DCUSA

DCP 344 Working Group Meeting 07

10 February 2021 at 10:00am
Teleconference

Attendees	Company
Working Group Members	
Donna Townsend [DT]	Energy Asset Pipelines
Tim Porter [TP]	SSEN
Mark Jones [MJ]	SSE Energy Supply
Karl Maryon [KM]	Haven Power
Peter Waymont [PW]	UKPN
George Barnes [GB]	Utilita
Ian Goudge [IG]	SSE
Code Administrator	
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
George Dawson [GD] (Technical Secretary)	ElectraLink

1. Administration

1.1 The Chair welcomed the members to the meeting. The Secretariat noted Rebecca Cailes had provided her apologies prior to the meeting.

1.2 The Working Group reviewed the "Competition Law Guidance". All Working Group members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.

1.3 The Working Group reviewed the minutes from the last meeting and agreed that the minutes were an accurate reflection of the discussions held.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

2.1 The Chair noted that the purpose of this meeting was to go through the industry feedback received from the consultation which was sent out on 04 January 2021.

3. Review of Consultation Responses

3.1 The Group review the consultation responses. Key points from these discussions are detailed below:

- Question 1 (*Do you understand the intent of the CP?):*
  - The Group noted that all respondents were comfortable in their understanding of the CP.

- Question 2 (*Are you supportive of the principles of the CP?):*
  - The Group noted that all respondents were comfortable in their support of the principles raised in the CP.

- Question 3 (*Do you encounter any issues with the current processes of manual billing?):*
  - The Group queried whether receiving invoices in a batch is more complex and time consuming than individual invoices. It was noted that CVA registrants are not necessarily party to the DTS and so may not be able to get the same E-billing solutions as DCUSA Parties, and so there will likely need to be a non-E-billing solution made to carve out CVA billing.

- Question 4 (*What are your views on Option A, Option B Option C and what is your preferred option and why?):*
  - The Group noted that Option B was the most preferred Option chosen by the respondents with 5 out of 7 choosing it. However, a common theme coming out of the consultation was the need to understand the costs associated with Option B to ensure it was a viable option. One respondent noted that if Option B becomes cost prohibitive, then Option A would be their second choice. A member noted that the responses from the initial consultation will need to be added to these to get an overall understanding of the view from industry. No respondent was in favour of Option C.

- Question 5 (*What will be the impacts on your internal systems if Option A, Option B or Option C is implemented?*):
  - It was noted that for Option B, there will be little impact for Parties already the DUoS e-billing service. For Parties not currently using the service they would require sight of the financial impacts this change would have to determine whether this is a viable option.

- Question 6 (*Do you agree that DCP 344 should only relate to the Clause 21 'Site-Specific Billing and Payment'? If not, please give reasons*):
  - The respondents believed that DCP 344 should only relate to Clause 21.

- Question 7 (*Do you have any other comments on the DCP 344?):*
  - The Group noted that there were no additional comments made by any Party in their Consultation response.

4. Review Solutions

4.1 The Working Group noted that in both the consultations, only one Party was supportive of Option C, so therefore it was agreed to remove this as a potential solution for DCP 344. Regarding preferred options, an action was taken to review both the first and second consultation to determine overall what the numbers were in support of each option.

4.2 PW took an action to investigate with ElectraLink the potential costs associated with DCUSA Ltd procuring the DUoS e-billing service. It was also note that prior to this he will provide a verbal update to the DCUSA Board on 17th February.

ACTION 07/01: PW investigate with ElectraLink the potential costs associated with DCUSA Ltd procuring the DUoS e-billing service.

4.3 Once these costings have been received, it was agreed that the Secretariat will issue those details to industry for 2 weeks through an RFI to provide a final opportunity for respondents to state their preferred option.

4.4 The Working Group also reviewed the proposed standard template for the manual billing solution. In this review members noted that a VAT code would need to be put into the spreadsheet and a taxation solution for non-UK based companies would also need to be arranged. An action was taken to review these fields against the mandatory fields in the D2021 flow to ensure consistency and to establish whether the proposed spreadsheet will be sufficient to act as an invoice.

4.5 DT raised the questions as to whether this CP should be extended to also cover similar aspects of Section 2B regarding DNO to IDNO billing and after discussion it was agreed to add this as a question when issuing out the RFI.

ACTION 07/02: Secretariat to research into what fields would be necessary in the manual invoice template for Option A.

Post Meeting Note – preferred option based on first and second DCP 344 industry consultations.

4.6 After reviewing both consultations, there were a total of 18 respondents. 1 respondent replied to both consultations and therefore have only been counted once for the purposes of this exercise. Below provides details of the number of Parties supportive of each option:

- Option A – **11**
- Option B – **3**
- Option C – **1**
- No preferred option currently – **2**

5. Determine Next Steps

5.1 The Group agreed that once the financials for Option B have been detailed and understood, they should be shared to Industry via an RFI. Once this has been shared to Industry and views returned, there could be a greater understanding of the appropriate next steps for the Change.

5.2 The date of the next Working Group will be confirmed shortly.

6. Any Other Business

6.1 There were no further items of AOB and the Chair closed the meeting.

New and open actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
07/01	PW investigate with ElectraLink the potential costs associated with DCUSA Ltd procuring the DUoS e-billing service.	Peter Waymont	
07/02	Secretariat to research into what fields would be necessary in the manual invoice template for Option A.	ElectraLink	

Closed actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
04/01	Secretariat to explore whether the DUoS E-billing data fields can be shared with the Working Group.	ElectraLink	Closed
04/02	Secretariat to update the pros and cons table to include Option A and circulate to Working Group for comments.	ElectraLink	Closed
04/03	Secretariat to explore ways of ensuring appropriate smaller Supplier engagement, which will include engaging with xxx, which meets on xxx November.	ElectraLink	Closed
04/04	CT to consider some tailored questions for the smaller Suppliers to ensure we receive the appropriate feedback required.	Claire Towler	Closed
05/01	Secretariat to provide an update on the status of DCP 344 following SSE internal review	ElectraLink	Closed
06/01	Secretariat to draft a tailored consultation to engage with smaller Supplier.	ElectraLink	Completed
01/04	DT and PW to explore the potential of DCUSA procuring the automated DUoS e-Billing data flow from ElectraLink.	Donna Townsend and Peter Waymont	Closed