent therewith) the promotion of such competition in the sale, distribution and purchase of electricity	None
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3. The efficient discharge by the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of obligations imposed upon them in their Distribution Licences	Positive
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4. The promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the DCUSA	Positive
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Compliance with the EU Internal Market Regulation and any relevant legally binding decisions of the European Commission and/or the Agency for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators.	None

- 5.3 Removing redundant dataflows from the DTC / EMDS will reduce wasted effort by existing and new market participants otherwise spent analysing, developing, assessing use of the redundant flows.
- 5.4 The proposal will also render the code administrators' (DCUSA and REC) maintenance of the data flow catalogue / specification more efficient by avoiding unnecessary activity.
- 5.5 The proposal will also reduce the likelihood that parties' IT departments continue to process dataflows during testing activities, thereby reducing non-value activity.

Question 8: Do you agree that CCSG should ask REC to review the wider DTC / EMDS to reassure industry that they do not retain other redundant flows?

Question 9 – Do you agree with the Proposer that the proposal better facilitates the DCUSA General Objectives? Please give supporting reasons.

6 Impacts & Other Considerations

Impacts on any Significant Code Review (SCR) or other significant industry change projects

6.1 No.

Impacts on other Codes

6.2 The Proposal does not impact on other codes per se but could result in actions on other Code Secretariat or Panels to review the EMDS for redundant or relic dataflows.

Are there any wider industry impacts?

6.3 It seems likely that much if not quite all of DTC / EMDS has been thoroughly reviewed during the MHHS Programme. However, this flow has slipped through that net. The Proposer would therefore like the industry to receive assurance that there are no other redundant or relic data flows in the specification.

6.4 The Proposer would like the DCUSA Working Group to consider who best should provide this assurance, noting that could be from either RECCo (as holder of the EMDS) or the Secretariat of each Code that 'owns' Data Flows in EMDS.

6.5 Such assurances once obtained could be discussed by the DCUSA Working Group as to adequacy of the response and/or any contingent actions arising from residual exposures for parties and code administrators presented by redundant and relic dataflows.

Question 10: Are you aware of any wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP?

7 Implementation

7.1 The Proposer considers that implementation for this DCP would be from 20 working days following approval, such lead time being sufficient to document the removal of the flow from DTC and EDMS.

Question 11: Are you supportive of the proposed implementation date of this CP?

Question 12: Do you have any other comments?

8 Consultation Questions

8.1 The Working Group is seeking industry views on the following consultation questions:

No.	Questions
1	Do you understand the intent of the CP?
2	Are you supportive of the principle of the CP?
3	Do you believe the D0164 flow is needed?
4	Can you conceive a scenario whereby others may need to use the D0164 flow? If you have used this flow, and the reasons for using these.
5	Are you aware of an obligation or right in DCUSA or anywhere else which might be met or exercised by the use of D0164?
6	Do you agree with the Proposer and Workgroup that retaining unused flows in the DTC / EMDS is inefficient?
7	Do you agree that a wider DTC / EMDS review would be beneficial to reassure industry that they do not retain other redundant flows?
8	Do you agree that CCSG should ask REC to review the wider DTC / EMDS to reassure industry that they do not retain other redundant flows?
9	Do you agree with the Proposer that the proposal better facilitates the DCUSA General Objectives? Please give supporting reasons.
10	Are you aware of any wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP?
11	Are you supportive of the proposed implementation date of this CP?
12	Do you have any other comments?

8.1.1 Responses should be submitted using Attachment 1 to dcusa@electralink.co.uk by no later than **07 April 2026**.

8.1.2 Responses, or any part thereof, can be provided in confidence. Parties are asked to clearly indicate any parts of a response that are to be treated confidentially.

9 Attachments

- Attachment 1 – DCP 468 Consultation Response Form
- Attachment 2 – DCP 468 Change Proposal Form