

Meeting Session	DCUSA Panel (Open Session)
Paper Reference	Panel_2026_0617_07_SIG Headline Report
Action	For Information

SIG Headline Report

1. Synopsis

- 1.1 This report sets out the key decisions made at a DCUSA Standing Issues Group (SIG) meeting on 29 May 2026. The minutes of the meeting are available [here](#) on the DCUSA website.

2. DIF 90 DCP 414 / DCP 458 Guidance (Customer Contact Process).

- 2.1 The group considered whether updates were required to existing guidance associated with DCP 414 and DCP 458, particularly in relation to customer contact requirements.
- 2.2 It was explained that suppliers are currently progressing changes to customers' measurement class, moving them from non-half hourly to half hourly settlement in preparation for MHHS. As part of this process, suppliers are required to contact customers to explain the impact on DUoS charges and to facilitate discussions with DNOs or IDNOs regarding future Maximum Import Capacity.
- 2.3 While much of this process is functioning as expected, it was highlighted that there remain gaps in the availability of contact details for certain IDNOs, which is creating uncertainty for suppliers. In particular, there is a lack of clarity around which contact details should be included in customer communications and where customer data should be sent where requested.
- 2.4 An IDNO SIG member advised that in many cases, appropriate contact details are already available within DNO and IDNO charging statements, which include information for discussions relating to MIC changes. It was suggested that these could be used as a fallback where direct contact information had not been provided.
- 2.5 At the same time, the same IDNO SIG member stated that they would raise the issue of sharing the detail of the issue with IDNO counterparts at the monthly IDNO forum to help close any remaining gaps.
- 2.6 A DNO member highlighted that in some instances Distributors have established specific inboxes for managing these interactions, and that relying on generic charging statement contacts could result in communications being sent to the wrong contacts. This highlighted the importance of using the most up-to-date and purpose-specific contact routes when possible.
- 2.7 It was noted that some newer suppliers, or those that have undergone organisational change, may not be fully aware of the processes that were introduced when DCPs 414 and 458 went live. Examples were shared of repeated requests for contact details from the same organisations from different individuals, suggesting that knowledge has not always been retained or effectively handed over.

- 2.8 It was agreed that no immediate changes to the guidance document are required. Instead, the preferred approach is to continue operating under existing processes, while maintaining engagement with IDNOs to close any outstanding contact gaps.
- 2.9 The group also agreed that the position should be kept under review. If issues persist over the coming months, it may be appropriate to issue a wider industry communication or to revisit the topic at a future SIG meeting, with a provisional checkpoint identified around August.

3. AOB: Who Has Authority to Agree a Capacity Change

- 3.1 A situation was described in which a tenant had requested a reduction in their Maximum Import Capacity, while the landlord had subsequently intervened to request that the capacity not be reduced. This had created uncertainty as to which party the Distributor should take instruction from.
- 3.2 The view was that in the explained scenario, both parties would need to approve any change in capacity before a distributor agreed to the change.
- 3.3 Examples of internal processes were highlighted, including requesting evidence that changes are consistent with tenancy agreements and requesting a letter of authority from the landlord before a change is considered.
- 3.4 It was agreed that, where possible, changes of this nature should proceed only where there is agreement between all relevant parties, such as the landlord and tenant. Where such agreement cannot be reached, the issue becomes a third-party dispute between those parties.
- 3.5 The group agreed that such disputes sit outside the remit of DCUSA processes and should instead be resolved through commercial negotiation or, where necessary, legal routes.

4. Next SIG Meeting – 26 June 2026

- 4.1 At present no new issues have been raised.

5. Recommendations

- 5.1 The DCUSA Panel is invited to:
 - **NOTE** the contents of this paper.

Andy Green
Governance Senior Analyst