

Name	Organisation	Company type	Confidential	Has the DIP Manager appropriately understood the issue?	Has the issue impacted your organisation?	Do you agree with the proposed solution?	If so, do you agree with the red-lined text in DSD002, Annex 5?	If so, do you agree with the response codes in Table 1 (page 4 of DSD002, Annex 5)	If so, do you agree with the response codes in Table 2 (page 14 of DSD002, Annex 5)	Do you agree that the red-lined solution addresses the issue in this DIP CR?	Will the solution in this DIP CR incur any costs to your organisation?	Do you agree with the implementation approach of this DIP CR?	Do you have any additional comments on this DIP CR?
Jimmy Tom Joseph	Scottish Power Energy Networks (SPEN)	Distributor; Registration Service; Unmetered Supplies Operator;	No	Yes	Yes - reporting and tracking of message status'	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, Table 1 and Table 2 have inconsistent Description for 1062 (in both guidance doc and Annex XX)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Assumption is Annex XX is Annex 5 mentioned in the redlined text
MHHS Design Authority	MHHS Programme	Other;	No	Yes. All parties need to understand what level 3/level 4 validation, they are required to complete and what error messages to use.	No, but as the MHHS Programme, we are aware that parties have faced issues during migration as different parties have made different assumptions, which is creating issues.	We agree that the Level 3/4 validation requirements and error codes should be set out in the DIP rules. This should provide unambiguous guidance as to what is required to all parties.	The wording of the text could be clearer on the obligation for parties to follow the validation as set out in DSD002 Annex 5. Suggested wording: "Level 3 and Level 4 message validation, as set out in DSD002 Annex 5, is mandatory for all DIP Users. DSD002 Annex 5 sets out the response codes required to be used for Level 3 and Level 4 validation."	DSD002 Annex 5 is largely a copy of the tables in the guidance note. The guidance can be looser with language, but the Code needs to be clear on what the obligations are. • Suggest removing quantitative/qualitative checks column • Suggest changing Usage Guidance to Usage • Suggest removing recommendations from "Usage" column eg RCP1000 • Suggest adding "where agreed bilaterally between parties" in Usage column for Optional flows. Don't want one party to use a code that another party is not expecting. • Suggest removing all references to future changes, the rules should get updated in line with those future changes	Yes	With the proposed firming up of the language suggested above, the solution should set out the current requirements for Level 3/4 validation	No	The solution needs to be clear on whether the expectation is that all parties have to be compliant by the implementation date or whether a window is being allowed post implementation for participants to adhere to these obligations.	We recommend that the DIP Manager engages with all parties currently transacting over the DIP to agree an implementation plan as clearly some parties are non-compliant at this stage.

								at that time eg RCP1008 • Suggest being clear on any tolerances eg RCP1008. State the tolerance is 1 minute and then everybody is doing the same check • Suggest making RCP1062 Optional as it's N against all columns in Table 2 and state "Only to be used where bi-laterally agreed between parties".					
Daniel Tadecic co	St Clements Services (MPRS)	Registration Service ;	No	Yes	Update to Status Message Format to align with the Guidance Note Updates to validation to use the Mandatory RCP Code instead of a generic RCP1001 or RCP1022 Introduction of validation for Future Dated Sending and DIP Timestamps. Currently , MPRS accepts and queues future dated message until the timestamp is equal to the MPRS System date then the message is	Yes	No Missing RCP1062, RCP1063, RCP1064, RCP9999	Yes	For RCP1062 in Table 2 there are no valid scenarios where this Error Code can be used. Should RCP1062 be deleted? Typographic Errors: [LinkedImportExportCase] [RelatedCase]	No, the guidance for populating Status Messages has not been included with in the DIP Rules. The population of Status Messages must be standardised and enforceable so that systems can reliably automate remediation	Yes, we are unable to provide costs as we are awaiting a detailed impact assessment. We anticipate the impact to be low.	We plan to implement the described changes into the MPRS June BSC Release.	N/A

					assigned to a processing stream								
Daniel Tadicic co	St Clements Services (MPRS)	Registration Service ;	No	UPDATED Response V2. YES	This change impacts MPRS: Update to Status Message Format to align with the Guidance Note Updates to validation to use the Mandatory RCP Code instead of a generic RCP1001 or RCP1022 Introduction of validation for Future Dated Sending and DIP Timestamps. Currently, MPRS accepts and queues future dated message until the timestamp is equal to the MPRS System date then the message is assigned to a processing stream	Yes, by restricting the validation that can be applied to MPRS messages it should significantly reduce the high volumes of invalid Status Messages.	No Missing RCP1062, RCP1063, RCP1064, RCP9999	Yes	For RCP1062 in Table 2 there are no valid scenarios where this Error Code can be used. Should RCP1062 be deleted? Typographic Errors: [LinkedImportExportCase] RelatedCase] It is not clear what the Y and N values mean. The table needs a legend to explicitly state that these validations must not be performed on these messages. MPRS receives high volumes of these N Status messages which causes a huge administrative overhead. The DIP rules must state that where the downstream provider believes there is an error with the message, a Service Desk Ticket must be raised and not a generic Error. Generic Errors are not actionable, especially at volume	No, the guidance for populating Status Messages has not been included with in the DIP Rules. The population of Status Messages must be standardised and enforceable so that systems can reliably automate remediation	Yes, we are unable to provide costs as we are awaiting a detailed impact assessment. We anticipate the impact to be low.	We plan to implement the described changes into the MPRS June BSC Release.	How are the DIP rules enforced? If a DIP user applies validation excluded in Table 2 what are the consequences?

Michal Dobosz	Flui Technologies	DIP Connection Provider;	No	Yes	Low impact, will be evaluating we are following the new changes to the new response codes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	From a DCP perspective, even a low complexity document change can still require design review, code changes, regression testing and other various updates. The proposed implementation approach should account for that.
Andrew Wallace	RECCo	Code Body/Code Administrator ;	No	Yes	Yes - Confusion on roles and responsibilities.	Yes, however we have some detailed comments on the legal drafting proposed (set out in Q8 below).	We do not agree that referencing applicant and proposed DIP Users is necessary. Other requirements in the DIP Rules are not similarly called out and there is no way to enforce this as the obligations to not relate to authorised DIP Users. To ensure that applicants are meeting the required standards for use of response codes, we suggest that DIP Manager should review, and if required, update the DIP Onboarding requirements as set out in DSD002 Annex 1. In addition, we have provided a separate marked up document with detailed drafting suggestions.	Yes	Yes	We have provided comments in Question 8 and a separate marked up review of the new annex that we consider need to be addressed to ensure that these new arrangements can be effectively used following implementation.	No	Yes	It is not clear why DIP Manager has not included a consultation question on the changes to DSD0002 Annex 2. As noted above, we do not agree that referencing applicant and proposed DIP Users is necessary. Other requirements in the DIP Rules are not similarly called out and there is no way to enforce this as the obligations to not relate to authorised DIP Users. To ensure that applicants are meeting the required standards for use of response codes, we suggest that DIP Manager should review, and if required, update the DIP Onboarding requirements as set out in DSD002 Annex 1. We note that response codes have been provided for the IF-051 which has not yet been implemented and the implementation date is not yet confirmed. If the IF-051 implementation date is expected to be after DCR0015, we suggest that the associated response codes are removed from DCR0015 and are included within a separate DIP Change Request.
Jonathan Coe	OVO Energy	Supplier;	No	Yes.	Yes. We have seen incidences of inconsistency in responses and use of response codes across the industry.	Yes.	No. DSD002 Annex XX and DIP L3-L4 Validation Guidance Note v1.5.pdf differ on details. We would like a single view to prevent any misunderstandings/discrepancies.	No – Table 1 doesn't contain all the codes from the same table in the DIP L3-L4 Validation Guidance Note v1.5.pdf. We would like a single view.	No – Table 2 doesn't align with Table 3 of the DIP L3-L4 Validation Guidance Note v1.5.pdf. We would like a single view.	No. We believe that the redline changes contradict the guidance note so it is still unclear on the codes in use and the messages they should be applied against. Further guidance is required on REP file validation responses.	The changes will incur costs for our DIP connection provider which may be passed on to OVO.	We agree with the implementation dates but require further information on the implementation approach.	We agree with the CR in principle but require clarification on the redline drafting before we can agree to the details within it. We would also welcome further clarity on the interactions with DCR0017, and the DIP Manager's intentions for progressing these two changes concurrently.
Dominiac Martin	Kraken Technologies Ltd	Supplier;Advanced Data Service;Smart Data Services;	No	Yes	There have been multiple times that our system has not met the requirements as they were intended due to the (initial) ambiguous documentation around status messages. This	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Since this form doesn't have a very large text box, I have provided feedback on this public URL: https://gist.githubusercontent.com/DomMartin27/1daff7abd3cb5f29ea2754a980c0f96e/raw/2b5997cc721de4d1ac8a4119944126683174c39b/gistfile1.txt

					has caused issues both for our system and to other DIP users.									
Dean Roberts	Stark / Siemens	Metering Services Advanced; Metering Services Smart ;	No	Yes	No as we are not live (yet)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, internal process updates.	Yes	No
Craig Donohue	National Grid Electricity Distribution	Distributor ;	No	Yes	Not directly, however it will reduce the amount of work that is currently being dedicated to this area by a significant amount. Through SCS and MPRS this change will update to Status Message Format to align with the Guidance Note Updates to validation to use the Mandatory RCP Code instead of a generic RCP1001 or RCP1022 Introduction of validation for Future Dated Sending and DIP Timestamps. Currently, MPRS accepts and queues future dated message until the	While we recognise the rationale behind the proposed solution and acknowledge the guidance provided by SCS (who administer both MPRS and Durabill), we cannot support it in its current form or timeframe. The intended restriction on validation applied to MPRS messages should help reduce the volume of invalid Status Messages, which is a positive outcome. However, the scale of change	No. Missing RCP1062, RCP1063, RCP1064, RCP9999	Yes	Taking guidance from SCS. For RCP1062 in Table 2 there are no valid scenarios where this Error Code can be used. Should RCP1062 be deleted? Typographic Errors: [LinkedImportExportCase] RelatedCase] It is not clear what the Y and N values mean. The table needs a legend to explicitly state that these validations must not be performed on these messages. MPRS receives high volumes of these N Status messages which causes a huge administrative overhead. The DIP rules must state that where the downstream provider believes there is an error with the message, a Service Desk Ticket must be raised and not a generic Error. Generic Errors are not actionable, especially at volume. Furthermore there is a risk of inconsistency between Elexon, LDSOs and suppliers if the same message is treated differently by different parties using the same codes within the Durabill system.	No, the guidance for populating Status Messages has not been included with in the DIP Rules. The population of Status Messages must be standardised and enforceable so that systems can reliably automate remediation. The solution does not fully resolve how validation failures at Elexon (e.g. IF-021 rejection) interact with downstream message distribution and rollback (IF-014). Existing DURABILL validations outside the guidance will continue to operate separately, meaning not all validation outcomes are covered by the new framework.	Costs to our organisation will come through SCS making the required changes to MPRS and Durabill. Estimated costs for DURABILL enhancements are £70k-£125k, depending on the implementation option. Additional internal costs will be required for deployment and testing.	No, we do not agree with the implementation approach as currently proposed. While SCS intend to deliver these changes as part of the MPRS June BSC Release, Status Clements Durabill requires a lead time of approximately 5 months to design, implement, and assure the necessary changes. This misalignment in delivery timelines presents a material risk. In addition, adequate time must be allowed for deployment and comprehensive testing. Without alignment across	We support the overall intent and direction of the change and recognise that it addresses a genuine and well-understood gap in the DIP Rules. However, there are significant practical, operational, and timing considerations that must be resolved before this can be implemented safely. As it stands, we are unable to support progression under the proposed timelines and approach. Alignment of delivery plans, realistic lead times, and sufficient testing windows will be essential to enable future support.	

					timestamp is equal to the MPRS System date then the message is assigned to a processing stream.	required for Durability is significant, and the proposed turnaround does not provide sufficient time to implement this safely and effectively. As such, we do not agree with the proposal as it currently stands.						systems and sufficient lead time, the approach is not viable.	
Neal Medley	UK Power Networks	Distributor ;	No	Yes	No, but our current design for the majority of our LDSO systems is based on previous discussions and agreement with the programme whereby status messages weren't required due to those systems just ingesting DIP messages, with the vast majority of those messages either being sent by the Registration Service (i.e. an internal system) or where the	Not for LDSO systems	-	-	It is unclear what the Y and N mean, and whether these apply (and indeed are appropriate) for all recipients of each message/Event Code	If extra status messages were to be introduced/mandated, it is still unclear what processes receivers of these would undertake e.g. if an LDSO system rejects an IF-021 for RCP1061 Invalid MPAN, what is the Data Service supposed to do with that? Particularly if no other recipients have reported a similar issue	Yes. As referenced in an earlier answer, most of our LDSO systems have been designed without the ability to create status messages following conversations and confirmation from the programme that it wasn't required. This functionality will therefore need to be built. We can only fully impact assess the costs once a design is formalised	No. If mandated to make these changes on LDSO systems, the time between decision publication and proposed implementation date is insufficient – we would require circa 6 months notice	Some DIP messages go to more than one LDSO system – e.g. the IF-021 goes to our DUoS billing system, our capacity management system and our reporting data warehouse. If this CR is approved, each of these receiving systems would be doing independent validation and sending back independent status messages. For RCP1061 in particular, MPAN validation will depend on the nature of the underlying usage of the system (e.g. the DUoS billing system only contains details of Advanced Connection Type MPANs). Please also note, UKPN have submitted a separate response for our Registration Service role and impacted system. Our analysis to date indicates our DIP Adaptor service (SWIM-Soak) is already performing the expected L3 validation. The Adaptor is unable to perform any L4 validation.

					LDSO is merely a Secondary recipient								
David Yeoman	UK Power Networks	Registration Service ;	No	<p>This remains unconfirmed, as the guidance notes and DSD002-Annex 2 (XX) address only some concerns regarding the use of status messages.</p> <p>Yes. As a Registration Service, we receive a large volume of status messages each day/week from recipients. The majority of these we identify as erroneous or generic, with a lack of proper explanation of the issue encountered. This is causing undue pressure on our Registration team's resources, as they try to determine whether there is a genuine issue with the registration system data or for example, the recipient system is responding erroneously. We</p>	<p>Conditional agreement subject to below comments being addressed.</p> <p>Conditional agreement, subject to amending the word 'potential' in DIP-CR-0015_DSD002-Annex2_v6.0_RED-LINED TEXT (section 7.4.5 [DSD002, Annex 5 outlines the response codes required for Level 3 and Level 4 message validations by DIP Users. These codes are mandatory for applicants, potential, and DIP Users within the message channel, as they support both synchronous and asynchronous message exchanges between DIP Users] to align with the definition in the 'DIP CR 0015: Introducing Level 3 & 4 Response Codes into the DIP Rules – Initial Assessment' document, which clarifies the term as 'potential DIP users'.</p>	<p>Yes, but not enough detailed information has been provided for each of them (including detailed check examples) for participants to correctly understand the usage of these codes. For example, we have started receiving what appears to be a 'hybrid' of codes & text, e.g. RCP1043 and RCP1006, i.e. "RCP1043 – Duplicate Message," with the help text stating: "Duplicate message – TransactionID and SenderUnique Reference must be unique."</p>	<p>Yes, we are supportive of the introduction of the table with codes, including the split by interface. However, there is important information missing, namely how the reader should interpret "N" and "Y" and the specific action expected. We would like to see a reference from this table back to Section 8.10, Error Handling & Message Distribution Patterns, in DIP-CR-0015_DSD002-Annex2_v6.0_RED-LINED TEXT, stating that messages sent by the Registration system are classified as the "System of Truth." Therefore, the listed RCP codes with the interface noted as "N" should not be responded to with a status message). Our observation is that, in most cases, recipient systems cannot correctly handle MPANs in Import/Export associations and related MPANs, and they reject Registration system messages on the basis that they have not been informed about the MPANs within the relationship or association.</p>	<p>Partially, for some of the codes, but not for all. We would welcome improvements in the handling of duplicate messages via status messages. We receive different types of messages, where in approximately 65% of cases there has been a timeout issue between the DIP and the recipient. After a DIP retry, the message is eventually delivered successfully to the recipient. We receive large volumes of status messages related to this scenario and believe that, if the message is successfully delivered, we as a Registration service do not need to take any action, nor should we be notified via a status message. The status message should only be sent after a 'terminal failure'. Investigating each</p>	<p>Yes, we can only fully impact assess the costs once a design is formalised.</p>	<p>We agree with the approach, but the timeline requires further validation and discussion.</p>	<p>Detailed examples of the required participant checks for each RCP code/scenario would be welcomed. This response is applicable to our Registration Service role and should be read in conjunction with the response submitted by our service provider for MPRS, St Clements Services. Please also note, UKPN have submitted a separate response for our LDSO role and impacted systems. Our analysis to date indicates our DIP Adaptor service (SWIM-SOAK) is already performing the expected L3 validation. The Adaptor is unable to perform any L4 validation.</p>		

also experience a high volume resulting from a timeout between the DIP and the recipient system. This results in additional status messages incoming to the Registration Service which we should not be expected to handle.

message manually in the DIP portal puts significant pressure on our resources. Similarly, in around 34% of cases, there has been a timeout between the DIP and the recipient, but other participants have received the message successfully, while the impacted party has rejected the message. In these instances, we would expect not to receive any status message until the other party has made reasonable efforts and a sufficient number of attempts to reply to the message. In the remaining 1% of cases, we have seen message failures between the DIP and the recipient marked as "internal server error." It is unclear from the DIP portal whether this issue originates on the DIP side or the recipient side, and whether the recipient can replay the message themselves. A formal clarification on this in would be appreciated.

Simon Harrison	Callisto/M group Energy	Advanced Data Service ;Metering Services Advanced; Metering Services Smart ;Smart Data Services;	No	Yes	Yes - we need to update some of our validation rules, but this is a low effort change for us	Yes. We believe the adoption and enforcement of consistent L3/L4 validation across all participants will help reduce avoidable exceptions	We would propose that the use of 'mandatory' application of validation, but that then the detail of validation being mandatory, conditional, optional is not as clear as it could be.	We are largely in agreement, but would appreciate the ability to discuss a couple of RCP codes to ensure we understand exactly what is being proposed	We are largely in agreement, but would appreciate the ability to discuss a couple of RCP codes to ensure we understand exactly what is being proposed	Yes, subject to our comment above. Specifically, as a DS provider, we are concerned about ambiguity in how we could/should use RCP1061 and RCP1062. We think that the tables have inconsistent definitions. We are not sure where RCP1062 would ever be used.	Yes	Yes	We would appreciate the opportunity to discuss our comments around which codes a DS is allowed to use, and particularly around how we should respond to receipt of unknown MPANs when we do not appear to be able to use RCP1061
Barry Smith	IMSERV	Advanced Data Service; Smart Data Services Metering Services Advanced; Metering Services Smart	No	Yes	No Impact	Yes	Yes, it appears in line with the content in the original DES138 catalogue.	yes	Yes	Yes	No, this will not incur costs.	Yes	No.
Richard French	PDA	Unmetered Supplies Data Service	No	Yes	No Impact	Yes	Yes, it appears in line with the content in the original DES138 catalogue.	yes	Yes	Yes	No, this will not incur costs.	Yes	No.
Katy Binch	C&C Group Holdings Ltd	DIP Connection Provider	No	Yes	No	C&C have no objection to creating a new annex, however we are seeking clarity against the content contained within Tables 1 and 2	Unable to answer until outstanding queries resolved DES138 v5.8.9 also contains RCP1063, RCP1064 and RCP9999. Are these expected to be included in the proposed annex too?	We are not clear why these five response codes are only being applied at interface level. For example, RCP1061 (Invalid MPAN), if an invalid MPAN was found in an IF-001 is it expected that the receiving party should not be able to reject this back to the sending party?	Unable to answer until outstanding queries resolved	Unable to answer until outstanding queries resolved	No	Yes	No.

Change Management	Northern Powergrid	Distributor, Registration Service, Unmetered Supplies Operato	No	Yes	Yes	No Missing RCP1062, RCP1063, RCP1064, RCP9999	Yes	<p>For RCP1062 in Table 2, there are no valid scenarios in which this error code can be applied. Should RCP1062 therefore be removed? Typographical errors identified: · LinkedImportExport Case] · RelatedCase]</p> <p>Additionally, the meaning of the Y and N values is unclear. The table requires a legend that explicitly states that these validations must not be performed on the relevant messages. MPRS receives a high volume of N status messages, which results in a significant administrative burden. The DIP rules must clearly state that, where a downstream provider believes a message contains an error, a Service Desk ticket must be raised rather than issuing a generic error. Generic errors are not actionable, particularly when received in high volumes.</p>	No, the guidance for populating Status Messages has not been included with in the DIP Rules. The population of Status Messages must be standardised and enforceable so that systems can reliably automate remediation	Yes, we are unable to provide costs as we are awaiting a detailed impact assessment. We anticipate the impact to be low.	Yes	How are the DIP rules enforced? If a DIP user applies validation excluded in Table 2 what are the consequences?
-------------------	--------------------	---	----	-----	-----	---	-----	---	---	--	-----	---

