

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	1. Do you understand the intent of DCP 416?	Working Group Comments
<b>UKPN</b>		Yes.	
<b>SPEN</b>		Yes.	
<b>BUUK</b>		We believe so however there is a level of ambiguity about the scope. It is our understanding that under MHHS we would still be able to continue with the current site-specific billing process – as such, the queries relating to making e-billing mandatory are somewhat confusing.	
<b>Energy Assets</b>		Yes.	
<b>British Gas</b>		Yes.	
<b>ENWL</b>		Yes.	
<b>NGED</b>		Yes.	
<b>NPg</b>		Yes.	
Working Group Conclusions:			

Company	Confidential/	2. Are you supportive of the principles of DCP 416?	Working Group Comments
---------	---------------	---	------------------------

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

	Anonymous		
<b>UKPN</b>		Yes.	
<b>SPEN</b>		Yes.	
<b>BUUK</b>		<p>Yes, we support the principles of DCP-416, i.e. the introduction of the new DIP-flow to support half-hourly e-billing processes subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This flow being under DCUSA/BSC governance and open to public scrutiny</li> <li>- As a result of being in governance, subject to oversight by appropriate governing bodies, i.e. OFGEM.,</li> </ul> <p>We do not currently use electralink e-billing, as such we cannot comment on something which is not currently part of our internal processes. However, we would highlight some concerns that should this become mandatory, the legal text as drafted would require us to adopt the D2021, which we would not support.</p> <p>Therefore, we are not prepared to support mandatory e-billing without further review.</p>	
<b>Energy Assets</b>		Only for the introduction of a new site-specific electronic billing flow in the post MHHS environment.	
<b>British Gas</b>		Yes.	

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

<b>ENWL</b>		Although we understand the benefits of moving to a DIP flow, we would support additional work being undertaken to see if the existing D2021 could be modified and retained rather than introducing a new DIP flow.	
<b>NGED</b>		Yes.	
<b>NPg</b>		Yes.	
Working Group Conclusions:			

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	3. Do you have any comments on the strawman flow structure for site specific billing? Are there any other data items that you would add or remove?	Working Group Comments
<b>UKPN</b>		For the purpose of site-specific billing only, we would suggest changing [Primary] MPAN to a Site ID (that may be the same) and including all MPANs being billed in the next row rather than as "other" MPANs. We also suggest adding Site Capacity into the R3 block in case it differs from the charged capacity within the invoice lines.	
<b>SPEN</b>		Declared Supply Capacity with effective date, this flow would need to support IDNO HH invoices, so IDNO would need to be include. For this flow to be able to support NHHSC and MAP invoices then we would need to include the contents of these invoices. The settlement run with dates. The MAP invoices will also require different details.	


## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

<b>BUUK</b>		The strawman is missing an entry for the agreed supply capacity, which is an on-going requirement in calculation of the chargeable amount on a site-specific MPAN for a period.	
<b>Energy Assets</b>		No.	
<b>British Gas</b>		The strawman flow structure looks to be consistent with the existing flow D2021 structure. It would be useful to compare against a redlined document of the existing flow to fully analyse the impact proposed change. Headers for credits/rebills with details of original document look to be missing, which is required for audit/tracking purposes.	
<b>ENWL</b>		Before introducing a brand-new DiP flow, St Clements as the Durabill vendor for DNO's should be approached to determine whether the changes could reasonably be accommodated by a modification to the existing D2021 data flow rather than introduce a brand-new DiP flow.	
<b>NGED</b>		<p>Please find below our software Provider – St Clements response on a record by record basis</p> <p>An overall flow (batch) invoice total record may be helpful. An overall identifier for the flow data, along with a version number would be helpful. We would suggest that DURABILL populates this with the batch number. This field is unique for the instance of DURABILL (e.g. UKPN will only ever have a single batch number but the same number may also be used by SSE). The version number would be set to 001 for the first time that the flow is sent and if a replacement file is required it would be set to version 002 etc.</p>	

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

		<p>St Clements recommends that the MIC / MEC and its associated effective date is included in addition to the capacity units charged (R5 Invoice Lines). Our suggestion would be that this could be included in the Site Info (R3) or Invoice Data (R4) record. This is because sometimes the charged capacity does not reflect the MIC / MEC, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•  Sites where some MPANs have moved to a new supplier while others have retained their previous registration (known as mis-aligned multi-MPAN sites) – in such a situation the capacity is typically split between the two suppliers.</li></ul> <p>3.3.2 R1 – Distributor Info All data items are held in DURABILL and can be made available on the new output flow.</p> <p>3.3.3 R2 – Supplier Info Minor changes may be required to support the requirement to populate the 'Supplier VAT additional text', however SCS are supportive of including this field in place of the existing D2021 process whereby such information is written to an address field. All other data items are held in DURABILL and can be made available on the new output flow.</p> <p>3.3.4 R3 - Site Info All data items are held in DURABILL and can be made available on the new output flow.</p> <p>St Clements is currently planning on moving away from using Lead MPANs and using a Site ID in its place. We there recommend that the Primary MPAN</p>	
--	--	---	--

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

		<p>field is replaced with a Site Identifier. This could contain the primary (or Lead) MPAN if non-DURABILL LDSOs wish to. We suggest that the datatype for the Site Identifier field is Char(30) which will allow for a range of Site ID naming conventions to be used by different LDSOs.</p> <p>An indicator to say that the site is a 'mis-aligned' multi-MPAN site is likely to assist suppliers in validating invoices and would be simple to include.</p> <p>3.3.5 R4 – Invoice Data All data items are held in DURABILL and can be made available on the new output flow.</p> <p>St Clements does not see a need for including the maximum demand in the invoice period or the date and time of the maximum demand as these aren't used in the calculation of the bill. The data is recorded against the invoice record in DURABILL and therefore can be included if useful (e.g. to reduce the number of queries from suppliers). If it is to be included, St Clements would recommend additional guidance is provided regarding how this should be populated in the following scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Capacity is not being charged</li><li>• No reads have been received by the DNO</li><li>• All reads received by the DNO have a zero value</li></ul> <p>St Clements recommends that the VAT Rate is included in the invoice data record in addition to the VAT Rate Code. The VAT Rate is stored against the invoice record in DURABILL and therefore it would not add any cost or complexity to the solution and is likely to assist supplier in validating and processing the flows.</p>	
--	--	--	--

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

		<p>3.3.6 R5 – Invoice Lines</p> <p>All data items are held in DURABILL and can be made available on the new output flow.</p> <p>St Clements recommends that more guidance is included for the 'Units Billed' field. We have previously seen differences in the ways that these are reported, for example with capacity units the units billed could be populated with either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The kVA charged</li> <li>• The kVA charged multiplied by the number of days.</li> </ul> <p>Our recommendation is that it should be populated with the kVA charged.</p>	
<b>NPg</b>		No.	
Working Group Conclusions:			

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	4. Would you support expanding E-Billing to other invoice types? If so, which invoice types?	Working Group Comments
<b>UKPN</b>		<p>Yes. The flow could be expanded to make it fit for all invoices under Clauses 20, 21 and 22 of DCUSA and late payment interest on those.</p> <p>See attached for expanded straw man to accommodate all invoice types (that does include some relabelling of the site specific data items). We have not included the suggestions in Q3 above.</p>	

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

<b>SPEN</b>		Yes, DNO NHHSC and MAP invoices including IDNO HH and NHHSC invoices.	
<b>BUUK</b>		In principle we would support extending a new DIP e-billing flow to non-site-specific MPANs with the caveat that we would require: - the ability to undertake robust validation prior to releasing the DIP flow - a detailed costs-benefit analysis on the impact of this, in addition to the criteria outlined in our response to question 2.	
<b>Energy Assets</b>		Neutral.	
<b>British Gas</b>		No.	
<b>ENWL</b>		Yes, HH IDNO billing and NHHSC billing could be considered but due to current levels of industry change this may be something for future consideration.	
<b>NGED</b>		<p>We would envisage that extending E-Billing to other DUoS invoicing types would be of benefit.</p> <p>A very similar format could be used for the invoicing of HH portfolio sites. The only changes required are likely to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Supplier Info and associated fields may require relabelling</li> <li>• Some fields in other groups (e.g. maximum demand in the invoice period) currently showing as mandatory on the straw man may need to be made optional for these invoices.</li> </ul>	



## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

		Were E-Billing to be used for DUoS aggregated invoicing, we would suggest that a separate flow is defined. This would reduce the complexity of a single file format having different record groups which are only used for one type of billing. It would also assist recipients of the flows in routing them to different systems if required.	
<b>NPg</b>		Yes, NHHSC.	
Working Group Conclusions:			

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	5. Would you be supportive of E-Billing being mandatory? Please provide your rationale.	Working Group Comments
<b>UKPN</b>		Yes. It makes sense to have one process. It removes risks around emailing or posting invoices.	
<b>SPEN</b>		Yes as a DNO we would be support E-billing being mandatory for SVA suppliers although we are aware that some suppliers and CVA registrants may not be able to process EDI files	
<b>BUUK</b>		We can see the benefits of a uniform approach – on consideration of previously mentioned caveats, we would only support DIP e-billing on an all-or-nothing basis. i.e., All parties undertaking DIP e-billing only, i.e., not a mixture of DIP flow and the existing D2021/D2026. We would not support this if the associated DIP flow was not in governance, please refer to question 2 response.	

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

<b>Energy Assets</b>		No. The systems costs incurred to produce the e-billing format, and potential for additional administration in implementing this change, are unrecoverable by IDNOS – so too are the commercial costs of contracting with Electralink for the E-billing service. It is wholly inappropriate for the DCUSA to mandate a party to make a commercial decision to procure the E-billing system – especially as Electralink own the IPR for the D2021/2026 file structure and parties will not be able to contract with an alternative provider.	
<b>British Gas</b>		Yes – It has previously raised under DCP344 and DCP307 to mandate e-billing. The working group would need to consider how this change would better facilitate this requirement against previous proposals. Would use of the DIP potentially move a previous blocker due to the cost associated for the provision of service by Electralink?	
<b>ENWL</b>		Yes, if we were to move to a DIP flow as this should hopefully remove some of the cost challenges for smaller suppliers linked to using the current D2021.	
<b>NGED</b>		There is no reason why E-Billing being mandatory would cause a problem in the system. It may be a less costly option for DNOs as the assumption would be that PDF invoice prints would no longer be required. We would assume that some parties (e.g. small suppliers and CVA registrants) would not find it cost effective to develop a system to load such a file.	
<b>NPg</b>		Yes, this increases efficiency and reduces long term cost.	

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

Working Group Conclusions:

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	6. Do you have any preferred lead time to implement any of the potential E-Billing changes and what would that lead time be?	Working Group Comments
UKPN		The changes would need to be concurrent with raising site specific invoices for MHHS migrated customers. Other invoice types, if included, could have the same implementation date.	
SPEN		Happy to be flexible but minimum 6 months	
BUUK		<p>We would struggle to provide any indication of lead times as 'any of the potential ebilling changes' is too broad to consider as one concept.</p> <p>We would have to consider the timelines for:</p> <p>1) introduction of a new DIP flow,</p> <p>2) mandating e-billing for all industry participants</p> <p>and 3) expanding e-billing to other invoice types</p> <p>as they all have quite different implications and potential lead times.</p> <p>Largely as a result of the multitude of systems which would require changes, we would not support a hybrid approach as noted in our Q5 response, due to the burden of complexity associated with transitional changes in this context.</p>	

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

<b>Energy Assets</b>		It is wholly inappropriate for the DCUSA to mandate a party to make a commercial decision to procure the E-billing system – especially as Electralink own the IPR for the D2021/2026 file structure and parties will not be able to contract with an alternative provider. Mandating the service was in scope for DCP344 which was rejected.	
<b>British Gas</b>		Align to MHHS programme transition.	
<b>ENWL</b>		Our preferred lead time would be in line with MHHS migration.	
<b>NGED</b>		This flow is outside of the MHHS end-to-end design and therefore we understand that it will be outside of the scope of SIT. We therefore believe that a go-live date in line with the start of MHHS migration is appropriate.	
<b>NPg</b>		We do not have a preferred lead time at current due to the overall changes that we anticipate MHHS will bring.	
Working Group Conclusions:			

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	7. Would you be supportive of cutting over to the new flow at a point in time, or running both flows in parallel? Is there an impact from credit/re-bills?	Working Group Comments
<b>UKPN</b>		We would support a transition period to mirror the MHHS migration, with a hard cut-off of the D2021 at the end of that. So for any periods that a site has been billed under the current arrangements, we would continue to send D2021s for subsequent cancel/rebills (but any periods where a site has been	

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

		billed under MHHS, it would always get the REP-ebill) and then at a given date when everything's migrated, we would switch everything over to the REP-ebill.	
<b>SPEN</b>		We would prefer a cut over date, but we are aware that this may cause issues for receiving parties.	
<b>BUUK</b>		Assuming that the ability to undertake credits remains within e-billing (which is essential), we would support a big-bang approach to the change.	
<b>Energy Assets</b>		No comment.	
<b>British Gas</b>		This would have a greater implication to network invoicing systems for generating invoices, so need to understand view of networks.  Preference to cut over rather than a parallel run to minimise file volume/processing.	
<b>ENWL</b>		We believe the D2021 would need to be retained to handle cancellation and rebilling of invoices produced pre MHHS so if implementation is prior to migration then they need to run in parallel.	
<b>NGED</b>		We believe that the only practical option is for the new flow to be used for billing all sites which have migrated to MHHS while continuing to use the D2021 flow for those sites which haven't yet migrated. Cancellations and rebills would for periods prior to the point when a site has migrated would need to continue to be reported via the D2021.	

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

<b>NPg</b>		Both flows in parallel. The credit and rebill impact would mean a financial impact that at present is unknown.	
Working Group Conclusions:			

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	8. Do you currently use the D2026 flow? If so, is further consideration needed?	Working Group Comments
<b>UKPN</b>		We receive this flow from some suppliers but do not see a need for a replacement going forward. We do not receive these from all suppliers and our processes focus on what has been paid rather than what we are advised should be paid.	
<b>SPEN</b>		No, however we would be happy to explore this option to streamline the collection processes.	
<b>BUUK</b>		Currently no, as do not use electralink e-billing. We would only support DIP e-billing where the associated flows are in governance, see answers to questions 2 & 5.	
<b>Energy Assets</b>		No.	
<b>British Gas</b>		We send D2026 flows and our payment system will also generate .PDF/.xlsx remittances. Working group to consider preference of networks.	

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

<b>ENWL</b>		No, we do not use the D2026, although we cannot see any reason why the D2026 would need to change at this point.	
<b>NGED</b>		Some suppliers send us D2026's though it is not necessary and rarely used	
<b>NPg</b>		No.	
Working Group Conclusions:			

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	<p>9. Do you consider that the proposal better facilitates the DCUSA General Objectives?</p> <p>If so, please detail which of the General Objectives you believe are better facilitated and provide supporting reasons.</p> <p>If not, please provide supporting reasons.</p>	Working Group Comments
<b>UKPN</b>		Yes, as per our proposal.	
<b>SPEN</b>		We believe that E-billing for multiple invoices is future proofing and sense to explore and implement during the MHH project.	
<b>BUUK</b>		<p>Yes – in the context of efficiency related objectives.</p> <p>Does it create a barrier for new industry parties – esp. smaller new suppliers – in terms of entering the market? If use of the D2021/D2026 is mandated</p>	

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

		for any parties not currently using Electralink e-billing, this may result in additional costs to use these flows which may impact newcomers to the market. However, in the event of a mandatory DIP e-billing flow(s) in all billing scenarios, we do not believe this would occur.	
<b>Energy Assets</b>		We do not agree with the WG in that General Objective 1 is better facilitated as IDNOs are unable to recover the costs of an E-billing service, and therefore not economical, if the intention is to widen the scope of DCP416 and mandate the service. We do agree that, if the scope isn't widened, then General Objective 4 is better facilitated.	
<b>British Gas</b>		Yes.	
<b>ENWL</b>		General objective 4 - The promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the DCUSA.	
<b>NGED</b>		We agree that the proposal facilitates DCUSA General Objectives 1 & 4	
<b>NPg</b>		Yes. In line with comments as per the DCP.	
Working Group Conclusions:			

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	10. Are you aware of any wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP?	Working Group Comments
---------	----------------------------	--	------------------------



## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

<b>UKPN</b>		No.	
<b>SPEN</b>		No, we are not aware of any impact to wider industry	
<b>BUUK</b>		Changes in tariff structure may impact the data structure required for this DIP flow structure – this change is still open even though recent progress/dialogue has been limited.	
<b>Energy Assets</b>		We agree that this change may impact the REC and BSC.	
<b>British Gas</b>		No, proposal raised due to impacts of changes for MHHS programme.	
<b>ENWL</b>		No.	
<b>NGED</b>		No.	
<b>NPg</b>		Yes. In line with comments as per the DCP.	
Working Group Conclusions:			

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	11. Do you have any comments on the proposed legal text?	Working Group Comments
---------	----------------------------	--	------------------------

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

UKPN		<p>The text will need to be updated in light of responses to this consultation. Particularly questions 4, 5 and 7.</p> <p>The definition provided needs updating as follows for site specific invoices –</p> <p>“electronic invoice” means an account providing the data items set out in data flow D2021 (as amended from time to time) sent using the Data Transfer Network for non-MHHS customers and the [REP-ebill] <b>sent using the DIP</b> for MHHS customers.</p> <p>Also changes will be required to Clause 21.2B for example</p> <p><del>Where the Company shall submit</del>s, and the User <del>agrees to</del> shall receive, accounts by sending an electronic invoice <del>it shall use an electronic invoice for all of that User's accounts</del> (including revised accounts and credit-notes) <b>save that prior to [MHHS migration end date] for non-MHHS migrated customers the User must have first agreed to receive such electronic invoices.</b> 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 <b>or the DIP</b> is unavailable.</p>	
SPEN		No comment.	
BUUK		We believe the legal text is not currently specific enough to define the extent of the proposed change and would recommend it be rewritten in greater detail – i.e. to specifically reference the contents of the D2021 and the proposed DIP flow.	

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

		<p>References to the D2021, although currently in the DCUSA, are problematic in that it is not universally used by all parties and should e-billing become mandatory the legal text would enforce use of the D2021.</p> <p>We would expect any legal text to refer to a flow fully defined under governance, unlike the D2021 as it currently stands.</p>	
<b>Energy Assets</b>		No.	
<b>British Gas</b>		No.	
<b>ENWL</b>		We have no comments on the proposed legal text.	
<b>NGED</b>		No.	
<b>NPg</b>		No comments.	
Working Group Conclusions:			

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	12. How might the legal text need to be changed if other invoice types are included?	Working Group Comments
<b>UKPN</b>		<p>The definition of electronic invoice would need to be updated</p> <p>“electronic invoice” means, an account providing the data items set out in the [REP-ebill] sent using the DIP, save that for non-MHHS customers</p>	

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

		<p>invoiced pursuant to Clause 20.2B it shall mean data flow D2021 (as amended from time to time) sent using the Data Transfer Network.</p> <p>Clauses similar to 21.2B will need to be added, for example as 20.4B and 22.2B.</p> <p>e.g. The Company shall submit, and the User shall receive, accounts by sending an electronic invoice. For the avoidance of doubt, where this Clause [XX.XXB] applies, Clause 59.4 shall apply to the sending of accounts during any period in which the DIP is unavailable.</p>	
<b>SPEN</b>		No comment.	
<b>BUUK</b>		We believe that there would be extensive legal text changes to incorporate this change and a significant review before these could be defined.	
<b>Energy Assets</b>		No comment.	
<b>British Gas</b>		n/a - Preference to keep to DUoS invoicing.	
<b>ENWL</b>		This question could be addressed if the working group does decide to widen the scope of the solution identifying the other invoice types.	
<b>NGED</b>		No comment.	

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

<b>NPg</b>		"electronic invoice" means an account providing the data items set out in the relevant data flow that are specific to DUoS Billing, sent using the Data Transfer Network/Data Integration Platform. (as per DCP415).	
Working Group Conclusions:			

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	13. Do you have any other comments on DCP 416?	Working Group Comments
<b>UKPN</b>		No.	
<b>SPEN</b>		No comment.	
<b>BUUK</b>		Our responses are provided on this basis prior to any systems provider impact assessment being undertaken and may be subject to change following systems provider guidance.	
<b>Energy Assets</b>		No.	
<b>British Gas</b>		No.	
<b>ENWL</b>		We think it would be more beneficial if the change was mandatory for migrated sites as this would remove the need to retain the PDF option for these customers.	

## DCP 416 'Electronic Invoicing Post MHHS'

### COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

---

<b>NGED</b>		No.	
<b>NPg</b>		No.	
Working Group Conclusions:			