

DCP 444 Working Group Meeting 01

30 September 2024 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Thomas Alexander [TA]	SSEN
Colin Berry [CB]	Elexon
Philip Mark [PM]	SSEN
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark
Laura Quinn [LQ]	SPEN
Peter Waymont [PW]	UKPN
Code Administrator	
Richard Colwill [RC]	Chair
Hannah Proffitt [HP]	Secretariat

Apologies

Attendee	Company
Victoria Burkett [VB]	SSE

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 once the minutes have been approved.

Apologies

- 1.2 Apologies are noted in the table above.

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. The Action Log is at the end of the document.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair highlighted that the purpose of the meeting was to review DCP 444 and to consider the next steps.

3. Overview of DCP 444

- 3.1 The Proposer provided the following summary of the Change.
- 3.2 *Changes to the DCUSA text arising from Market Wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS) have assumed that the settlement runs that created the D0030/D0314 flows (SF, R1, R2, R3, RF, DF) would be the same runs that will create the REP-002/A/B messages. This largely arose from the “ERI0118- ECS Reports External” documents that contained an item called DI-160 “Settlement Code” in the REP-002/A/B and REP-901 messages that contained the relevant values of SF, R1, R2, R3, RF, DF (and also included DR but D0030s/D0314s have never been created for those and the DR run doesn’t have a sequence number so couldn’t be processed). For more information see “Settlement Sequence Number” in ISD Entity 51.*
- 3.3 *Subsequently the MHHS programme has amended DI-160 to add in “II” runs (MHHS-DIN-1077) – these are information runs that are created prior to SF. They therefore intend to send REP-002/A/B messages in respect of those runs.*
- 3.4 *The MHHS programme have stated it was always their intent that their central systems would create messages for all settlement runs and DI-160 was originally in error.*
- 3.5 *The programme have said that if parties do not wish to receive REP-002/A/B in respect of those runs, they would need to raise a change request after migration starts. Such a change request would likely introduce a new data item, to replace DI-160 in the messages, that describes the desired run types if “II” is not desired. This would mean a lead time for the change request to be considered and central systems to be adjusted, during which the “II” run data will be received by DCUSA parties.*
- 3.6 *DCUSA therefore needs to deal with the handling of the “II” Supercustomer DUoS Reports, at least at the start of migration.*
- 3.7 *To determine what to do with the “II” run files. Here are three options that have been identified –*
 1. *Receive II REP-002A/B – do not calculate charges, do not issue REP-901 and do not use in billing*
 2. *Receive II REP-002A/B – calculate charges and issue REP-901 but do not use in billing.*

3. *Receive II REP-002A/B – calculate charges and issue REP-901 and use in billing as the initial run (SF becomes a reconciliation run).*

4. Review and Discussion of Change Proposal

- 4.1 The Chair asked the Working Group for their feedback and questions.
- 4.2 One member stated that there would be value in seeing the interim information for forecasting purposes. The member advised that it would give an initial idea of what volumes might be coming through sooner than the standard SF run.
- 4.3 The Proposer suggested that another thing to consider is that the II run comes up 4 Working Days (WDs) after the settlement date and the SF will come at 7 WDs after the settlement date. One member noted that for their month end processes they are looking to get as good an idea of what has happened in the last month as possible, therefore the 3 WDs would have value.
- 4.4 TA agreed to draft a paragraph outlining the benefits of receiving the data for forecasting to be included in the consultation document.

Action 01/01 – TA to draft a paragraph outlining the benefits of receiving the data for forecasting.

- 4.5 Another member noted that from a billing point of view, they would pick option 1 (Receive II REP-002A/B – do not calculate charges, do not issue REP-901 and do not use in billing), however noted that they can speak to their forecasting and sales teams internally to gain a broader view.
- 4.6 The first member advised that from a forecasting perspective, it is irrelevant whether you charge and bill on the II run, it is just useful to have the information earlier than the SF run would provide it.
- 4.7 It was noted that all three options would allow forecasting to see that data.
- 4.8 The Proposer stated that there could be a further option - 1A, which would be to not calculate the charges and stop the flow being received. The group agreed to add the further option.
- 4.9 The Proposer noted that currently the system used by the DNOs is rejecting the flows and that if the intent is to receive them and do nothing, a cleaner solution could be put in place other than rejection.
- 4.10 The Proposer highlighted that the Change also mentions DR runs which are a current run, however noted that they have never seen one. The Proposer noted that these seem to be random dispute runs that do not form part of the operational sequence but are included in the list of potential files that could be received. The Proposer noted that a consultation questions should ask about these as well as the II runs.
- 4.11 One member noted that they have seen large erroneous changes happening in DF runs and there is currently an issue raised with Elexon about this. The erroneous change happened at DF and so any fix will happen with an Extra Settlement Determination (ESD). The member noted that it won't come through as a D30 in the current system but to get that update through on a final run would be useful there rather than being processed as an ESD.

- 4.12 The Proposer asked whether this is what the DR runs are for. Another member noted that the DR runs are theoretically there to run between reconciliation runs or between SF and R1 if required by a trading dispute, so they try to avoid them where possible.
- 4.13 The Proposer asked whether DR runs should be processed or not and CB took an action to look into this.

Action 01/02 – CB to check whether DR runs should be processed as they will be corrected/properly dealt with later on.

- 4.14 For the consultation, the group agreed to outline the Working Group view that DRs should not be sent on the basis that they will be corrected later in a formal run. The Chair noted that to change this, a change request would need to be made to MHHS.
- 4.15 One member noted that this would be a change to BAU as there is a change freeze on MHHS at the moment so Elexon processes would pick it up after M10. The Proposer noted that once the outcome of this change is clear, they will raise an appropriate change if needed.
- 4.16 The Chair agreed that the consultation can be used to seek industry views and to feed back to the relevant codes.
- 4.17 One member asked for clarity on the additional option to be added to the existing 3. The Proposer confirmed that an additional option could be added to stop the flow being sent altogether. The member asked whether there is an option to do nothing and for the IIs to bounce back, as all options will currently require system changes.
- 4.18 The Proposer noted that the current option 1 (Receive II REP-002A/B – do not calculate charges, do not issue REP-901 and do not use in billing) could be done with no changes as it is rejecting them at the moment.
- 4.19 The Working Group discussed which questions they would like to include in the consultation.
- 4.20 The group agreed to ask which of the three options was preferred and for the rationale. The Proposer suggested that the following additional question could be included – ‘If you have chosen option 1, should a subsequent change be raised to stop the runs being sent at all?’.

5. Review/Update Work Plan

- 5.1 The Working Group agreed the following next steps:
- The Chair to create an initial draft of the consultation and issue to members for review.
 - Members to meet again on Monday 07th October at 10am to review the consultation (if needed).
 - The Chair to issue the consultation to industry on Tuesday 08th October for a period of 2 weeks. Responses will be due on 22nd October.

- Members to meet again on Friday 25th October at 1pm to review the consultation responses.

6. Any Other Business

- 6.1 No other business was raised.

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/01	TA to draft a paragraph outlining the benefits of receiving the data for forecasting.	TA	New action.
01/02	CB to check whether DR runs should be processed as they will be corrected/properly dealt with later on.	CB	New action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update