

Request for DCUSA Party feedback 17 September 2025

DIF 87: Charges#2

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 87 Charges#2 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 87 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 that the billing processes and systems they use assesses standing data for charging as at the end of the billing period (usually a month end).
 - 2.3 Where there is a mid-month change in tariff, the system will assess the tariff at the month end and use that for charging the entire month.
 - 2.4 Where there is a mid-month change of capacity, the system will assess the capacity at the month end and use that for charging the entire month.
 - 2.5 Both these scenarios can result in an under or over charge for a portion of the month.
 - 2.6 The proposer also highlighted that a mid-month change of capacity can also mean that excess capacity charges are “incorrect”, depending on how any excess relates to the correctly applicable capacity on the relevant date.
 - 2.7 The proposer has offered a solution which entails splitting the billing periods, so the assessment of charges is not made at the month end but at the point in time of each relevant change.
 - 2.8 SIG members agreed to issue this RFI to understand further whether parties have experience of the issue, what the volumes of occurrences are and whether the issue is large enough to warrant a change in process.
-

2.9 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. Have these scenarios occurred in your licence area? If so, how many instances of each scenario have occurred? What are your thoughts on the potential solution of splitting the billing periods, so the assessment of charges is not made at the month end but at the point in time of each relevant change?
3. Is there another solution that hasn't been considered?
4. Is the issue prevalent enough for a change to be made, or are the instances so rare that the costs in resolving the issue outweigh the benefits?
5. 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 87 RFI Response Form
- Attachment 2 DIF 87 Charges#2