

# DCP 312 Working Group Meeting 01

12 December 2017 at 10:00am

Skype Meeting

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Donna Townsend [DT]	ESP
Peter Waymont [PW]	UKPN
Steven Grant [SG]	Scottish Power Energy Networks
Tim Aldridge [TA]	Ofgem
Tim Porter [TPo]	SSE
Tracey Pitcher [TP]	WPD
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
John Lawton [JL] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Dan Fittock [DF] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink

## 1. Welcomes and Apologies

- 1.1 The Secretariat noted the welcome and apologies for this meeting.

## 2. Administration

- 2.1 The Working Group reviewed the DCP 312 Terms of Reference (ToR). All Working Group members agreed to the terms.
- 2.2 The Working Group reviewed the “*Competition Law Do’s and Don’ts*”. All Working Group members agreed to be bound by the Competition Laws Do’s and Don’ts for the duration of the meeting.

## 3. Purpose of the Meeting

- 3.1 The secretariat set out that the purpose of the meeting is to review and analyse the Change Proposal (CP) and to discuss what should be included within the consultation document.

#### 4. Working Group review of DCP 312 Change Proposal

---

- 4.1 The Proposer explained the background of the proposal, noting that the intent of this proposal is to align HH portfolio billing practices across all DNOs and IDNOs.
- 4.2 It was further noted that this proposal is a follow-on from DCP 281, where the main concern related to how multiple MPAN sites were billed. As a result of this, it was agreed that the DCP 281 Consultation Responses should be reviewed to ensure that the concerns raised in these responses are adequately addressed by the intent and solution of DCP 312.

##### Review of DCP 281 Consultation Responses

- 4.3 Upon review, it appears that two DNOs that responded to the DCP 281 consultation did not utilise a HH billing process which details each MPAN on multi-MPAN sites.
- 4.4 DT clarified that where their response to the 281 consultation was considered unclear, ESP support the inclusion of all MPANs on HH portfolio bills rather than just including a lead MPAN to represent the site. It was noted that the inclusion of all MPANs on HH portfolio billing would ensure transparent billing practices and enable a greater level of validation to be undertaken by DNOs.

##### Potential Solutions

- 4.5 The Working Group reviewed the proposed template as provided as part of the CP Form. Upon discussion of the various limitations of current DNO, IDNO and Supplier system architecture, it was agreed that there are two viable solutions for this proposal:
- **Option 1:** Each MPAN on a multi-MPAN site has its own line on the bill spreadsheet, with the 'Lead' MPAN containing all consumption data for the entire site, and the other MPANs for the site having the consumption data set to 0. This has been included in Attachment 1 highlighted in green; or
  - **Option 2:** Each MPAN on a multi-MPAN site has its own line on the bill spreadsheet, with the total consumption data for the entire site being spread over all of the MPANs. This has been included in Attachment 1 highlighted in blue.
- 4.6 It was agreed that both of these approaches could accommodate cancellations and re-bills, with the Option 1 approach showing the first set of site data for the site as a negative value for the first MPAN only and the remaining MPANs continue showing 0's, followed by the updated consumption data in the next set of site showing the new data under the first MPAN and the rest of the MPANs consumption data remaining as 0.
- 4.7 For the second option for cancellations and re-bills, all of the consumption data for each MPAN on a site would show a negative value in the first set of site data, followed by the correct consumption data per MPAN on the subsequent set of site data.
-

- 4.8 Some Working Group members queried whether this change in approach regarding HH portfolio billing would impact Suppliers. DT agreed to take an action to investigate this and report back at the next Working Group meeting.

#### **ACTION 01/01 - DT**

- 4.9 As a result of these discussions, the Working Group agreed to the following consultation questions:

- Can you support both solutions?
- Which option to you prefer? Please provide rationale.

#### Legal Text Review

- 4.10 The Working Group agreed to review the proposed legal text, with the only amendment being agreed was that the reference to Excel 2003 may require a review. It was agreed that a question to this effect should be added to the consultation document.
- 4.11 It was further agreed that the legal text should be provided in the first consultation to allow industry to feed in comments on this as part of their review.

### **5. Work Plan**

- 5.1 The DCP 312 Working Group reviewed the Work Plan and made a number of amendments. This has been included as Attachment 3.

### **6. Any Other Business**

- 6.1 There were no items of any other business discussed and the Chair closed the meeting.

### **7. Date of Next Meeting**

- 7.1 The Working Group agreed for the next meeting to be arranged ex-committee.

### **Attachments**

- Attachment 1 – DCP 312 Change Proposal
- Attachment 2 – DCP 312 Proposed Template Solutions
- Attachment 3 – DCP 312 Work Plan

## Appendix 1: New and open actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
<b>01/01</b>	To investigate Supplier impacts of the revised approach to HH portfolio billing.	Donna Townsend	