








DCUSA Change Proposal (DCP)		At what stage is this document in the process?
<h2>DCP 468:</h2> <h3>Remove Redundant DataFlow from DTC/EMDS</h3> <p><b>Date Raised:</b> 14/11/2025</p> <p><b>Proposer Name:</b> Mark Bellman</p> <p><b>Company Name:</b> SP Electricity North West</p> <p><b>Party Category:</b> DNO</p>		<div>01 – Change Proposal</div> <div>02 – Consultation</div> <div>03 – Change Report</div> <div>04 – Change Declaration</div>
<p><b>Purpose of Change Proposal:</b> 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><b>Governance:</b></p> <p>The Proposer recommends that this Change Proposal should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treated as a Part 2 Matter</li> <li>• Treated as a Standard Change</li> <li>• Progressed to the Working Group phase</li> </ul> <p>The Panel will consider the proposer's recommendation and determine the appropriate route.</p>	
	<p><b>Impacted Parties:</b></p> <p>Suppliers/DNOs/IDNOs/CVA Registrants/Gas Suppliers/OTSO Party]</p>	
	<p><b>Impacted Clauses:</b></p> <p>By definition, there is not expected to be any impacted DCUSA clauses.</p>	

Contents		 Any questions?												
1	Summary	3												
2	Governance	Error! Bookmark not defined.												
3	Why Change?	4												
4	Solution and Legal Text	4												
5	Code Specific Matters	5												
6	Relevant Objectives	5												
7	Impacts & Other Considerations	5												
8	Implementation	6												
9	Recommendations	7												
Indicative Timeline		 020 7432 3011												
<b>The Secretariat recommends the following timetable:</b>		Proposer: <b>Mark Bellman</b>												
<table><tr><td>Initial Assessment Report</td><td>21 January 2026</td></tr><tr><td>Consultation Issued to Industry Participants</td><td>March 2026</td></tr><tr><td>Change Report Approved by Panel</td><td>15 July 2026</td></tr><tr><td>Change Report issued for Voting</td><td>16 July 2026</td></tr><tr><td>Party Voting Closes</td><td>06 August 2026</td></tr><tr><td>Change Declaration Issued to Parties</td><td>10 August 2026</td></tr></table>		Initial Assessment Report	21 January 2026	Consultation Issued to Industry Participants	March 2026	Change Report Approved by Panel	15 July 2026	Change Report issued for Voting	16 July 2026	Party Voting Closes	06 August 2026	Change Declaration Issued to Parties	10 August 2026	 <a href="mailto:mark.bellman@enwl.co.uk">mark.bellman@enwl.co.uk</a>
Initial Assessment Report	21 January 2026													
Consultation Issued to Industry Participants	March 2026													
Change Report Approved by Panel	15 July 2026													
Change Report issued for Voting	16 July 2026													
Party Voting Closes	06 August 2026													
Change Declaration Issued to Parties	10 August 2026													
		 07385 009419												

# 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

### Justification for Part 1 and Part 2 Matter

- 2.1 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.

### Requested Next Steps

- 2.2 This Change Proposal should:
- Be treated as a Part 2 Matter;
  - Be treated as a Standard Change; and
  - Proceed to the Working Group phase.

## 3 Why Change?

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

## 4 Solution and Legal Text

### Legal Text

- 4.1 Not applicable (see 2.1 – 2.4 above).

## 5 Code Specific Matters

### Reference Documents

- 5.1 Data Transfer Catalogue (DTC)
- 5.2 Electricity Market Data Specification (EMDS)

## 6 Relevant Objectives

DCUSA General Objectives		Identified impact
Please tick the relevant boxes. ( <a href="#">See Guidance Note 9</a> )		
<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

- 6.1 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
- 6.2 The proposal will also render the code administrators' (DCUSA and REC) maintenance of the data flow catalogue / specification more efficient by avoiding unnecessary activity.
- 6.3 The proposal will also reduce the likelihood that parties' IT departments continue to process dataflows during testing activities, thereby reducing non-value activity.

## 7 Impacts & Other Considerations

- 7.1 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

- 7.2 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.
- 7.3 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.

## Does this Change Proposal impact a Significant Code Review (SCR) or other significant industry change projects, if so, how?

7.4 No.

## Does this Change Proposal Impact Other Codes?

BSC.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	MRA.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
CUSC.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	SEC.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
Grid Code.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	REC.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distribution Code..	<input type="checkbox"/>	None.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- 7.5 See 6.1 – 6.3 above.
- 7.6 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.

## Consideration of Wider Industry Impacts

- 7.7 See 6.1 – 6.3 above.
- 7.8 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.

## Confidentiality

7.9 Not applicable.

## 8 Implementation

### Proposed Implementation Date

- 8.1 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.

## 9 Recommendations

*The Code Administrator will provide a summary of any recommendations/determinations provided by the Panel in considering the initial Change Proposal. This will form part of a Final Change Report.*