

DCP 416 Working Group Meeting 05

23 June 2023 at 13:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Peter Waymont [PW]	UKPN
Laurie Harman [LH]	British Gas
Robert Short [RS]	MHHS Programme
Tim Porter [TP]	SSE
Tom Perryman [TP1]	St. Clements
Tracey Dunne [TD]	ENWL
Tracey Pritcher	
Hazel Patterson(HP)	PEN
Code Administrator	
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Donna Jamieson [DJ]	Energy Assets
Laura Quinn [LQ]	SPEN

1. Administration

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed attendees to the fifth DCP 416 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.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was for the Working Group to review the consultation responses and finalise the legal text and flow structure before agreeing on next steps.

3. Review Consultation Responses

- 3.1 The Working Group reviewed the initial conclusions to the 2nd consultation responses. The Chair informed the Working Group that at the initial review of the consultation responses, the conclusions were that the change wouldn’t be taken wider to include other invoice types and that there wouldn’t be a hard and fast cut over point.
- 3.2 PW noted that a hard and fast cut off point wouldn’t work for the change and that the approach would be for non-migrated MPANs would be on the current process and any MPANs that have migrated would be using the new DIP flow.
- 3.3 The Chair advised that he’d walk the Working Group through the initial conclusions for each question up to question 5, which was when some additional comments and decisions needed to be made.
- 3.4 Reviewing the conclusion to question 1, the Working Group concluded that whilst there is appetite to include other invoicing types, this would be appropriate to be done at a later stage and to focus on the must have requirement. After reviewing the responses to the first consultation the Working Group agreed that the process should only be for HH billing as the majority of respondents to the first consultation and the majority of Working Group members agreed with this approach.
- 3.5 RS noted the majority of respondents had stated that for this change the Working Group should focus on the minimum viable product and any further billing/invoicing changes could be picked up by a separate DCP.
- 3.6 The Working Group agreed that the conclusion to the responses to question 2 were that there was no strong feeling towards having the misaligned multi-site MPANs identifier, however it was noted this wouldn’t be difficult to deliver so better to include the identifier in the new DIP flow to future proof the process.
- 3.7 The Working Groups conclusions to question 3 were that if the change is specific to DUoS then some smaller system changes would be required however if the proposal is taken wider, this could create significant changes across numerous systems.
- 3.8 In conclusion to question 4 the Working Group agreed that mandating the change for HH DUoS billing was the right approach and that neither the Working Group and consultation respondents support any form of optionality for any invoices as this could cause confusion within the industry and

create significant costs for distributors as they would be required to run several processes to support.

- 3.9 In conclusion to question 5, do you have any comments on the legal text, the Working Group agreed that clause 22B was no longer needed and that further drafting of the legal text was required due to the Working Group agreeing to keep the change to the must have requirement for now and to also cater for the view of the consultation respondents and the Working Group that the change should be mandatory for MHHS.
- 3.10 The Working Group agreed to pick up the legal text changes once all 6 consultation questions had been reviewed.
- 3.11 In conclusion to question 6, any additional comments, the Working Group agreed that all but comments raised by E.ON had been addressed earlier in the consultation. E.ON had noted several points with the flow structure which the Working Group agreed to pick up when reviewing the strawman flow structure.

4. Legal Text Review

- 4.1 The Working Group reviewed the draft legal text and started by deleting paragraphs 20.4B and 22.4B as these changes were no longer required due to the change being kept to the must have requirement for now.
- 4.2 An amendment to clause 21.2B was also made to clarify that the change was mandatory for MHHS migrated customers.
- 4.3 It was also agreed to park the issue of how to treat non-migrated customers once they migrated. It was noted this could be picked up via a new change as this wouldn't need to be considered for some time. It was noted that this piece of work could lead to a lot more system work and archiving of old systems in order to rebill small amounts. It was concluded that it would be prudent to deliver the must have requirement now as this would support and inform any future changes if and when they were required.
- 4.4 That concluded the review of the legal text as the Working Group agreed this would be the final version.

5. Review of the Flow strawman

- 5.1 The Working Group started reviewing the Strawman Flow structure against the comments made by E.ON.
- 5.2 It was agreed that the items from row 119 to row 139 could be deleted as the change was no longer being taken wider to other invoice types. This resolved the point raised by E.ON requesting examples to the Transactional Charge Code and Charge Code Descriptions as these rows were deleted as these items were no longer in the scope of the change.
- 5.3 The typo to 'cancelled' in rows 101 and 102 were corrected.

- 5.4 Additional guidance was added to Number of Days Billed item (row 113) as per the suggestion by E.ON to state 'Number of days in billing period up to 31 days'
- 5.5 A new row was included at row 82 to cater for the multi misaligned MPAN site identifier that the Working Group and consultation respondents agreed would be useful.

6. Next Steps & Work Plan

- 6.1 The Working Group agreed that the legal text and strawman flow structure had been finalised and could now be sent to the MHHS programme to be reviewed and the legal text would be sent to John Lawton to include within the wider DCUSA consequential change document.
- 6.2 PW agreed to raise the change request to the programme.
- 6.3 It was also agreed to raise with the DCUSA panel whether a change report would be required or not but the likelihood would be that DCP 416 would be withdrawn once the process had been reviewed by the MHHS programme but sense checking this with the DCUSA panel was sensible.
- 6.4 RS advised that for DCP 415 the MHHS programme worked off the change request rather than the change report that the Working Group created.
- 6.5 It was agreed that implementation would be in line with MHHS migration so that allowed plenty of time for the programme to review well before implementation and should give enough time for impacted parties to understand and know of the change so system changes could start to be worked on and tested before implementation.

7. Any Other Business

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

8. Date of Next Meeting

- 8.1 As there were no further items to discuss the Chair advised that there would be no more Working Groups to be held at this time.

9. Attachments

- Attachment 1 – DCP 416 Consultation 2 Responses 23 June
- Attachment 2 DCP 416 Draft Legal Text V5.0
- Attachment 3 DCP 416 Strawman Flow Structure (Clean)

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref. #	Action	Owner	Update
03/03	Draft the Change Report for the Working Group to review at the next meeting.	Secretariat	On hold

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
02/01	The Working Group to review the strawman flow structure and make the necessary updates.	Working Group	Closed
02/02	The Secretariat to make the necessary amendments to the draft legal text following the Consultation responses.	Secretariat	Closed
03/01	The Chair to speak with the Chair of DCP 415 to seek further information around whether there is a header/footer on the current dip flow, and if so, what are the requirements.	Chair	Closed
03/02	The Secretariat to finalise the Consultation v2 and circulate to wider industry on 15 February 2023, with a response deadline of 01 March 2023.	Secretariat	Closed
03/04	The Secretariat to make the necessary updates to the draft legal text and circulate to the Working Group post-meeting for review.	Secretariat	Closed
04/03	Check the items listed in the response against the strawman flow structure and make changes/corrections as appropriate.	Chair	Completed