

DCP 424 Working Group - Meeting 06

19 September 2023 at 14:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Benny Talbott [BT]	Co-Op
Hazel Paterson [HP]	SPEN
John Lucas [JL]	Elexon
Sally Musaka (SM)	SSE
Mary Guille (MG)	Energy Local
Kara Burke (KB)	NPg
Edda Dirks (ED)	SSEG
Elanor Sutter (ES)	BU-UK
Laura Quinn (LQ)	SPEN
Code Administrator	
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Lee Stone	E.ON
Paul Bedford (PB)	Drax

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. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair advised that the purpose of the meeting was to review the outstanding meeting actions, review the feedback provided by the Working Group on the consultation document and then to consider the consequential impacts this change will have on the work being undertaken by the DCUSA MHHS consequential change Stakeholder Group.

3. Actions Review

- 3.1 Action 02/04– The Chair confirmed this action had been completed as further clarity had been provided for paragraph 4.28 by Working Group members and that this would be reviewed as part of the consultation review.
- 3.2 01/05– The Chair confirmed this action was also completed as feedback had been provide by the Working Group and shared in readiness for this meeting.

4. Review Of Consultation Document

- 4.1 The Chair advised the Working Group that they would start by reviewing the feedback within the email sent by HP to the Working Group on 19 September 2023.
- 4.2 It was noted that the majority of the feedback was centred around the pros and cons of the use of pseudo billing and pseudo settlement MPANs.
- 4.3 HP advised that her thinking for the feedback on the use of pseudo billing MPANs was below.
 - The billing pseudo MPANs are set up by DNO’s and sometimes DC’s and suppliers can set up the pseudo MPANs on different numbers. This isn’t the case for pseudo settlement MPANs as these are formally created so if a pseudo billing MPAN is used the MPAN needs to be shared with DC’s and suppliers.
 - D0036’s can have different spreadsheet formats depending on the DC so a standardised format for those to be issued by DC would be helpful.
 - The D0036’s for this process currently are for a full month whereas the BAU D0036’s are loaded daily.
 - For MHHS, for pseudo settlement MPANs, if there’s a sweep to migrate these MPANs these are easily captured, however for pseudo billing MPANs this sweep might not be as easy due to the measurement classes being removed which may result in some MPANs not being successfully migrated.

- 4.4 MG asked that in the new process, if the D0036's are coming in daily then could they just be loaded into the system daily if the DC's are happy with this? It was noted this approach would also support automated the process and that at least one DC had confirmed this was something they could do.
- 4.5 It was noted that KB had provided some wider feedback on the consultation document as well so the comments raised above could be considered when KB's feedback was being reviewed.
- 4.6 HP advised that her thinking for the feedback on the use of pseudo settlement MPANs was below.
- Creating only one pseudo MPAN for settlement and billing MPANs wouldn't work as it would still require multiple MPANs so consumption could be assigned to the correct banding for measurement class G customers.
 - Pseudo Settlement MPANs are visible to all other parties so that would make a lot of the process transparent as to what the MPAN is used for.
 - The D0036's processes on pseudo settlement MPANs would have the automated processes followed removing the need for a manual process if the DC could provide the data.
 - The MHHS sweep up risk would be removed as these pseudo settlement MPANs are visible to all parties and systems.
 - The systems automatically communicate between the registrations process and billing process for pseudo settlement MPANs so some sort of flag would be required to identify these MPANs so they didn't fall into some of the BAU processes.
 - Additional text provided to clarify that the pseudo MPANs wouldn't need to be taken apart if only one site was removed due to how the data is netted off.
- 4.7 The Working Group moved on to KBs feedback.
- 4.8 KB advised that a worked example was being provided to show the reader what would happen in the current process to a site if this change wasn't made verses what would happen to a site if it was.
- 4.9 Clarity was added to state that this solution only applies to measurement classes F and G sites and that the existing processes in place for all other measurement classes are not impacted by this change as reads would still be received for the rest of the HH sites as normal.
- 4.10 References to the CDCM have been replaced to state schedule 16 to make it clear which schedule was being updated.
- 4.11 AG advised that he would update paragraph 4.1 with the appropriate attendees.
- 4.12 A clarification was given in paragraph 4.5 to explain that for site specific billed customers, the P441 solution was to ensure that their reads would still be sent on the D0036 and the DCSUA solution was to ensure a different D0036's would be sent to distributors.
- 4.13 It was confirmed that different D0036's being issued for settlement and billing wouldn't be an issue.

- 4.14 Some of the questions were updated to provide clarity on what views the consultation was seeking to obtain.
- 4.15 A placeholder was added to the consultation document to explain to the reader what a pseudo MPAN is. It was noted that there was no formal definition for what a pseudo MAPN was so this would be needed.
- 4.16 The Working Group agreed to take this away as an action as it was agreed this explanation would be helpful to the reader.
- 4.17 A table was provided to show the pros and cons on the use of either pseudo settlement and billing MPANs. It was agreed to transfer over the pros and cons that HP had provided in her feedback into this table by the Chair.
- 4.18 An additional question was included to ask which option should be used to ensure pseudo MPANs do not incur additional fixed charges and it was agreed that there were two approaches.
- apply a set of tariffs with the existing unit charge and a zero fixed charge to the pseudo MPAN.
 - apply a flag in the billing system to ensure the pseudo MPAN does not incur a fixed charge.
- 4.19 The Working Group also agreed to ask as part of the above question to ask if there was another alternative solution that the Working Group haven't considered to ensure all avenues were considered.
- 4.20 Paragraphs were added to explain what happens to residual charging bands as part of this process to make it clear to the reader on the impacts to this area.
- 4.21 Currently the process for DNOs getting the data for measurement class G customers is to request this is sent by Electralink. The Chair took away an action to confirm this would still be possible for the proposed solution.
- 4.22 An additional question was created asking what future consequential changes to MHHS are required.
- 4.23 An additional question was created asking if there are any additional/potential impacts to residual charging that the Working Group haven't considered?

5. Any Other Business

- 5.1 The Chair asked the group whether there were any other items of business to discuss.
- 5.2 There were no other items raised.

6. Date of Next Meeting

- 6.1 The Working Group agreed to complete the consultation review over email before it being issued to industry so no next meeting was agreed at this time.

7. Attachments

- Attachment 1 DCP 424 Consultation Document v5.0

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
06/01	Update sections 4.1 with the appropriate attendees.	Andy Green	New action
06/02	Provide an explanation within the consultation document as to what a pseudo MPAN is within the consultation document.	All	New action
06/03	Transfer over the pros and cons for settlement and billing MPANs that HP had provided in her feedback into the table in section 4.	Andy Green	New action
06/04	Find out the process that DNOs have to follow to request measurement class G data and confirm this data will still be available if this change is approved.	Andy Green	New action
06/05	The Chair to update the consultation document and share with the Working Group	Andy Greem	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>
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	<i>Closed</i>
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	<i>Closed</i>
02/04	The Working Group to review paragraph 4.28 and see if this can be simplified.	All	<i>Closed</i>
01/05	Review section 4 and provide feedback on how the section can be more focused on the solution	All	<i>Closed</i>