

## DDDG Meeting 01

29 April 2025 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Samantha Wilcock [SW]	Shell
Kevin Woollard [KW]	British Gas
Peter Waymont [PW]	UK Power Networks
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
Furqan Aziz [FA]	Chair
Hannah Proffitt [HP]	Secretariat

### 1. Administration

#### Recording

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

#### Apologies

- 1.2 No apologies were received ahead of the meeting.

#### Competition Law Guidance and Terms of Reference

- 1.3 The Chair advised that the Terms of Reference would be discussed later in the meeting.
- 1.4 The group agreed that the Competition Law guidance was not relevant to the nature of this group and agreed for it to be taken off the agenda for future meetings.

### 2. Purpose of the Forum and Objectives

- 2.1 The Chair advised that the purpose of the meeting was to outline the objectives of the forum and agree the Terms of Reference. The Chair noted they had also received a request from Ofgem that would be discussed later in the meeting.

- 2.2 The Chair advised that the objective of the forum is to discuss and review new ideas, suggestions and feedback relating to the DCUSA website. The Chair noted that these could be submitted by users or the Secretariat.
- 2.3 The Chair highlighted the following ways these ideas can be identified.
- Users completing the feedback form on the website
  - Users attending DDDG with suggestions
  - Discussing challenges experienced by DCUSA users
  - In depth walk through of the website
  - Reviewing other code platforms
  - Reviewing the latest technological developments

### 3. Agree the Terms of Reference

---

- 3.1 The Chair went on to outline the scope of the group, advising that the following were directly in scope; the main website functionality, the digital document, how we manage DCUSA data and how we communicate with users. The Chair advised that the Secretariat workflow is indirectly in scope, and that updating legal text will usually be out of scope, however that there may be exceptions.
- 3.2 The Chair explained that minor housekeeping changes that are identified can be discussed by the group and the usual change process would be followed.
- 3.3 PW clarified that a Change Proposal would need to be raised for any change needed to DCUSA. The Chair agreed.
- 3.4 Members agreed the scope of the group.
- 3.5 The Chair highlighted the responsibilities of the group, including reviewing ideas that have been shared, considering the impact on DCUSA users, prioritising which ideas should be recommended and where possible helping test or draft solutions. The Chair encouraged members to be on the lookout for improvements and to encourage others to submit feedback.
- 3.6 The Chair outlined the decision making process, summarising as follows.
- DDDG agree a solution/improvement
  - Create user stories (document what is looking to be achieved)
  - Brief Xanda, the technical partner
  - Receive a quote from Xanda
  - Present to the DCUSA Board for approval

3.7 The Chair highlighted that this process should take approximately three weeks.

## 4. Discussion of User Feedback

---

### Ofgem - Transparent Charging Information Hub Required

- 4.1 The Chair outlined that an item had been raised by Ofgem, suggesting a charging information hub is needed. The request stated that finding and understanding network charging models published on the DNOs websites is difficult and the models and statements follow templates but each DNO hosts them differently.
- 4.2 The request noted that the documents are stored in different places and labelled inconsistently, making it confusing and inconvenient for users to locate. The request outlined that parties find it hard to understand why specific data is needed and documents sometimes feel like they exist as a tick box exercise. The request noted concern around a lack of transparency around how network charges are calculated.
- 4.3 The Chair outlined the solution proposed by Ofgem, to create a centralised hub for network charging information. The proposed solution includes API integration to pull data from DNO sources and display them consistently. The solution proposes models and templates are presented with explanations to aid understanding and that outputs are more structured and transparent for industry users and regulatory needs.
- 4.4 PW noted that it would be possible to host all of the DNOs models and charging statements on the DCUSA website, but questioned why API integration would be necessary.
- 4.5 The Chair noted that it would address the lack of consistency, and that the information would be pulled automatically rather than needing to be submitted. The Chair added that any updates would be pulled through automatically.
- 4.6 PW questioned the, cost benefit of a dynamic updating system for information that only changes once a year with 13 months' notice.
- 4.7 The Chair noted that currently to obtain the information it is necessary to manually download the Excel spreadsheet, however if there was API integration it could go directly into their systems. This would automate the process.
- 4.8 PW asked, if the data is being pulled from the DNOs websites, what happens if the DNOs change their websites or file structure. The Chair confirmed there should not be an issue as it is not pulling the data from the website, but from the data source.
- 4.9 PW asked if the DNOs will have to change their data, as it is currently in Excel format. The Chair noted that it would not pull from a spreadsheet and that it would need to be set up which would require resource.
- 4.10 PW questioned what would compel Distributors to do this and asked whether a Change Proposal would be needed to introduce an obligation. PW added that work is required to establish the impacts. The Chair agreed that different DNOs will have a different view on how much resource would be required to facilitate this.

- 4.11 Members questioned whether the charging models are currently on the DCUSA website. PW clarified that templates are on the DCUSA website but charging models are on the DNOs website. PW highlighted that EDCM models are confidential and therefore cannot be shared, which limits transparency.
- 4.12 KW noted that as a DCUSA Contract Manager they are sent the charging statements from all of the DNOs and IDNOs each April and that a central place could be more efficient. PW highlighted that this would still happen as it is a licence obligation to send them. KW suggested that this could be a possible licence change.
- 4.13 Members discussed whether this matter should be presented at the DCMDG for discussion. The group agreed that the ENA Commercial Operations Group (COG) would be a better forum. The Chair agreed to contact Ofgem for further clarity on some aspects of the request and then contact the COG to discuss further with DNOs.

Action 01/01 – The Chair to contact Ofgem for further clarity on their request, and then to contact the ENA to request attendance to the COG to discuss the request with DNOs.

#### Central Change Register

- 4.14 KW raised a further item, advising that they are looking into the possibility of creating a joint change register for all codes that is updated dynamically and gives a consistent view. KW noted that CACoP publish something similar however it is always outdated and therefore not fit for purpose. KW advised they are discussing this with all codes to assess feasibility.
- 4.15 KW noted that consistency around data fields would be required, however there is already a lot of common fields. KW added that it would also need to be decided how much information was included.
- 4.16 The Chair noted that this would be a REST API, meaning the data would be made available and could then be pulled by any user. The Chair agreed to liaise with the DCUSA technical partners to better understand the technical requirements and resourcing required for a DCUSA open REST API and to present findings at the May DCUSA board.

Action 01/02 – The Chair to liaise with DCUSA technical partners to better understand the technical requirements and resourcing required for a DCUSA open REST API. The Chair to present all findings at the May DCUSA board.

- 4.17 Members discussed what data should be included and considered whether a consultation should be issued to parties asking which fields they would find beneficial. The Chair suggested that a REST could be created with all the information included and then people can choose to pull what they want. This would avoid additional costs associated with adding fields in the future that were not included initially. Members agreed that this would be a good approach and that would avoid the need for a consultation. Members acknowledged that the information is publicly available anyway.
- 4.18 The Chair agreed to speak to KW after the meeting to ensure all information is captured, and then to request a cost estimate from Xanda to present to the DCUSA Board at the May meeting.

Action 01/03 - The Chair to speak to KW after the meeting to ensure all information is captured, and then to request a cost estimate from Xanda to present to the DCUSA Board for approval at the May meeting.

## 5. Any Other Business

---

- 5.1 The Chair asked if there was any other business, to which nothing was raised.

## New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/01	The Chair to contact Ofgem for further clarity on their request, and then to contact the ENA to request attendance to the COG to discuss the request with DNOs.	The Chair	New action.
01/02	The Chair to liaise with DCUSA technical partners to better understand the technical requirements and resourcing required for a DCUSA open REST API. The Chair to present all findings at the May DCUSA board.	The Chair	New action.
01/03	The Chair to speak to KW after the meeting to ensure all information is captured, and then to request a cost estimate from Xanda to present to the DCUSA Board for approval at the May meeting.	The Chair	New action.

## Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update