

DCP 424 Working Group - Meeting 04

25 August 2023 at 14:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Blessing Epke [BW]	SSE
Hazel Paterson [HP]	SPEN
John Lucas [JL]	Elexon
Sally Musaka (SM)	SSE
Paul Bedford (PB)	Drax
Code Administrator	
Craig Booth [CB] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Lee Stone	E.ON

1. Administration

- 1.1 The Working Group reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance” and “Terms of Reference”. All Working Group members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting and agreed to the Terms of Reference.
- 1.2 An action log has been created and all updates are provided in **Appendix A**.

2. Actions Review

- 2.1 02/01– The Chair confirmed the timelines had been circulated. This action was closed.
- 2.2 03/02– The Chair confirmed this action was closed as it was confirmed that pseudo MAPN data is held within the D0036 flow.
- 2.3 04/02 – The Chair confirmed this action was closed as it was confirmed that D0036 flows are loaded into Durabil.
- 2.4 Action 06/02 – remained open as this was going to form part of the consultation document review.
- 2.5 03/01- The Chair confirmed that clarification on whether a derogation was required or not to amend the charging statements was still waiting to be received from Gowlings so this action remained open.
- 2.6 03/03- This action was closed as the draft consultation document had been created and shared with the Working Group.
- 2.7 03/04- This action was closed as it was agreed that this would be reviewed within the consultation review.

3. Review Of Consultation Document

- 3.1 SM asked if this consultation would be issued at the same time as the REC and BSC MODs. The chair advised this was the plan and the intention was to consult for the usual 3 weeks.
- 3.2 The Consultation document can be found in **attachment 1 DCP 424 Consultation Document v2.0**
- 3.3 Within the impacted party’s section, it was confirmed that DCs wouldn’t be included as the DCUSA change wasn’t driving any changes to DCs and these would be delivered within the BSC change.
- 3.4 The Chair confirmed that the intention was to get the change to the October DCUSA panel although this depends on what comes back from the consultation. JL confirmed that this broadly aligned to the BSC changes timescale.
- 3.5 It was queried if the approach of netting off the consumption would impact the NETSO report as the obligation for this report was to share gross data and to also not include export data.
- 3.6 It was noted that the D0036 data would still be issued to DNOs as gross data. It was confirmed that the D0036 that’s sent for settlement would contain the data netted off as well as export data which wouldn’t impact the DUCSA parties.

- 3.7 It was noted that this clarification is included later in the consultation document however, it was agreed to also include some additional text within the how section to explain that the DCUSAA change would be for gross data.
- 3.8 There were no additional changes to sections 1,2 and 3 of the draft consultation documents.
- 3.9 It was agreed to include footnotes within the consultation document for the REC and BSC changes.
- 3.10 It was agreed to amend question 3 to state that aggregated D0030 data would be used, not just aggregated data to make it clearer on what data was going to be utilised.
- 3.11 The clarification on the identifiers for pseudo settlement MPANs within Durabil was moved to paragraph 4.18 as the Working Group agreed sharing the identifier earlier in the consultation document would help the reader to understand the process sooner.
- 3.12 The Working Group reviewed the section for the benefits of using pseudo billing or settlement MPANs and agreed to take this away and share any additional benefits for each approach prior to the next review of the consultation document review.
- 3.13 It was agreed that the Working Group would take paragraph 4.28 away to see if any additional clarity could be added to it.
- 3.14 A slight reordering of questions 4, 5 and 6 was agreed with question 6 having its own lead in text.
- 3.15 The Working Group agreed to ask the below questions within the consultation:
- Do you understand the intent of the Change Proposal?
 - Are you supportive of the principles that support this Change Proposal?
 - Do you agree with the Working Groups approach of utilising the D0036 flow for DUoS unit rate billing and aggregated standing charge? If not what are the perceived risks/issues with this approach.
 - The Working Group identified two potential solutions for submitting gross demand data for class F and G sites, one to utilise Pseudo billing MPANs and another to utilise the existing Pseudo settlement MPANs. What are the benefits and risks to each of these approaches?
 - Which of the two approaches of using Pseudo billing or existing pseudo settlement MPANs do you prefer and why?
 - For Distributors Only- What would the process entail for a supplier requesting both pseudo billing and pseudo settlement MPANs? This will be a scenario that would only arise if the option to use pseudo billing MPANs was taken forwards.
 - For Distributors only- How do distributors identify if an MPAN is a pseudo settlement or pseudo billing MPAN i.e LLFCs etc
 - For Suppliers Only – How do Suppliers identify if an MPAN is a pseudo settlement or pseudo billing MPAN?

- Do you have any comments on the drafted legal text?
- Do you believe are there further DCUSA schedules or legal text changes required to facilitate this change? Please provide further information if yes.
- Do you consider the solution better facilitates the DCUSA objectives? Please give supporting reasons
- Are you aware of any wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP?
- What date do you believe this change proposal should be implemented? Please provide rationale.
- For Distributors Only-What are the potential impacts to billing systems based on the Working Groups approach?
- Question 14: Do you have any other comments?

3.16 It was noted by one Working Group member that the proposer wasn't on this call to review the consultation document. The Chair advised that this was raised with the proposer at the last meeting, and it was agreed to continue with this consultation review whilst the proposer was on annual leave and then another meeting would take place on 08 September 2023.

3.17 It was agreed to take this approach due to the tight timescales and the meeting on 08 September would be used as the final sign off for the consultation.

3.18 There were no additional changes to sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

4. Any Other Business

4.1 The Chair asked the group whether there were any other items of business to discuss.

4.2 There were no other items raised.

5. Date of Next Meeting

5.1 The Working Group had previously agreed to meet again on 08 September 2023 at 2pm.

6. Attachments

- Attachment 1 DCP 424 Consultation Document v2.0

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/03	Seek legal advice on if a derogation is needed or specific legal text changes if the new zero-based tariffs are required in charging statements.	Chair	
01/04	The Working Group to review internally if there are any additional benefits to using pseudo settlement or pseudo billing MPANs and share with the Working Group	All	New action
02/04	The Working Group to review paragraph 4.28 and see if this can be simplified.	All	New action

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
02/01	Circulate the aligned timelines as soon as this is available.	<i>Chair</i>	<i>Closed</i>
05/01	Engage with St Clements to understand if the D0268 data can be published into Durabill and understand the feasibility, scale, timescales, etc., of this.	Chair	<i>Closed</i>
01/02	Collate all responses into a single document.	Chair	<i>Closed</i>

02/02	Find the rationale for why the D0168 was removed.	Chair	<i>Closed</i>
03/02	Check internally whether the pseudo MPAN is in the D0036 and whether this is loaded into Durabill.	Working Group	<i>Closed</i>
04/02	Check with St Clements whether the pseudo MPAN is in the D0036 and whether this is loaded into Durabill.	Chair	<i>Closed</i>
05/02	Pick up with LS re his email and the Working Group discussion.	Chair	<i>Closed</i>
06/02	Check whether a settlement MPAN can be used as a billing pseudo MPAN in Durabill.	Working Group (DNO)	<i>Closed</i>
07/02	Send REC wording to AG.	VB	<i>Closed</i>
08/02	Circulate DCP 414 rationale for a derogation and see if this indicates a derogation may be needed for DCP 424	Chair	<i>Closed</i>
09/02	Issue a Doodle Poll for the next meeting	Chair	<i>Closed</i>
02/03	Create draft consulting document and share with the Working Group prior to the next meeting	Chair	<i>Closed</i>