

# DCUSA SIG Meeting 147 Minutes

25 August 2023 at 10:00am: Web Conference

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Peter Waymont (PW)	UKPN
Simon Vicray (SV)	EDF
Jo Brown (JB)	NGED
Emily Waters (EW)	BU-UK
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
Andy Green [AG] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
<b>Apologies</b>	

## 1. Administration

---

- 1.1 SIG members reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance”. All members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.

## 2. Overview of DIF 67 ‘Use of "REP-242” in aggregated billing’ consultation responses

---

- 2.1 DIF 67 was raised to consider the use of REP-242 (equivalent to the D0242 flow) in aggregated billing for MHHS migrated customers. The REP-002 is the DIP flow that is equivalent to the D0030 flow.
- 2.2 There were eight responses to the consultation, and these can be found within **attachment 1 DIF 67 'Use of REP 242 in aggregated billing collated consultation responses.**
- 2.3 A summary of the SIGs conclusion to each question can be found below:

### Question 1-Considering the issues raised in DIF 67, do you have a preference from the four options stated in paragraph 2.6?

- 2.4 The Chair confirmed that there were four options within the consultation which were:
- Send REP-242 to all suppliers in the REP-002
  - Send REP-242 to non-blank suppliers only.
  - Send REP-242 to non-blank suppliers and any blank suppliers that were populated on a previous run.
  - Lobby to change REP-002
- 2.5 A majority of five out of eight responders preferred option one, two responded stating that option two was their preferred option and one responder supported option three.

### Do you have any other solution/s that the SIG have not considered?

- 2.6 It was noted that there were no other solutions put forwards by all eight respondents.

### If a blank REP-242 is to be sent, where there was not data in the previous reconciliation, should a zero invoice be raised?

- 2.7 Four of the eight respondents believed that no zero invoice should be raised, and four respondents believed that zero invoices should be sent.
- 2.8 It was highlighted that this would have a larger impact on smaller or new suppliers but there wasn't much engagement from suppliers with the consultation responses and that it would be unlikely that the two suppliers who did respond would receive blank data.
- 2.9 The Chair suggested reopening the consultation to suppliers with a clear call to action to suppliers requesting a response. It was noted that raising this within the MHHS programme to see if they had an equivalent to the DAG where this issue could be raised could increase engagement.
- 2.10 It was also suggested that the DCUSA could raised this as well with Cornwell Energy, but the SIG agreed to continue to review the consultation responses and that if the outcome was to raise an new DCUSA Change Proposal this topic would be resolved within that Working Group.

### Any other comments?

- 2.11 The SIG agreed to raise a new DCUSA Change Proposal to resolve the issue and that the Working Group that is set up would need to consider the equivalent IDNO process and seek to encourage engagement from the supplier community, particularly smaller and new suppliers.
- 2.12 PW agreed to raise a new DCP based on the concept of if a zero flow is received, a zero flow goes out and then a zero invoice is issued. It was agreed that this would create the foundation for the Working Group to begin developing a solution.
- 2.13 It was agreed that the proposal would include the output of the SIGs consultation and note that the preference within that consultation was to send the REP-242 to all suppliers in the REP-002.

### Post Meeting Note

- 2.14 A Change Proposal has been received and will be presented to at the DCUSA Open Panel on 20 September 2023. If approved, invites to join the Working Group will be issued on 21 September 2023.

## 3. Any Other Business

---

- 3.1 PW raised a new issue within the Good Payment Record process within schedule 1 for Credit Cover as the drafting was fundamentally flawed.
- 3.2 PW agreed to raise another issue on this topic for discussion at Septembers SIG meeting. It was highlighted that as it was only a drafting issue and not changing the intent of the text, a full consultation might not be required so the issue could likely be remedied quicker if it goes through the SIG and then subsequently raised as a Part 2 matter.
- 3.3 The Chair suggested that the usual process for the SIG was to cancel the meeting if there were no new issues raised however in the future, rather than cancel the session it could become a drop-in session for other parties to dial into and raise any questions or concerns they had about the DCUSA. The Secretariat will consider this.
- 3.4 SV asked if the request for the derogation had been raised for the Rota Disconnection process.
- 3.5 SV advised that there was an obligation to deliver the data to customers within a set time scale and without the derogation or correct data Suppliers were at risk of not being able to fulfil the obligation.
- 3.6 The Chair advised he would contact the ENA to check on the progress of seeking a sponsor for the derogation.

## 4. Date of Next Meeting:

---

- 4.1 The next SIG meeting will take place on 29 September 2023 at 10am, via Microsoft Teams

