|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DCUSA Consultation** | | At what stage is this document in the process? |
| DCP 312:  Standardisation of the Reporting of HH Portfolio Billing Data by EDNOs.  *Date raised 10th October 2017*  *Proposer Donna Townsend*  *Company ESP Electricity Ltd*  *Company Category IDNO* | | |  | | --- | | **01 – Change Proposal** | | **02 – Consultation** | | **03 – Change Report** | | **04 – Change Declaration** | |
| Purpose of Change Proposal:  To develop a consistent approach to the formatting of HH Portfolio Billing data for reporting purposes under Schedule 19. | | |
| Description: Description: YES_GREEN | The Workgroup recommends that this Change Proposal should:   * proceed to Consultation  Parties are invited to consider the questions set in section 10 and submit comments using the form attached as Attachment 1 to dcusa@electralink.co.uk by **xx xxxx 2018.** DCP 312 has been designated as a Part 1 Matter and a standard change.  The Working Group will consider the consultation responses and determine the appropriate next steps for the progression of the Change Proposal (CP). | |
|  | Impacted Parties: DNOs, IDNOs | |
|  | Impacted Clauses: Schedule 19 | |

***Guidance On The Use Of This Template****:*

*Code Administrators will produce this Report using the original proposal as the source.*

*The Workgroup will verify all of the information provided, adding the Impact Assessment.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Contents  1. Summary 3  2 Governance 5  3 Why Change? 5  4 Working Group Assessment 10  5 Legal Text and Spreadsheet Template 13  6 Relevant Objectives 13  7 Impacts & Other Considerations 14  8 Implementation 16  9 Consultation Questions 17  Timetable  The timetable for the progression of the CP is as follows: Change Proposal timetable  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Change Proposal timetable:** | | | Activity | Date | | Initial Assessment Report Approved by Panel | 11 October 2017 | | Consultation issued to Parties | 7 February 2018 | | Change Report issued to Panel | 11 April 2018 | | Change Report issued for Voting | 20 April 2018 | |  |  | | Party Voting Ends | 11 May 2018 | | Change Declaration Issued to Parties | 15 May 2018 | | Authority Decision | 19 June 2018 | | Implementation | First Release following Authority Approval | | **Any questions?** |
| Contact:  **Code Administrator** |
| **DCUSA@electralink .co.uk** |
| **02074323000** |
| Proposer:  **Donna Townsend** |
| **donna.townsend@espug.com** |
| **01372 587500** |

1. Summary

#### What?

## The Distribution Connection and Use of System Agreement (DCUSA) is a multi-party contract between electricity distributors, electricity suppliers and large generators. Parties to the DCUSA can raise Change Proposals (CPs) to amend the Agreement with the consent of other Parties and (where applicable) the Authority.

## This CP proposes that Schedule 19 is changed to ensure portfolio billing data is provided in a consistent manner by all Embedded Distribution Network Operators[[1]](#footnote-1) (EDNOs) and that it includes all Metering Point Administration Numbers (MPANs) associated with any invoice (for Distribution Network Operators’ (DNOs) reconciliation purposes), and that credit/rebilling is consistently reported as two separate rows. (Attachment 2)

#### Why?

## DNOs currently experience administration issues with EDNO Portfolio Billing as data is currently provided in a number of formats and there is no consistency as to how credit/rebilling should be reported. This issue will be compounded with the increasing number of EDNOs entering the market. Standardising the reporting format will reduce the administration currently experienced by DNOs.

## It is also important that all MPANs are listed for multi-MPAN invoices so that reconciliation can be made back to the registration data provided by the EDNOs as this will avoid queries with the data.

#### How?

## By amending Schedule 19 to clarify what is required and publishing an excel template which shows the format of the data requirements..

1. Governance

#### Justification for Part 1 Matter

## Part 1 matter as it is likely to discriminate in its effects between one or another Party as per Clause 9.4.3 of DCUSA. Please refer to additional information below.

#### Requested Next Steps

## Following a review of the Consultation responses, the Working Group will progress to Change Report stage on completion of an Impact Assessment.

1. Why Change?

#### Background of DCP 312

## Under Schedule 19 of DCUSA, EDNOs provide a spreadsheet for HH site specific data via a spreadsheet on a monthly basis. Albeit the data items are identified, the reporting of bills requiring a credit/rebill and the information on multiple MPANs associated with a bill are not in a standardised form.

## By applying a consistent approach to the EDNOs’ credit/rebill and multiple MPAN reporting, this CP will improve the processing of this information by DNOs without any need for reformatting or bespoke tailoring and therefore reduce the administration currently experienced by DNOs. Without this common approach the administration of this activity may be compounded as more EDNOs enter the market.

## A previous attempt, DCP281[[2]](#footnote-2), sought to ensure that HH data was reported to DNOs in a consistent manner by all EDNOs and to define how revised data must be reported. Revised data was referring to credit/rebill. The CP was raised as a Part 2 matter and therefore progressed under self-governance. Although the need for a standardised format was broadly supported, the CP failed because an alternative was raised, causing the voting to be split with no clear majority. The difference between the two CPs being how multiple MPANs associated with a bill would be shown within the spreadsheet and resulted in costs to DNOs dependent upon the solution chosen. This demonstrates that focusing on one preferred method to standardise this reporting, in a manner that enables DNOs to reconcile the data provided and hence gives controls, had a discriminating impact on different parties

|  |
| --- |
| Q1: Do you understand the intent of the change proposal? |
| Q2: Do you agree with the principles of the change proposal? Please provide your rationale |

1. Code Specific Matters

#### Reference Documents

* 1. n/a

1. Working Group Assessment

#### DCP 305 Working Group Assessment

## The Working Group reviewed the DCP 312 legal text and associated example template(Attachment 2) and also considered the consultation and voting outcomes of DCP 281.

## Upon completion of this review, the Working Group agreed that there were a number of various limitations of current DNO, EDNO and Supplier systems due to differing system architecture, and it was agreed that based on these differences there are two viable solutions for this proposal:

## **Option 1:** Each MPAN on a multi-MPAN bill has its own row on the bill spreadsheet, with the ‘Lead’ MPAN (the first row) containing all consumption data for the entire bill, and the other MPANs for the bill having the consumption data set to 0. This has been included in Attachment 3 highlighted in green; or

## **Option 2**: Each MPAN on a multi-MPAN bill has its own row on the bill spreadsheet, with the totalconsumption data for the entire bill being spread over all of the MPANs based on the consumption data for that MPAN. This has been included in Attachment 3 highlighted in blue.

## It was agreed that both of these approaches could accommodate cancellations and re-bills, with the Option 1 approach showing the first set of bill data as a negative value for the first MPAN only and the remaining MPANs continue showing 0’s, followed by the updated 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.

## 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 data.

**Q4: Which option do you prefer? Please provide rationale.**

**Q3: Can you support both options? Please provide rationale.**

1. Legal Text

## This change proposes to modify Schedule 19 Section 3 to provide clarity and consistency of how the EDNOs’ HH credit/rebill data , and multiple MPANs associated with a bill are submitted to the DNO as set out below;

## Wording added to Clause 3.2 – “Where revised data is received by the EDNO and rebilled, a credit row and new debit row should be reported”. In the proposed spreadsheet template a credit re-bill is displayed using two separate lines, the first line shows the negative value of the original invoice and the second line shows the value of the new invoice.

## Clause 3.3 lists the data items to be included in respect of each invoice raised on a HH settled connectee.

## Clause 3.4 is modified to require EDNOs to use the template spreadsheet which is proposed to be inserted as Appendix A to Schedule 19 and report all data within the same tab. The wording “Where any data item was not present or had a value of zero in the invoice raised, the report shall show zero for that data item” is introduced in reference to the population of the proposed template.

## Clause 4.2 has been introduced to reflect the approach taken for HH Site Specific Data in Clause 3.4 in the MPAN Report. In Clause 4 the wording proposed is “Where there are no half-hourly-settled Connectees, the EDNO shall submit a nil return”.

## It was noted by the Working Group that the currently proposed legal text includes a reference to the use of Excel 2003. The Working Group would like to understand whether there is an opportunity to update the version based on Parties feedback on the version they use. Based on the information received the Working Group will determine whether the version number can be updated to a later version that all Parties could support

**5: Do you have any comments on the legal text**

**Q6: Which version of excel does your company use?**

1. Relevant Objectives

## **Assessment Against the DCUSA Objectives**

* 1. For a DCUSA Change Proposal to be approved it must be demonstrated that it better meets the DCUSA Objectives. The Working Group is interested in parties’ views on which of the following DCUSA General Objectives are better facilitated by this change and why.
  2. The Proposer’s view on which DCUSA General Objectives are better facilitated have been included below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DCUSA General Objectives** | **Identified impact** |
| 1 The development, maintenance and operation by the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of efficient, co-ordinated, and economical Distribution Networks | None |
| 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 |
| 3 The efficient discharge by the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of obligations imposed upon them in their Distribution Licences | None |
| 4 The promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the DCUSA | Positive |
| 5 Compliance with the Regulation on Cross-Border Exchange in Electricity and any relevant legally binding decisions of the European Commission and/or the Agency for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators. | None |
| Objective 4 will be better facilitated as the introduction of this change will provide a clear and standardised defined method to provide HH Portfolio data to the DNO. This will enable DNOs to manage all EDNOs’ HH Portfolio billing data in a consistent manner. |  |

* 1. The Proposer believes that Objective 4 will be better facilitated as the introduction of this change will provide a clear and standardised defined method to provide HH Portfolio data to the DNO. This will enable DNOs to manage all EDNOs’ HH Portfolio billing data in a consistent manner.
  2. The Working Group is seeking views from Parties on whether the DCUSA objectives are better facilitated by this change proposal.

**Q7: Are the DCUSA Objectives are better facilitated by this change proposal. Please provide your rationale.**

1. Impacts & Other Considerations

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

## The Working Group do not believe that this change has any impact on a Significant Code Review or any other significant industry change project.

#### Environmental Impacts

## In accordance with DCUSA Clause 11.14.6, the Working Group assessed whether there would be a material impact on greenhouse gas emissions if DCP 305 were implemented. The Working Group did not identify any material impact on greenhouse gas emissions from the implementation of this CP.

#### Engagement with the Authority

## Ofgem has been fully engaged throughout the development of DCP 312 as an observer on the Working Group.

**Q8: Are you aware of any wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP?**

|  |
| --- |
| Q9: **Are there any alternative solutions or unintended consequences that should be considered by the Working Group?** |

1. Implementation

## The proposed implementation date for this change is the next DCUSA release following Authority approval.

## The Working Group would like your views on the proposed implementation date and whether you believe there needs to be a lead time associated with each option.

**Q10: When should this change proposal be implemented for:**

**Option 1, and**

**Option 2.**

**Please provide your rationale**

1. Consultation Questions

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Number** | **Questions** |
|  | Do you understand the intent of the change proposal? |
|  | Do you agree with the principles of the change proposal? Please provide your rationale |
|  | Can you support both options? Please provide rationale. |
|  | Which option do you prefer? Please provide rationale. |
|  | Do you have any comments on the legal text |
|  | Which version of excel does your company use? |
|  | Are the DCUSA Objectives are better facilitated by this change proposal. Please provide your rationale. |
|  | Are you aware of any wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP? |
|  | Are there any alternative solutions or unintended consequences that should be considered by the Working Group? |
|  | When should this change proposal be implemented for:  Option 1, and  Option 2.  Please provide your rationale. |

## Responses should be submitted using Attachment 1 to dcusa@electralink.co.uk no later than **xx xxxx 2018.**

## 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.

#### Attachments

* Attachment 1 – Party response form
* Attachment 2 – Change Proposal including initial legal text and spreadsheet template
* Attachment 3 – Legal text for each option
* Attachment 4 – excel spreadsheet showing both options

1. A term used within Schedule 19 which refers to Independent Distribution Network Operators and Distribution Network Operators operating outside of their Distribution Service Area. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [DCP281 – changes to Schedule 19 - portfolio billing](https://www.dcusa.co.uk/Lists/Change%20Proposal%20Register/DispForm.aspx?ID=306&Source=https%3A%2F%2Fwww%2Edcusa%2Eco%2Euk%2FSitePages%2FActivities%2FChange%2DProposal%2DRegister%2DArchive%2Easpx%23InplviewHash35f4ef25%2Df112%2D41cb%2D9311%2Ddac2d3455147%3DPaged%253DTRUE%2Dp%5FDCP%253D286%2Dp%5FID%253D312%2DPageFirstRow%253D11&ContentTypeId=0x0100684A1DE09E1F9740A444434CF581D435) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)