

DCUSA Consultation		At what stage is this document in the process?
DCP 480: REP-900 cancellations charges Date Raised: 28 July 2026 Proposer Name: Peter Waymont Company Name: Eastern Power Networks Party Category: DNO		01 – Change Proposal
		02 – Consultation
		03 – Change Report
		04 – Change Declaration
Purpose of Change Proposal To ensure consistency among senders of REP-900.		
	This document is a Consultation issued to DCUSA Parties and any other interested Parties in accordance with Clause 11.14 of the DCUSA seeking industry views on DCP 480. The Working Group recommends that this Change Proposal should proceed to Consultation. Parties are invited to consider the questions set in section 10 and submit comments using the form attached as Attachment 2 to dcusa@electralink.co.uk by 08 October 2026.	
	Impacted Parties Suppliers/DNOs/IDNOs	
	Impacted Clauses DCUSA owned market message	

Contents

1	Summary	3
2	Governance	3
3	Why Change?	3
4	Working Group Assessment	4
5	Solution and Legal Text	5
6	Relevant Objectives	5
7	Implamentation	6
8	Impacts & Other Considerations	6
9	Consultation Questions	7
10	Attachments	8



Any questions?

Contact:

Code Administrator



DCUSA@electralink.co.uk



020 7432 3011

Proposer:

Peter Waymont



**Peter.Waymont@ukpowernet
works.co.uk**



+44 1293 657939

Timetable

Activity	Date
Initial Assessment Report	19 August 2026
Consultation Issued to Industry Participants	24 September 2026
Change Report Approved by Panel	21 October 2026
Change Report issued for Voting	22 October 2026
Party Voting Closes	12 November 2026
Change Declaration Issued to Parties/Authority	16 November 2026
Authority Decision	TBC

1 Summary

What?

- 1.1 To ensure consistency among senders of how REP-900 cancellations should be treated.

Why?

- 1.2 Most parties submit cancellations with values that have the opposite sign to the original invoices. However, some parties submit REP-900 cancellations using the same sign as the original invoices. This causes confusion and problems with processing the cancellations consistently.

How?

- 1.3 Amend REP-900/MM20064 to add a note to explain how cancellation values should be shown.

Who?

- 1.4 This change impacts suppliers and distributors.

2 Governance

Requested Next Steps

- 2.1 This Change Proposal should:
- Be treated as a Part 2 Matter;
 - Be treated as a Standard Change; and
 - Proceed to the Working Group phase.
- 2.2 This consultation is issued for a period of 10 working days. The Working Group will review the responses after this period.
- 2.3 A period of 10 working days was agreed as this is a relatively uncomplex change and this aligns with the consultation window for DCP 482, which whilst unrelated to DCP 480, is an urgent change and also includes changes to the REP-900 process and is due to be issued at the same time as this consultation

3 Why Change?

- 3.1 To ensure consistency among senders of REP-900 so that recipients can interpret and process them consistently.

Q1: Do you understand the intent of the Change Proposal?

Q2: Are you supportive of the principles of this Change Proposal?

4 Working Group Assessment

Working Group Assessment

- 4.1 The DCUSA Panel established a Working Group to assess this CP. Meetings were held in open session and the minutes and papers of each meeting are available on the DCUSA website – www.dcusa.co.uk.
- 4.2 The Working Group reviewed DCP 480, which seeks to improve consistency in the creation and processing of REP-900 messages by clarifying the treatment of cancellation credits. The proposal would introduce guidance by adding a note into the REP-900/MM20064 to state: ALL credits should be issued with a negative value even when the Site-Specific DUoS Invoice Type is “Can” for cancelling the previous invoice.
- 4.3 The Working Group noted that the objective of the proposal is to ensure that recipients can consistently interpret and process REP-900 messages irrespective of the practices adopted by individual message senders.
- 4.4 During its assessment, the Working Group agreed that greater standardisation of REP-900 processing would be beneficial and that the proposed solution appeared to provide a straightforward means of achieving this outcome. Working Group members considered whether the proposed wording adequately conveyed the intended treatment of cancellation credits and agreed that industry feedback should be sought on both the proposed approach and the drafting itself.
- 4.5 The Working Group also discussed whether the clarification should explicitly reference Data Item DI-585/DI20374, which is a Site-Specific DUoS Invoice Type. While the Change Proposal notes this as a potential option, no consensus was reached on whether such a reference is needed. The Working Group therefore agreed that consultation respondents should be invited to provide their views on whether an explicit reference would improve clarity and assist implementation.
- 4.6 As the proposal relates solely to the amendment of a DCUSA-owned market message, the Working Group noted that no amendments to the legal drafting of the DCUSA are currently proposed. The Working Group's assessment was that the primary impact of the proposal would be to provide clarity and consistency to market participants that send or receive REP-900 messages.
- 4.7 In summary, the Working Group agreed that consultation should focus on confirming support for the proposed standardised approach, identifying any implementation or operational impacts, and determining whether additional references or clarification are required within REP-900/MM20064 before a recommendation is presented to Panel.

Q3: Do you agree that all cancellation credits within the REP-900 should be submitted as negative values, regardless of invoice type?

Q4: Do you have any comments on, or suggested amendments to, the wording proposed for REP-900/MM20064?

Q5: Are there any implementation, operational or system impacts associated with adopting the proposed REP-900 clarification?

5 Solution and Legal Text

Solution Overview

- 5.1 Add a note into the REP-900/MM20064 to state: ALL credits should be issued with a negative value even when the Site-Specific DUoS Invoice Type is “Can” for cancelling the previous invoice.

Legal Text Amendments

- 5.2 This is a market message amendment. As such, no legal text has been provided.

Legal Text Commentary

- 5.3 Not applicable.

Addition/Amendment to DCUSA Owned Market Message (Data Flow) or Data Item

- 5.4 Add a note into the REP-900/MM20064 to state: ALL credits should be issued with a negative value even when the Site-Specific DUoS Invoice Type is “Can” for cancelling the previous invoice”

<https://digital-navigator.azurewebsites.net/search/market-messages> or <https://digital-navigator.azurewebsites.net/search/data-items>

Market Message (Data Flow) / Data Item Commentary

- 5.5 It's not clear at this stage if this needs to reference DI-585/DI20374, which is a Site-Specific DUoS Invoice Type, so the Working Group would like to seek views on this point.

Q6: Should the REP-900 guidance explicitly reference DI-585 / DI20374 (Site-Specific DUoS Invoice Type)? Please explain your reasoning.

6 Relevant Objectives

- 6.1 The Working Groups view as to which of the DCUSA Objectives would be better facilitated by the implementation of this Change Proposal is set out below:

	DCUSA General Objectives	Identified impact
☐	1. The development, maintenance and operation by the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of efficient, co-ordinated, and economical Distribution Networks	None
☐	2. The facilitation of effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity and (so far as is consistent therewith) the promotion of such competition in the sale, distribution and purchase of electricity	None

☐	3. The efficient discharge by the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of obligations imposed upon them in their Distribution Licences	None
☒	4. The promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the DCUSA	Positive
☐	5. Compliance with the EU Internal Market Regulation and any relevant legally binding decisions of the European Commission and/or the Agency for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators.	None

- 6.2 The Working Groups is of the view that DCUSA General Objective 4 is met by standardising a process for this purpose.

Q7: Do you consider the solution better facilitates the DCUSA objectives? Please give supporting reasons.

7 Implamentation

- 7.1 This Change Proposal should be implemented as soon as reasonably possible and as such the proposed date is the next release after approval, subject to any system changes required.

Q8: Do you agree with the proposed implementation date?

8 Impacts & Other Considerations

Does this Change Proposal impact a Significant Code Review (SCR) or other significant industry change projects, if so, how?

- 8.1 We do not believe that this CP impacts upon any current SCR or other significant industry change projects.

Consumer Impacts

- 8.2 There are no consumer impacts as a result of this CP.

Does this Change Proposal Impact Other Codes?

- 8.3 We do not believe that this change will impact other codes.

Environmental Impacts

- 8.4 In accordance with DCUSA Clause 10.4.5A, we have assessed whether there would be a material impact on greenhouse gas emissions if this CP were implemented. We have not identified any material impact on greenhouse gas emissions from the implementation of this CP.

Q9: Are you aware of any wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP?

Q10: Do you have any other questions?

9 Consultation Questions

- 9.1 The Working Group is seeking industry views on the following consultation questions:

No.	Questions
1	Do you understand the intent of DCP 480
2	Do you support the principles of DCP 480?
3	Do you agree that all cancellation credits within REP-900 should be submitted as negative values, regardless of invoice type?
4	Do you have any comments on, or suggested amendments to, the wording proposed for REP-900/MM20064?
5	Are there any implementation, operational or system impacts associated with adopting the proposed REP-900 clarification?
6	Should the REP-900 guidance explicitly reference DI-585 / DI20374 (Site-Specific DUoS Invoice Type)? Please explain your reasoning.
7	Do you consider the solution better facilitates the DCUSA objectives? Please give supporting reasons.
8	Do you agree with the proposed implementation date?
9	Are you aware of any wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP?
10	Do you have any other questions?

- 9.2 Responses should be submitted using Attachment 2 to dcusa@electralink.co.uk no later than 08 October 2026
- 9.3 Responses, or any part thereof, can be provided in confidence. Parties are asked to clearly indicate any parts of a response that are to be treated confidentially.

10 Attachments

- Attachment 1 - DCP 480 Consultation Response Form
- Attachment 2 - DCP 480 Change Proposal Form

