

DCMDG Subgroup ‘AAR Lessons Learnt’ – WG Meeting 01

10 June 2024 at 14:00

Teleconference via Microsoft Teams

Attendees	Company
Diandra Orodan [DO]	BU-UK
Donna Jameison [DJ]	Independent Distribution Connection Specialists
Emma Clark [EC]	SSEN
Lorna Murray [LM]	SPEN
Michelle Brown [MB]	Energy Assets
Victoria Burkett [VB]	SSE
Ian Chadwick [IC]	MUA
Secretariat	
Alysson Peña [AP] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Dylan Townsend [DT] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Lee Stone	E.ON

1. Administration

- 1.1 The group reviewed the DCUSA “Competition Law Guidance” and agreed to be bound by this for the duration of the meeting.

2. Introduction

- 2.1 The Chair welcomed the DCMDG attendees to the meeting.

3. Review of discussion points

- 3.1 The Chair reminded members of the Sub-Group that it was set up for the purposes of facilitating a discussion on the process for the annual allocation review. Specifically, as was discussed during the May DCMDG meeting, the information distributors provide to suppliers as part of the annual allocation review process had been inconsistent in both form and content. Therefore, the hope was that something could be done to resolve this issue, with one option being to see if agreement can be reached on the use of a template for this purpose.
- 3.2 The Chair noted that to assist the sub-group in their discussions, that a paper had been pulled together which contained, an extract from the relevant part of the minutes of the May DCMDG meeting, an extract of the relevant DCUSA legal text and some high-level points for discussion.

3.3 Members noted that the crux of the process/discussion centred around the text from Paragraph 6.10 and 6.11 of Schedule 32, which states:

6.10 *On or before 15 September of the Annual Allocation Review, the DNO/IDNO Party shall provide each Supplier Party with a list **of each and every** MPAN associated with a Non-Domestic Premises that is connected to the DNO/IDNO Party's Distribution System that has been reallocated to a New Charging Band as a result of the Annual Allocation Review, identifying the Old Charging Band and New Charging Band to which each such MPAN has been allocated, and the LLFC Id which is assigned to the MPAN.*

6.11 *Reallocation of a Final Demand Site to a New Charging Band may result in the Registrant for the Final Demand Site being either eligible for a rebate or subject to an additional charge both of which shall be backdated to the date on which the Final Demand Site was first charged the Old Charging Band residual fixed charge. The New Charging Band will be applied from the next billing period.*

3.4 In reviewing the above text the following was agreed:

- items to be provided to Suppliers are:

1. MPAN
2. Old Charging Band
3. New Charging Band
4. The new LLFC Id

3.5 In terms of distributors providing MPANs, members discussed whether it would be preferable for distributors to provide Suppliers with all MPANs that have moved bands or just those which the Supplier are registered for. It was noted that one option could be for all MPANs to be provided and for distributors to provide the Supplier MPID in a separate column to assist Supplier Parties to identify the sites that are theirs. Members initial thoughts were that this might be problematic due to such data uncovering the exact portfolio of each Supplier.

3.6 Another option was suggested that might make the provision of all MPANs more acceptable for Suppliers, and that was for distributors to issue the spreadsheet separately to each Supplier and to include only the MPID(s) against MPANs associated with that Supplier and then blanks for the other Supplier sites. It was noted that whilst this might be a good solution for Suppliers, that it would mean quite a bit more work for distributors and therefore might not be something that distributors will sign on to.

3.7 With respect to the provision of the LLFC Id, the Chair noted that the text just states “the LLFC Id which is assigned to the MPAN” and he assumed that this meant the new LLFC ID for the new band but asked members whether it could also be taken to mean the old LLFC ID. Members discussed whether having both would be of benefit or not, with the outcome being that it might be useful for some Suppliers and so it could be added to the proposed template for now.

3.8 In terms of the proposed template, members suggested that given only one Supplier representative was able to join the call, that it would likely be useful to undertake a short RFI, setting out the proposal that distributors should be agreeing to use the same template and the fields that are to be populated. A version of the template was shared on screen, with members agreeing that the following fields be included for now

- MPAN/MSID
- LLFC ID
 - Old
 - New
- New LLFC ID Effective From Date
- Secondary MPAN?
- Old Residual Charging Band
- New Residual Charging Band
- Residual Charging Band Effective From Date

3.9 Members discussed their thoughts on a point that was made during the May DCMDG meeting related to ways of ensuring that updates are being made to EES/MPRS in a timely fashion. It was agreed that this should be something for distributors to come to an agreement on that could form part of a guidance document that parties could refer to. Further to that point, members agreed that such a guidance document might be useful for Suppliers, in that it could set out what process to follow in cases where the information hasn't been updated in EES/MPRS (i.e., if suppliers find issues – who they could contact). Note that Paragraph 6.11 states that “the New Charging Band will be applied from the next billing period”.

3.10 One member questioned whether the template/guidance would need to be updated once MPANs start moving across into MHHS, as LLFC Ids no longer exist in MHHS. The Chair explained that as it currently stands, DCUSA drafting for MHHS proposes to include some additional text that would indicate that for MHHS MPANs, that the DUoS Tariff Id should be included (in place of the LLFC Id). It was agreed that the DCUSA MHHS representative could be asked about this point during the next Panel meeting.

3.11 In terms of the proposed RFI, members turned their minds to the questions that should be asked, and during that discussion, the below items were captured:

- Do you have a preference for distributors issuing one file that would cover multiple licence areas or IDNOs (if one or more IDNOs operate under say a parent company) or a separate file per DNO area or IDNO company?
- Do you have a preference for the data to be provided in a single tab in a spreadsheet or multiple tabs as has been provided previously (i.e., currently the template has it split across customer groupings LV No-MIC, LV MIC, HV, EHV)?

- Would it be beneficial for guidance to be developed to help parties both in providing the data but also for those receiving the data, including the point in time by which any re-allocated MPANs have been updated in EES/MPRS and maybe a process to be followed in cases where this hasn't been updated (i.e., if suppliers find issues – who they could contact).

4. Working Group Agreed Next Steps

4.1 The Chair invited members to discuss and agree the next steps for this subgroup, which were noted as follows:

- ElectraLink to draft an RFI document, including some introductory text to call out to suppliers specifically but that it should be open to Suppliers/DNOs/IDNOS (1 week)
ACTION
- Sub-Group to review the draft RFI and provide feedback Review Draft RFI (1 week)
- RFI issued to Parties for 15 Working Days
- Sub-group to meet again to review responses and the date is to be confirmed via doodle poll.

5. Any Other Business (AOB)

5.1 The Chair asked for any other items of business.

5.2 There were no further items of business raised.

6. Date of Next Meeting

6.1 The DCMDG members agreed that the next meeting would be arranged once the RFI was reviewed and circulated.

7. Attachments

- Attachment 1 – DCMDG 'AAR' Subr-Group
- Attachment 2 – Template

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/01	ElectraLink to draft an RFI document, including some introductory text to call out to suppliers specifically but that it should be open to Suppliers/DNOs/IDNOS (1 week)	Secretariat	New Action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update