

DIF 76 Subgroup Meeting 01 Draft Minutes

19 June 2025 at 14:00 via Microsoft Teams

Attendees	Company
Komal Brown	Scottish Power
Donna Jamieson	IDCSL
Nik Wills	Stark
Laide Adekanle	Scottish Power
Isaac Hale	EDF
Elaine Carr	SPEN
Secretariat	
Craig Booth [CB ²] (TechSec)	ElectraLink
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
No apologies	

1. Administration

- 1.1 The Chair asked members if they were comfortable for this Subgroup meeting 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 the minutes are approved.
- 1.2 The Subgroup reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance” and it was noted that all members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.
- 1.3 The Chair noted that the group was not quorate and as such no decisions could be made, but it was agreed to continue the conversation.

2. Review of DIF 76 ‘MPAN and GSP Group correction and charges’

- 2.1 The Chair explained the purpose of the meeting was to review DIF 76 and agree the next steps.
- 2.2 The Chair presented the DIF document (see Attachment X) and explained that this was related to DIF 69 which was raised to perform some exploratory work, with DIF 76 now being raised to tackle the issue.
- 2.3 KB gave an overview of the DIF and explained that the DNOs/IDNOs have a mechanism to charge suppliers if retrospective changes to top line items are required, but no such mechanism exists for suppliers to charge DNOs/IDNOs where MPANs or GSP groups have to be corrected.
- 2.4 KB explained that where an MPAN or GSP group has to be corrected, this creates a lot of work for suppliers and requires customer engagement, which was confirmed in the RFI. The Chair noted that Centrica had mentioned the need for manual intervention, to suppress certain communications and ensure the billing is correct.
- 2.5 DJ considered whether the guidance document would sit under the DCUSA, however it was discussed that this may instead sit under another code, such as the BSC.
- 2.6 EC stated that [BSCP604 ‘Error Resolution and Retrospective Manual Adjustments’](#) covers error resolution and retrospective manual adjustments.
- 2.7 EC suggested it would be good to define scenarios that need to be covered, so that it would be clear what specific scenarios the guidance would relate to.
- 2.8 The Subgroup discussed potential scenarios, such as an MPAN being created by a DNO for an IDNO with the incorrect GSP, or a local authority having three GSPs in its area. The Chair noted that large installations, such as airports, could also be impacted by this.
- 2.9 The subgroup discussed whether the communication method should also be agreed so that one method, should as SDEP, is used for communication MAP04 purposes.
- 2.10 EC suggested that a business case should be pulled together to show what the benefit is to implement any proposed solutions. The group referred to the RFI which showed Scottish Power was able to detail a significant impact, but other suppliers show a small or no impact.
- 2.11 LA shared the retrospective amendments tables on screen, showing that where the supplier initiates the corrections there is a mechanism for charges to be quoted by the LDNO, but where the LDNO initiates the corrections there is no such mechanisms for suppliers to quote costs.

- 2.12 KB asked how this would be moved forward.
- 2.13 AG explained that the SIG groups are used to explore the issues first and agree what next steps would be required. AG explained that in the first instance the subgroup could issue an RFI to request further information (and more up-to-date information) to understand volumes, scenarios and which code Parties consider this should sit under.
- 2.14 DJ questioned what the impact to end consumers would be if a DNO/IDNO was quoted a cost for the correction of errors and subsequently refused to pay this. DJ noted that, historically, corrections were not made until after payment had been made.
- 2.15 EC agreed an RFI would be useful for scenarios and volumes, but that it would also be useful to understand costs. EC explained that a variety of different costs go into the charging statements but were suppliers to be able to charge for LDNO initiated corrections, this should not amount to a blank chequebook where there is an array of different supplier charges.
- 2.16 EC queried whether this could also cause issues relating to charging, as these costs would not have been expected and would impact against DNOs/IDNOs allowed revenues.
- 2.17 EC asked how the supplier would know whether to charge a DNO or an IDNO for the correction if the MPAN or GSP. KB proposed this would be the entity that created the MPANs, but EC cautioned that it may not be that clear cut and that disputes could be raised as a result.
- 2.18 The subgroup discussed that the RFI would help to determine if there was a business case and to get supplier views on what it would be reasonable to charge DNOs and IDNOs for LDNO initiated corrections.
- 2.19 AG suggested the next best step would be to set up a call/meeting with the BSC to discuss the best way to move this forward and whether the SIG should issue the RFI.
- 2.20 AG stated that once he had arranged the meeting with the BSC, the next meeting would be arranged via a doodle poll.
- 2.21 DJ asked if it would be worth identifying any “persistent offenders” that cause the need for corrections. AG agreed this would be worthwhile asking, as it may be possible to work with specific Parties to improve their processes and prevent the need for corrections.
- 2.22 KB asked if it was possible to report on how many MPAN/GSP corrections had been made in a given year.
- 2.23 DJ explained that superuser changes could be reported on, which would include GSP changes.
- 2.24 The subgroup discussed that it would be worth asking DNOs and IDNOs what reporting capabilities they have, if the RFI is issued. AG noted that Elexon may also be able to help understand the volume of these types of corrections and that he would reach out to Elexon to discuss this.
- 2.25 NW stated that [BSCP501 ‘Supplier Meter Registration Service’](#) might be relevant to this as it details the SMRA obligations, which includes payments and SLAs.

3. Any Other Business

- 3.1 No other business was raised.

4. Attachments

- Attachment 1 DIF 69 collated RFI Responses