

DCUSA SIG Meeting 86 Minutes

27 July 2018 at 10:00am
Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Terry Carr [TC]	E.ON
Richard Dakin [RD]	E.ON
Karl Maryon [KM]	Haven Power
Claire Towler [CT]	SSE
Julia Haughey [JH]	EDF Energy
David Spillet [DS]	Energy Networks
Richard Ellis [RE]	Western Power
Code Administrator	
John Lawton [JL] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Shahin Miah [SM] (technical secretariat)	ElectraLink
Dylan Townsend [DT]	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC]	Electralink

1. Administration

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the members to the meeting.
- 1.2 The Group reviewed the “Competition Law Do’s and Don’ts”. All members agreed to be bound by the Competition Laws Do’s and Don’ts for the duration of the meeting.
- 1.3 The Secretariat noted there was no feedback from the DCUSA Panel.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair welcomed the Working Group to the call and quickly ran through the agenda to be covered by the meeting. The Chair provided an update on DIF 50, informing the Working Group that a Change Proposal (DCP 326) had been raised and was now at the Working Group stage. The Working Group

were reminded to join the Working Group should they have any further input and that DIF 50 had now been closed.

3. Review of DIF 53 'National Terms of Connection - De- Energisation'

- 3.1 The Chair informed the Working Group of the issue raised by a member of the Standing Issues Group (SIG) regarding "De-Energisation" within the National Terms of Connection. This was then handed over to the issue owner for further details.
- 3.2 The issue was raised by the Energy Networks Association as a consequence of a comment made by a member of the Distribution Code. Currently the National Terms of Connection states that a customer must gain authorisation from the DNO prior to wishing to undertake an Emergency De-energisation, even if there is a risk to life. This was opened to the Working Group for discussion, particularly towards the DNOs present on the call. The proposer suggested deleting such an authorisation or amending it so that the authorisation was only applicable in case of personal injury and not for property. One member suggested that a slight amendment to the wording would suffice.
- 3.3 It was agreed that a few sentences clearly stating what a customer is able to do in the event of an emergency, should suffice.
- 3.4 The Chair asked if an RFI would be required to which the issue owner stated there was sufficient information to progress this to the Change Proposal (CP) stage. Another member mentioned that an RFI with the DNOs could uncover a process which is in use that avoids the need for a Change Proposal.
- 3.5 It was agreed that it would be quicker to go through a Working Group meeting via the Change Proposal process. The issue owner confirmed they would report back to the Distribution Code Panel, draft a CP and seek a sponsor from the distributor community prior to the forthcoming DCUSA Panel paper day on 8 August 2018. They also confirmed the wording would be very specific to outline that Emergency De-energisation should only be an option if there was an imminent risk to life and not a risk to property.
- 3.6 There were no further comments, so the Chair moved onto the next item.

ACTION 86/01: Proposer to seek a sponsor and draft Change Proposal before the next DCUSA paper day on 08 August 2018.

4. Agenda Items for the next meeting

- 4.1 No items were noted

5. Any Other Business – E-Billing Methods Review

- 5.1 The Chair handed over to a member of the SIG who raised an issue regarding E-Billing, the issue being shared with SIG members as a late paper.
- 5.2 The issue owner explained this was related to DCP 307 which was to be withdrawn, with the intent to raise a new CP for E-Billing after discussions in the SIG around this topic, ensuring a more robust and well-rounded proposal is tabled.
- 5.3 The issue owner explained that in their opinion data flow D2021 should be used for billing across the industry, however, it was expensive. Currently not all within the industry were using the data flows for billing purposes. The other method of billing was emails with attachments for manual billing or post. It was mentioned that this approach resulted in an increase in workloads and risks.

- 5.4 The issue owner asked explained that a number of concerns were raised during the DCP307 meeting and that prior to raising an alternative CP they wanted to gauge opinion from the industry on what options are available with hopefully a common approach being agreed for all.
- 5.5 The Chair mentioned that DCP 307 was specific for IDNOs to use the data flow and this excluded Distributors since the current drafting facilitates the option to use and as such they could decide not to in the future. The proposed CP should be more inclusive and should specify if the change would affect remittance as well as billing.
- 5.6 The Chair also mentioned the current legal text was very open and asked if the new proposal was looking to mandate the Billing method? It was stated the ideal resolution would be uniformity across all, not to mandate any one process.
- 5.7 The Chair mentioned DCP 145 - and suggested looking back over that as this type of change had been attempted previously and was rejected by the Authority.
- 5.8 The Chair listed the different ways billing was completed currently and gave the opinion that the issue was whether billing types are optional or mandated. One member of the Working Group mentioned consistency was key going forward, as options lead to further work before processing E Billing.
- 5.9 The issue owner asked if there was a scope to develop a two-tier solution? An option for data flows to be used as well as spreadsheets? The Chair said these were currently the choices as per the legal text, however there were areas where these could be developed further in order to ensure that whatever method is used a common approach is delivered and cited a recent change associated with distributor to distributor billing that states how a spreadsheet should look and what date items are required and in what order (DCP312 - Standardisation of the Reporting of HH Portfolio Billing Data by EDNOs which is awaiting implementation).
- 5.10 The issue owner stated a draft CP could be completed by the next DCUSA Panel paper say, 8 August 2018. It was asked how long this may take to implement to which the Chair stated that it would depend on whether this CP would affect current Billing systems. If it was just wording that needed updating, the change would not take as long. Ultimately, it depended on which route is taken.
- 5.11 The Working Group discussed different options for billing including the removal of manual billing. This would affect smaller suppliers as an automated system would cost more money. It was suggested that the use of spreadsheets via email for billing purposes could help streamline the process for those who were currently using a manual billing process.
- 5.12 One concern is not to lose D2021/26 data flows as some bigger suppliers are only using this method.
- 5.13 It was stated that the change would target those who are not using DCUSA e billing. It would be inherently important to find out who is not currently using DCUSA E-billing. We will need to get smaller suppliers and those who would be affected by this change to engage in this issue.
- 5.14 The Chair asked if this change would focus on Billing only? Or would it include remittance as well? It was clarified that the change would focus on the entirety of billing, including remittance and credit as well.
- 5.15 The Chair informed the Working Group that currently, there was nothing in the DCUSA that mentioned remittance. The Chair proceeded to read out section 21.2B:

Where the Company submits, and the User agrees to receive, accounts by sending an electronic invoice it shall use an electronic invoice for all of that User's accounts (including revised accounts and credit-

notes). For the avoidance of doubt, where this Clause 21.2B applies, Clause 59.4 shall apply to the sending of accounts during any period in which the Date Transfer Network is unavailable.

There is nothing within clause 23 that covers the user sending a remittance.

- 5.16 It was summarised that effectively, it would be ideal to standardise the sending of invoices and remittance for any method chosen, so that everyone is sending it in a consistent manner. The issue owner agreed with this statement.
- 5.17 The proposer concluded that there was sufficient information and understanding of the issue for raising a Change Proposal. It was agreed that a CP form would be completed by the next DCUSA Panel paper day, 8 August 2018.

ACTION 86/02: Proposer to draft a Change Proposal before the next DCUSA paper day on 08 August 2018

- 5.18 There were no further comments so the Chair closed the meeting.

6. Date of Next Meeting:

- 6.1 The SIG has a standing timetable. The meetings take place on the last Friday of each month subject to any issues being tabled for discussion

7. Attachments

- Attachment 1 – DIF 53 “National Terms of Connection - De-energisation.”
- Attachment 2 – National Terms of Connection
- Attachment 3 – DIF – Billing and remittance via data flow (AOB item)

New and open actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
86/01	Proposer to seek a sponsor and draft Change Proposal before the next DCUSA paper day on 08 August 2018 associated with DIF53.	SIG Issue proposer	
86/02	draft a Change Proposal before the next DCUSA paper day on 08 August 2018 associated with the method of invoicing.	SIG Issue proposer	
