

## DCP 440 Working Group Meeting 01

03 June 2024 at 13:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Chris Ong [CO]	UKPN
Donna Jamieson [DJ]	IDCSL
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE
Ian Chadwick [IC]	MUA Group
Jenny Harvey [JH]	NGED
Jo Brown [JB]	NGED
Kara Burke [KB]	NPg
Kevin Woollard [KW]	Centrica
Lili Zou [LZ]	SSE
Monique Pereira [MP]	Indigo Networks
Peter Waymont [PW]	UKPN
Sarah Everest [SE]	SPEN
Shaun McRaith [SM]	Ofgem
Simon Vicary [SV]	EDF
Victoria Burkett [VB]	SSE
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
Andy Green [AG]	Chair
Hannah Proffitt [HP]	Secretariat

## 1. Administration

---

### Recording

- 1.1 The Chair asked members if they were comfortable for this Working Group to be recorded. No members objected to this request. The purpose of this recording is purely to aid the Technical Secretariat in producing an accurate report of the meeting. The recording will be deleted after 15 Working Days.

### Apologies

- 1.2 No apologies were received ahead of the meeting.

### Competition Law Guidance and Terms of Reference

- 1.3 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.

### Action Log

- 1.4 An action log will be used for this Working Group when actions arise.

## 2. Purpose of the Meeting

---

- 2.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was to review DCP 440 and to consider the next steps.

## 3. Overview of DCP 440

---

- 3.1 The Proposer of the change provided the below overview.

*Where an MPAN (Meter Point Administration Number) is marked as "de-energised" in the registration system but there are actual meter readings, it is clear that the MPAN is not actually de-energised. For Non Half Hourly (NHH)/Supercustomer/Aggregated Distribution Use of System (DUoS) charges, settlements includes actual consumption recorded against de-energised MPANs and counts the MPAN. However, the incorrect flagging of an MPAN means that site-specific charges are avoided, under the Common Distribution Charging Methodology (CDCM), unless the supplier corrects the status.*

*This change is being raised to reflect the true status of the MPAN and to ensure consistency between Site-specific and NHH/Supercustomer/Aggregated billed MPANs.*

*The change will also give use of system charging consistency with settlements. The Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS) Programme have confirmed that actual data is accepted into settlements if it is on a De-energised MPAN. They stated that in this case a IF-014 will be sent, using event code [ConsumptionOnDeEnergisedMPAN] as a warning to the Data Service/ Supplier that they may want to investigate why the MPAN is showing as De-energised.*

## 4. Review and Discussion of Change Proposal

- 4.1 One member asked if there is currently a process for DNOs to report these cases to Suppliers. Another member advised that a DNO can send a 134 data flow to the Supplier if they believe an MPAN is energised which sometimes rectifies the issue.
- 4.2 Another member highlighted that if there is an existing process, work should be done to resolve the problems with that process and that a DCUSA change is not needed.
- 4.3 The member noted that there are also situations in which the site is listed as energised, however is deenergised, and questioned whether the Supplier in this situation would get a credit. The member noted that there are a number of changes being introduced that involve passing charges down to the Supplier, and these costs will ultimately need to be passed to customers where possible.
- 4.4 The member noted that where there has been a change in tenancy or illegal activity to reenergise, the charges will be passed onto the Supplier who wont then necessarily be able to pass them onto a customer.
- 4.5 The Proposer questioned how it would be possible to identify when a site is energised but not consuming, as it could be that there is a reason the site was not consuming for a period of time, such as an outage. The member suggested that if there is master data or an existing process, the information should work both ways.
- 4.6 The Proposer asked what happens when settlements pick up meter readings on sites marked as deenergised. The Chair noted that they believe they are not used in settlements until the issue has been resolved and that the Supplier is informed and advised to investigate.
- 4.7 One member highlighted paragraph 140 of the legal text and questioned the wording 'where a site is incorrectly deenergised', noting that this implies the site has been deenergised in error, rather than being incorrectly labelled as being deenergised.
- 4.8 Another member asked whether a data cleanse could be completed to ensure the correct statuses are held, and then the change wont be needed.
- 4.9 The member asked if the Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC) had been contacted regarding any interactions or necessary consequential changes. The Proposer noted that they did not feel there was an interaction with the BSC.
- 4.10 The group agreed that the BSC should be contacted to ask what they do when they receive consumption data from deenergised sites.

Action 01/01 – The Chair to contact the BSC to ask what they do when they receive consumption data from deenergised sites.

- 4.11 One member asked how many cases there are of these instances and what the materiality of the issue is. The group agreed to ask the Central Settlement Source to provide the data anonymised.

Action 01/02 – The Chair to contact the Central Settlement Source requesting data on deenergised sites.

- 4.12 A Supplier representative highlighted that when they are aware of a site being recorded as deenergised, they are struggling to find out the history of who deenergised/reenergised it. Other Supplier members agreed that this could be an issue.
- 4.13 Members agreed to add the following text to the consultation document to ensure the intent of the proposed change is clear. 'The intent is to charge DUoS to those who are using the system in the scenario where the MPRS system says a site is deenergised but actual meter readings are being received'.
- 4.14 The Working Group agreed for the following questions to be asked in the consultation, alongside the standard questions.
- For measurement class C and E MPANs only - What current reporting exist between DNOs/Suppliers that identify if an MPANs Energisation status is incorrectly de energised?
  - What existing process across the industry are in place to identify incorrect energisation statuses within other industry codes? Can you please be specific to the processes and codes that are already in place.
  - For measurement class C and E MPANs only - In what instances would a de energised site be consuming energy i.e. theft, COT/COS?
  - What causes the energisation status to not get updated?
  - In instances where the energisation status is not updated, what are challenges to getting the relevant information to confirm if the status is incorrect and resolve the status?
  - If this change was to be approved, what would the impact to your organisation be? I.e. additional resource, training, changes to billing systems, additional bad debt etc.
  - If this change was to be approved, what are the potential impact to customers?

## 5. Review/Update Work Plan

---

- 5.1 The Chair agreed to draft the consultation and to issue this to the Working Group for review.
- 5.2 The Working Group agreed to meet again on Wednesday 12 June 2024, 10am to 1pm.

## 6. Any Other Business

---

- 6.1 No other business was raised.

## New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
<b>01/01</b>	The Chair to contact the BSC to ask what they do when they receive consumption data from deenergised sites.	AG	New Action.
<b>01/02</b>	The Chair to contact the Central Settlement Source requesting data on deenergised sites.	AG	New Action.

## Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update