

Request for DCUSA Party feedback 17 September 2025

DIF 86: Charges#1

1. Purpose of this Document

- 1.1 The purpose of this document is to seek Party feedback to understand if the issue as explained in Attachment 1 DIF 86 Charges#1 is something that Parties have experience of and if the issue is sufficiently large enough that a solution is required.
- 1.2 To respond to the questions posed in Section 3.1 of this document, please complete the RFI response form found in Attachment 2.

2. Summary

- 2.1 DIF 86 was discussed at a Standing Issues Group (SIG) meeting held on 25 July 2025. The original issues form can be found in Attachment 1 of this document.
 - 2.2 The proposal explained where a site has more than one MPAN, and the distributor intends to group those and charge such situations as a single site, different suppliers may register each MPAN independently.
 - 2.3 In such situations the site's capacity is often pro-rated over the number of energised MPANs in order to try to continue to charge the full capacity for the site. But this can lead to issues in certain cases as one of the billing processes assesses standing data for capacity charging as at the end of the billing period (usually the month end).
 - 2.4 The DIF form in Attachment 1 goes on to highlight four separate scenarios where the issue can occur.
 - 2.5 The proposer has offered a solution which entails splitting 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
 - 2.6 SIG members agreed to issue this RFI to understand further whether parties have experience of the issue, what the volumes are, if the original DIF has captured all the scenarios and whether the issue is large enough to warrant a change in process.
 - 2.7 SIG members will use the responses to this RFI to aid them in determining next steps.
-

3. Feedback Request

3.1 The SIG is keen to seek DCUSA Party views on the following:

1. Have you had any experience of the issue explained and if so, what is this experience?
2. How do you charge for multi MPAN sites?
3. For scenarios 1, 2, 3 and 4, as described in the DIF, have these scenarios occurred in your licence area? If so, how many instances of each scenario have occurred? Are you aware of any other scenarios of a multi MPAN site potentially under, or overcharging capacity when one or more of the MPANs associated with site has some sort of significant event occurring? Please provide details.
4. What are your thoughts on the potential solution of splitting 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?
5. Is there another solution that hasn't been considered?
6. Is the issue prevalent enough for a change to be made to the DCUSA, or are the instances so rare that the costs in resolving the issue outweigh the benefits?
7. Any other comments?

3.2 Please respond to the above questions by completing the consultation response form found in Attachment 1.

4. Attachments

- Attachment 1 DIF 86 RFI Response Form
- Attachment 2 DIF 86 Charges#1