

DCUSA SIG Sub-Group for DIF 86 and 87 - Meeting 01

15 August 2025 at 10:00

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Kara Burke [KB]	NPg
Phill Mark [PM]	SSE
Tim Porter [TP]	SSE
Rachel Wallace [RW]	BU-UK
Gareth Evens [GE]	Water Wye
Meg Wong [MW]	Stark
Nik Willis [NW]	Stark
Jenny Harvey [JH]	NGED
Jo Brown [JB]	NGED
Ryan Roberts [RR]	Tech Solutions
Code Administrator	
Andy Green	Chair
Apologies	
Mark Bellman [MB]	ENWL

1. Administration

Recording

- 1.1 The Chair asked members if they were comfortable for this Subgroup 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 these minutes have been approved.

Competition Law Guidance and Terms of Reference

- 1.2 The Working Group reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance” and “Terms of Reference”. All subgroup members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss DIFs 86 and 87 and decide on next steps.

3. Overview of DIF 86

- 3.1 The proposer of the issue opened by stating that these issues are minor non compliances with the charging methodology and that are driven mainly by simplifications that have been made in billing systems in order to deal with unforeseen events.
- 3.2 It was highlighted that these are largely very rare and edge case events and so the question is whilst systems are being reviewed as a result of MHHS, were these issues large enough to warrant spending money on updating billing systems to mitigate the issues.
- 3.3 PW went on to note that the issue in DIF 86 was a byproduct of some of the controls around multi MPAN sites and change of supply.
- 3.4 It was queried if the DIF was looking at related or associated MPANs.
- 3.5 PW explained that it wasn't aimed at associated MPANs which deal with import and export and that the issue that DIF 86 was looking at was centred around related MPANs.
- 3.6 PW went on to explain that the issue generally occurs when they have a site and the connection agreement for that site has more than one MPAN. The expectation is they would want to charge DUoS for that site in its entirety for all the MPANs in one go.
- 3.7 PW went on to state that as they're not in control of these MPANs being related, as that's a supplier driven activity, it is possible for these MPANs to individually change supplier.
- 3.8 An example of the issue was provided which was, a site has three MPANs on the site and one of the MPANs goes to a different supplier. The question then is how is the capacity split across the three MPANs in these instances.

- 3.9 It was noted that within the DIF the suggested solution was to split the billing periods so that the assessment for capacity charging is not made at the month end but at the point in time of each relevant change so the change of supplier would then be factored into the charges.

4. Overview of DIF 87

- 4.1 The Subgroup then went on to discuss DIF 87 and it was noted that this DIF had a similar solution to DIF 86, which was to amend the process so that certain events that occur mid-month can be catered for within the billing system.
- 4.2 It was explained that the issue was looking at events like capacity changes and other events that lead to a change in standing charge items.
- 4.3 RW explained they usually stick to making changes at the start of the month, with the expectation of de-energising/energising MPANs.
- 4.4 It was highlighted that for customers wanting to downgrade their capacity, telling them they would have to wait until a new month for that capacity to become applicable can lead to customers paying for a higher capacity for a period when it's not needed.
- 4.5 A DNO confirmed that their process is usually always to make these updates on the 1st of each month but did give an example of a broker who challenged this asking why they had to wait for the start of a new month for the downgrade in capacity to take effect.
- 4.6 It was agreed that sending RFIs for each individual issue was the best approach.
- 4.7 It was agreed to ask questions relating to whether parties have experience of the issues and if the issues were large enough to warrant system changes or, if they were so edge case, it's better to leave the process as it is currently.
- 4.8 It was also agreed to ask questions as whether the suggested solutions were fit for purpose and if there were any solutions that the Subgroup hadn't considered.
- 4.9 The Chair took an action to create two separate one pager RFIs and share with the Subgroup for feedback before issuing to industry.
- 4.10 It was agreed to have both RFIs open for 15 working days, and for the Subgroup to meet on 22 September 2025 10am-12pm to review the RFI responses.

5. Next Meeting

- 5.1 The next meeting will be agreed via doodle poll once it has been agreed what date the consultation is to be issued.

6. Any Other Business

- 6.1 EC raised an AOB item as they'd noticed the below regarding how the excess capacity calculation was carried out in Durabill when an MPAN changes supplier.

- The definition of XS capacity requires that the peak HH value is used in a given month, but Durabill takes the peak HH value used for each supplier.
- See below as an example for an MPAN in October 2020 during which time there was a transition from LOND to TNDO.

Looking through the HH data:

- The peak HH period for LOND was SP=44 on 10/10/2020 (46.6 kVA) based on 15 days

- The peak HH period for TNDO was SP = 33 on 22/10/2020 (29.0 kVA) based on 16 days

- LOND was issued a bill based on 46.6 XS kVA and TNDO was issued a bill for 29.0kVA whereas a bill should have been issued to both suppliers for 46.6kVA. At the moment, a customer could potentially reduce their XS capacity bill just by changing supplier.
- 6.2 It was acknowledged that this is an issue and bringing the item as a formal DIF to the August SIG meeting for a wider discussion made sense.
- 6.3 The Chair advised that he'd send the DCUSA Issues Form to EC and advised that the last date to get issues raised with DCUSA to be discussed at the August SIG meeting was 21 August 2025.

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/01	Draft RFIs to be created for each DIF and shared with the subgroup to review	Andy Green	New Action
01/02	Chair to send EC the DCUSA issues form	Andy Green	New Action

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update

DCUSA