

Meeting Session	DCUSA Panel (Open Session)
Paper Reference	Panel_2025_0521_08_SIG Headline Report
Action	For Information

SIG Headline Report

1. Synopsis

- 1.1 This report sets out the key decisions made at a DCUSA Standing Issues Group (SIG) meeting on 25 April 2025. The minutes of the meeting are available [here](#) on the DCUSA website.

2. DIFs 80 'De-energised sites'

- 2.1 The SIG revisited this DIF in April as agreed at the previous SIG meeting.
- 2.2 It was explained that the REC had been contacted and noted that they believed that there were no gaps in the process and that all elements from the MRA had been picked up however, they did highlight that the previous MRA process had been spilt across the DCUSA, the REC and the BSC.
- 2.3 The person who raised DIF 80 stated that they were minded to wait 6 months to allow for some MHHS changes to be implemented, as it was hoped that these changes would close some of the gaps in the process however, it was agreed to keep DIF 80 on the agenda for May's SIG as there were still some outstanding actions from SIG members to check the BSC, REC and DCUSA process to see if there were any areas that required immediate attention.

3. DIF 81 'Making RAV uplift consistent with PCFM inflation basis'.

- 3.1 It was noted that the issue was raised to address an inconsistency in how RPI and CPIH are used within the RAV calculation in Schedule 1 of the DCUSA, where the calculation of RAV uses RPI, but the price control uses RPI up to March 2023 and then CPIH from April 2023.
- 3.2 The SIG agreed this could create future issues, especially if there was a divergence in the values of RPI and CPIH so a Change Proposal (CP) would be required.
- 3.3 There was a discussion around whether the CP should be raised as Part 1 or Part 2 Matter, during which it was agreed to initially raise the CP as a Part 2 Matter as the change doesn't make a significant material impact to any market participants, doesn't impact consumers and doesn't distort competition. The Chair also advised the SIG that the DCUSA Panel would review the CP against the Part 1 Matter and Part 2 Matter criteria and feedback accordingly if they believed it was appropriate to raise as a Part 1 Matter or a Part 2 Matter.
- 3.4 The SIG members in attendance provided the person who raised DIF 81 with some ideas of potential solutions and the raising party agreed to take these suggestions away and consider them before formally raising a CP for the DCUSA panel to review.

4. DCP 417 Guidance document review

- 4.1 The SIG reviewed a guidance document that had been produced by the Secretariat following the implementation of DCP 417. It was noted that the document used the word 'group' throughout and at times in different contexts. It was requested that the document is updated to make it clear as to who can vote, how many times a group can vote and what is meant by 'group' in the context of voting on whether or not the Secretariat is able to raise a CP.
- 4.2 It was also agreed to rename the document to something along the lines of 'Guidance on Secretariat raising DCPs' as using the Change Proposal number (i.e., DCP 417) will become confusing as time passes by and people eventually forget what net result of DCP 417 actually was.
- 4.3 It was also agreed to include a pre-amble/context to the document e.g. this document provides guidance on the process for the Secretariat raising DCPs pursuant to clause xxx of DCUSA....

5. MHHS Stakeholder Group comparison of data items in EMDS

- 5.1 It was noted that the issue to be discussed related to potentially inconsistent data items as set out within the Energy Market Data Specification (EMDS) held under the REC and those captured within the remit of the MHHS Programme. Members noted that this issue is to be handled by the DCUSA MHHS Stakeholder Group but was brought to the SIG with DCUSA MHHS Stakeholder Group members also invited for additional support.
- 5.2 It was explained that the SIG members were being requested to validate data within the EMDS as there was the potential for some of that data to be incomplete or incorrect which could cause a number of issues if not corrected, especially for new market entrants.
- 5.3 It was agreed that the central source of data that the EMDS would be populated with should be the SWAGGER as this is the approach that industry has taken when building systems and processes at the steer of the MHHS programme.
- 5.4 It was noted that there were some data items within the SWAGGER that needed to be updated but this could be resolved separately with the programme.
- 5.5 With the principle agreed of where the data for the EMDS should be sourced from, the MHHS Stakeholder Group members agreed to hold a DCUSA MHHS Stakeholder Group meeting on 02 May 2025 to continue the discussion and review the data sources to highlight where the EMDS has gaps before taking these gaps to the MHHS programme and the REC for resolution.

6. Next SIG Meeting – 30 May 2025

- 6.1 At present no new issues have been raised.

7. Recommendations

- 7.1 The DCUSA Panel is invited to:
 - **NOTE** the contents of this paper.