

# DCP 415 Working Group Meeting 02

26 January 2023 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Arif Jagot [AJ]	MHHS Programme
Hazel Paterson [HP]	SPEN
Laura Quinn [LQ]	SPEN
Laurie Harman [LH]	Centrica
Peter Waymont [PW]	UKPN
Tim Porter [TP]	SSE
Tom Perryman [TP]	St Clements
Tracey Dunne [TD]	ENWL
Tracey Pitcher [TP]	NGED
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
Craig Booth [CB] (Chair)	ElectraLink
George Kestner [GK]	ElectraLink
Hannah Proffitt [HP] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink

## 1. Administration

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed attendees to the second DCP 415 Working Group (WG) meeting.
- 1.2 The group reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance”. All members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.
- 1.3 The group reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting and agreed they are an accurate record of events. The final version of the minutes can be found as **Attachment 1**. Details on the open actions can be found in **Appendix 1**.

## 2. Purpose of the Meeting

---

2.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was to:

- Review the responses to the consultation;
- Review the Draft Legal Text; and
- Review the Draft Change Report.

## 3. Review Consultation Responses

---

3.1 The Chair presented the consultation responses to the group. The response document including the Working Group's responses are included as **Attachment 2**.

3.2 A summary of discussions and actions are below.

**1) Do you understand the intent of DCP 415?**

3.3 The Working Group noted that all Parties indicated that they understood the intent of the DCP.

**2) Are you supportive of the principles of DCP 415?**

3.4 Regarding Electricity North West's response, TD noted that their Market-Wide Half Hourly Settlement manager had raised this point after looking at the time and costs involved and suggested that if it is cheaper to keep existing flows, this should be considered.

3.5 PW raised that both D0030 and REP-002 flows would coming in and suggested that this could pose a challenge. PW questioned whether there would be two D242 flows for the same settlement date or whether they would be put into a single D242. PW noted a potential challenge if there is a lag between the two input flows.

3.6 The group discussed and agreed that they should proceed with the development of a DIP flow.

**3) Do you have any comments on the structure of the flow, such as items you would like to include or items you believe should be removed? Please provide your rationale.**

3.7 Regarding British Gas's response, the group discussed whether, post-MHHS, you could still end up with data passing to a default tariff and whether there could be a situation where the Distribution Use of System (DUoS) tariff ID and the rates don't align. It was discussed that you would have to use the rates that applied, as opposed to the DUoS tariff rates.

3.8 The Working Group discussed that there was merit to the proposal, but noted the lack of responses or concerns from other Suppliers. The Working Group agreed that Suppliers should be contacted again about this to gather feedback.

02/01: The Chair to issue communication to Supplier Contract Managers, seeking further feedback on question 3 of the consultation.

- 3.9 Regarding UK Power Network's response concerning there being no D0030 received for DR (Dispute Reconciliation) runs, the group agreed to monitor this.
- 3.10 Regarding Energy Assets Networks Ltd's response, the Working Group noted that the owner fields are also blank in REP-002. The Working Group agreed the GSP is owned by the DNO. It was discussed that the totals fields have come out of the settlements process, which could be a reason these may not be owned by LDSO.
- 3.11 The Working Group agreed to check with the programme whether these will be picked up by it, to identify and agree the owners.

02/02: AJ to check whether the programme are picking up the matter of identifying/agreeing the appropriate owners for each of the data items.

**4) Are there any consequences of the flow being a DIP flow as opposed to a DTN flow? Please provide your rationale.**

- 3.12 Regarding UK Power Network's response, the group discussed that there is going to be cost and complexity regardless, but there could be more work to do if there is an eventual migration to the DIP from the DTN.
- 3.13 It was questioned whether the Working Group had fully investigated the other option and understood the amount of work involved. The respondent stated there was a need to consider time pressures and costs related to the whole programme.
- 3.14 The Working Group agreed, as per question 2, to continue moving forward in developing a DIP flow.
- 3.15 Regarding Energy Assets Networks Ltd's response, the Working Group noted that based on the MHHW design, there is no requirement to send out a JSON message.
- 3.16 Regarding Electricity North West's response, it was noted that from a DURABILL development point of view, producing the DTN or DIP flow is not seen as dramatically different in terms of cost. The group noted that every LDSO will need a method of connecting to the DIP for MPRS and that these discussions are still in early stages.

**5) Are there any consequences of using a single flow for both LDSOs and Suppliers? Please provide your rationale.**

- 3.17 Regarding SP Energy Networks' response, it was discussed that there would be two versions of the flow: one for Suppliers and one for LDSOs. REP-002 and REP-002A make the differentiation. REP-002 comes in and a D242 is sent to Suppliers. REP-002A comes in and a D242 is sent to IDNOs. A delay to one would not impact the other.

**6) Do you have any comments on the proposed draft legal text? Please provide your rationale.**

3.18 The Working Group noted the responses to this question. The draft Legal Text was discussed further on in the meeting.

**7) Are there any other consequential changes to the DCUSA legal text as a result of the introduction of the REP-242 replacement flow that the Working Group should be considering? Please provide your rationale.**

3.19 The Working Group noted that all Parties had indicated that there are not any other consequential changes to the DCUSA legal text as a result of the introduction of the REP-242 replacement flow that need to be considered.

**8) Do you consider that the proposal better facilitates the DCUSA Charging Objectives? Please give supporting reasons.**

3.20 Regarding Energy Assets Networks Ltd's response, the Working Group noted that there is an error in the question and agreed to correct this.

**9) Are you aware of any impact on other industry codes of this Proposal?**

3.21 The Working Group noted that Parties had agreed with the groups assessment.

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

3.22 The Working Group noted the responses to this question.

#### Legal Text

3.23 The Working Group reviewed a draft version of the Legal Text. This is included as **Attachment 3**.

3.24 The Chair agreed to issue this to Gowling WLG following the meeting for legal review.

#### Change Report

3.25 The Working Group reviewed a draft version of the Change Report. This is included as **Attachment 4**.

3.26 The Chair agreed to circulate this after the meeting for members to review.

## 4. Next Steps & Work Plan

---

4.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:

- The Chair to send the draft Change Report to members for review and feedback;
- The Chair to issue the agreed legal text to Gowling WLG for legal review; and
- The Secretariat to schedule the next DCP 415 meeting for 06 February 2023, 2:00pm to 3:30pm for members to finalise the Change Report and to discuss legal feedback from Gowling WLG.

## 5. Any Other Business

---

- 5.1 The Chair asked the group whether there were any other items of business to discuss, to which nothing was raised.

## 6. Date of Next Meeting

---

- 6.1 The next meeting has been scheduled for 06 February 2023, 2:00pm to 3:30pm.

## Attachments

---

- Attachment 1 - DCP 415 Working Group Meeting 01 - Final Minutes v1.0
- Attachment 2 - DCP 415 Collated Consultation Responses - WG Responses
- Attachment 3 - DCP 415 Draft Legal Text (Post Consultation)
- Attachment 4 - DCP 415 Draft Change Report v0.2

## APPENDIX A

### New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
<b>01/01</b>	Chair to discuss with the MHHS programme, the practicalities of including the flow in the DIP.	The Chair	Ongoing. <i>Have contacted the programme. There is a challenge around the DIP provider not having been announced yet. Will continue discussions and provide an update when possible.</i>
<b>01/02</b>	Chair to check with MHHS if the REP-002 flow has been baselined and what the likelihood of further changes are.	The Chair	Ongoing. <i>Have contacted the programme. There is a challenge around the DIP provider not having been announced yet. Will continue discussions and provide an update when possible.</i>
<b>02/01</b>	The Chair to issue communication to Supplier Contract Managers, seeking further feedback on question 3 of the consultation.	The Chair	New Action. <i>Email issued to Supplier Contract Managers on 27 January 2023 with a deadline for responses of Thursday 02 February 2023.</i>

<b>02/02</b>	AJ to check whether the programme are picking up the matter of identifying/agreeing the appropriate owners for each of the data items.	AJ	New Action.
--------------	--	----	-------------