

DDDG Technical Subgroup Meeting 01

28 October 2025 at 12:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Attendees	
Abrar Masud [AM]	P3P Partners
Ahna Taylor [AT]	SSE
Alex Walmsley [AW]	Smartest Energy
Alexander Pentecost [AP]	Eclipse Power
Chris Barker [CB]	ENWL
Chris Berry [CB]	SE First
Chris Ong [CO]	UK Power Networks
Daniel Merrington [DM]	EON
Ed Grimsey [EG]	BUUK
Erik Baguzis [EB]	Indigo Networks
Georgia Preece [GP]	NPg
Lilly Stanislas [LS]	Ecotricity
Mark Bellman [MB]	ENWL
Micheal Clark [MC]	Engie
Narinder Lall [NL]	EON
Peter Waymont [PW]	UK Power Networks
Sam Khonji [SK]	Ovo
Seun Adedapo [SA]	NGED
Tom Jenkins [TJ]	Indigo Power
Code Administrator	
Furqan Aziz [FA]	Chair

Hannah Proffitt [HP]	Secretariat
Apologies	
Donna Jamieson [DJ]	IDCSL

1. Administration

Recording

- 1.1 The Chair asked members if they were comfortable for this 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.

Apologies

- 1.2 Apologies are included in the table above.

2. The Problem Statement from Ofgem

- 2.1 The Chair advised that as part of the DCUSA Digitalisation Phase 5 programme, the DCUSA Digitalisation Development Group (DDDG) was formed to allow users to request improvements to the website and digital services.
- 2.2 The Chair advised that Ofgem had submitted their request to the DDDG for the development of a centralised tariff charges summary dashboard. The Chair clarified that this is not a mandate from Ofgem. The DCUSA Board approved for this to progress, and for the subgroup to be formed to provide technical expertise and input on the design and functionality of the dashboard.
- 2.3 The Chair presented a slide to members outlining the problem that has been identified. These are as follows.
- Hard to Find and Use
 - Network charging info is hard to find and use
 - They follow templates but each DNO stores and labels things slightly differently, which can make it confusing (especially with cross-comparisons)
 - Poorly Explained
 - Documents lack clear explanations or context
 - Users often don't know why the data matters or how to use it
 - Lack of Transparency
 - How charges are calculated isn't clear
 - The process feels hidden – like a 'black box'
 - This causes confusion and reduces trust

- 2.4 AW highlighted that as well as being difficult to find, the accuracy of the data is poor. AW noted that in particular the charging statements populated by IDNOs, highlighting that there have been a significant number of new entrants in the independent space. AW added that the template is fixed and not always fit for purpose.
- 2.5 AW noted that they find more issues with the nonstandard charges, i.e. extra high voltage charges, the duplication of charges on an Annex 2 relative to Annex 6 and conflating or contradicting evidence in Annex 6 to Annex 2. AW also highlighted issues with inconsistency between years.
- 2.6 AW advised that with the mandated 15 months' notice for the publication of tariffs, there are subsequent changes which can be difficult to understand. AW noted that it difficult to see what has changed between versions.
- 2.7 AW agreed that a dashboard could be beneficial in addressing these current issues.
- 2.8 The Chair asked members for their opinions on the statement 'Users often don't know why the data matters or how to use it'. AW felt that Distributors and customers may not always understand what the statements are used for.
- 2.9 CB agreed noting that as a Third Party Intermediary (TPIs), they spend a lot of time explaining these elements to end users. CB suggested that although the dashboard would not remove all confusion, it would help having the line loss factors, tariff IDs, DNO profiles and GSP groups in one place.
- 2.10 The Chair asked whether, how the charges are calculated is a practical concern. CB advised that aspect it is not a concern to them, they are just hoping for a solution in which the information is all in one place and that it can be exported and filtered so it can be validated against the bills they get to prove DUoS is being charged correctly.
- 2.11 AT advised that it is important to their organisation how charges are calculated. AT noted that it is relevant in accounting for methodology changes in the future and understanding how, when there is a SoLR complaint, this feeds through and when allowed revenues increase, how that feeds through.
- 2.12 AT stated that there is currently a big issue regarding extra high voltage charges as the explanation of these charges is currently hidden. AT added that they understand there are potential confidentiality issues surrounding this, but that a way to understand what factors affect those charges is needed in order to explain and forecast.
- 2.13 SA raised that they receive lots of requests from customers trying to understand what has been changed. SA noted that this could be factors such as PCP implementation, a change to cost assumptions, revisions to the forecast or a regulatory adjustment. SA suggested that the dashboard could include this information.
- 2.14 AW highlighted that currently there is inconsistency in how the data is populated, for example some Distributors have used comma formatting as a 1000 separator in the LFC field and this has caused issues when parsing the data using Python script. AW added that they have also seen instances of knockout formatting which causes similar issues. AW noted that when mapping extra high voltage tariffs, some distributors do not populate Band 0, some leave it blank and some type a different number or letter.

- 2.15 AW suggested that some of these issues are due to the mandated template being outdated but that a central dashboard would help with these consistency issues. AW questioned how, if the dashboard is not mandated, it would be possible to ensure all parties populate this. AW suggested that there must be a more efficient way to populate the information than using spreadsheets.
- 2.16 The Chair presented a slide highlighting Ofgem's proposed solution.
- One Central Hub
 - Create a single platform where all network charging information can be found
 - Consistent and Connected
 - Show the information in a consistent format, no matter which DNO it comes from
 - Use APIs to automatically pull data from DNOs
 - Clear and Transparent
 - Provide simple explanations alongside the models and templates
 - Help users understand what the data means and why it matters
 - Make the outputs structured and user-friendly.
- 2.17 TA suggested that an API first approach would be welcomed and noted that they believe UK Power Networks have started this already, with an open source API.
- 2.18 CB noted that the dashboard should be the only source for this information and should replace the current process. CB added that the group will need to define who is within scope, as this may have implications for the solution. For example, it could be possible for DNOs to come up with a solution that builds off Durabill, however this may not work for IDNOs who often have complex charging structures.
- 2.19 CB noted that in terms of transparency, a lot of the current issues are due to the methodology and that work is underway looking at this. CB suggested that this is separate from this piece of work and the group should focus on delivering the output of the models.
- 2.20 AT suggested that as well as tariffs, it would be good to have line loss factor classes, time bands and EHV data included. AT suggested that annual review packs which include four year forward views of forecasts could be built in as well as DNO cost tables which have illustrative charges every quarter. AT highlighted that it would be beneficial to include all data that Suppliers might need.
- 2.21 Regarding the output of the dashboard, AT noted that it needs to be efficient to download as well as efficient for people to use.
- 2.22 The Chair agreed that in future meetings, the group will discuss and agree what needs to be included.
- 2.23 The Chair presented a mock example of the dashboard to the group. The Chair highlighted that the initial plan was not to include the API elements in the Minimum Viable Product (MVP) as this is not a mandate. The Chair questioned whether agreement can be reached across the board to give the information voluntarily.

- 2.24 AW asked what steps would be needed to make this mandatory. The Chair advised that a DCUSA change would be needed to introduce an obligation to provide the data, but that that this is out of scope of this session.
- 2.25 PW noted that they would need to consider how the information can be viewed in a matrix. For example people may want to view year on year analysis, or view a given tariff across different DNOs. PW noted that in terms of this being the single source of the data, DNOs have licence requirements to publish statements on their websites. This will need to be considered.
- 2.26 AT noted that they would be looking to select all DNOs and download rather than having a separate filter, so the ability to select multiple DNOs, or select multiple years for one DNO would be useful to see how a tariff has changed.
- 2.27 MC suggested another column would be needed for the Region/DNO and the year.
- 2.28 CB advised that there is currently a transition to a new view of market domain data or ISD, so it would make sense to build this around the new world where there is DUOS IDs, not LLFCs.

3. The Purpose of the Subgroup (Terms of Reference)

- 3.1 The Chair outlined the following objectives of the subgroup.
- Provide expertise on the functional and technical requirements
 - Ensuring the solution meets the needs of all stakeholders
- 3.2 The Chair went on to explain what is within the scope of the group and what is outside the scope. This is summarised below.

Within scope

- Identify user needs
- Define the functional requirements
- Advise on technical design
- Share expertise on tariff charging statements and models
- Identify and resolve nuances
- Ensure solution viability for both users and publishers
- Recommend data standardisation approaches
- Validate proposed solutions against real-world use cases

Outside of scope

- Project governance and delivery methodology used
- Resource costs and delivery signoff
- Procurement decisions and vendor selection
- Any decisions that require raising a Change

4. Roadmap to Minimum Viable Product (MVP)

4.1 The Chair advised that this would be discussed at the next meeting.

5. Understanding the Challenges

5.1 The Chair advised that this would be discussed at the next meeting.

6. Verification of Key Themes

6.1 The Chair advised that this would be discussed at the next meeting.

7. Any Other Business

7.1 The group agreed that the meetings would be held 11:30 to 13:00 going forward.

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update