

DCP 480 / DCP 482 Working Group - Meeting 02

16 October 2026 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Ian Goudge [IG]	SSE
Peter Waymont [PW]	UK Power Networks
Philip Mark [PM]	SSEN
Code Administrator	
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Jenny Harvey [JH]	National Grid Electricity Distribution

1. Administration

Recording

- 1.1 The Chair noted that the meeting is being recorded. The purpose of this recording is purely to aid the Technical Secretariat in producing an accurate report of the meeting.

Apologies

- 1.2 The Chair noted received apologies. These can be found in the attendees list above.

Competition Law Guidance and Terms of Reference

- 1.3 The Working Group agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.

Previous Minutes

- 1.4 The Chair invited the Working Group to review the previous meeting minutes – no further feedback was received, and the minutes were approved.

Actions

- 1.5 The Chair confirmed that all actions captured within this meeting will be recorded within the action log; this can be found in the Appendix.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair explained that the purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss both the DCP 480 and DCP 482 Collated Consultation Responses (separately) within the Working Group and agree next steps.

3. Review DCP 480 Collated Consultation Responses

- 3.1 The Chair presented the DCP 480 collated Consultation responses document live on screen for the Working Group to review and further discuss.
- 3.2 The key points can be found below:
- 3.3 The Chair confirmed that there eight responses had been received: five DNOs, two Suppliers and one IDNO.
- 3.4 **Q1**
- 3.5 The Chair confirmed that all eight respondents understood the intent of DCP 480.
- 3.6 **Q2**
- 3.7 The Chair confirmed that all eight respondents supported the principles of DCP 480 and what it sought to achieve.
- 3.8 **Q3**
- 3.9 The Chair confirmed that respondents supported consistent treatment of cancellation credits.
- 3.10 One respondent requested clear implementation guidance and examples. Another respondent supported the principle, however, proposed expressing cancellation values as the reverse of the original invoice, rather than requiring all cancellations to be negative.
- 3.11 PM noted that generation invoices could be credits, requiring a positive cancellation. PW clarified that the proposed wording required credits to be negative, including cancellations which were credits; it did not require every cancellation to be negative.
- 3.12 The Working Group reviewed the proposal and agreed that this distinction was already reflected within the intent. The working group agreed that the response would be acknowledged and the distinction made clear in subsequent documentation.
- 3.13 **Q4**
- 3.14 The Working Group considered one respondents' request for worked examples and agreed to include simple explanatory examples within the Change Report, identifying the relevant fields rather than

reproducing complete JSON (JavaScript Object Notation) messages. Examples would explain that an original positive value is cancelled by a negative value and an original negative value by a positive value.

- 3.15 One respondent's proposed reversal of every value was discussed. PW cautioned that indiscriminately reversing both quantities and prices could produce an incorrect positive result. The Working Group therefore did not adopt the suggested wording wholesale and retained the distinction between credit values and cancellations.
- 3.16 Following the above discussion, PW agreed to draft and circulate simple explanatory examples for DCP 480, identifying the relevant REP-900 fields and illustrating cancellation of positive and negative original values (to be included within the Change Report).

ACTION 02/01: PW to draft and circulate simple explanatory examples for DCP 480, identifying the relevant REP-900 fields and illustrating cancellation of positive and negative original values (to be included within the Change Report).

- 3.17 **Q5**
- 3.18 The Chair informed the group that several respondents already supported the proposed sign convention. Potential DuraBill impacts would require engagement with the system provider. One respondent had not confirmed impacts with its relevant business teams and requested sufficient notice for assessment and any necessary changes. Another respondent anticipated limited changes to reconciliation queries and explained that standardisation would remove sender-specific handling.
- 3.19 The Working Group noted that the DIP did not validate the sign of values and regarded recipient checks and exception handling as normal operational controls. Limited billing-system amendments could be required.
- 3.20 **Q6**
- 3.21 The Chair informed the group that respondents broadly supported explicitly referencing the site-specific DUoS invoice-type data item, DI585 / DI20374, to improve clarity and consistent implementation. One respondent noted that restricting the guidance to one invoice type could reduce futureproofing if other invoice types became relevant.
- 3.22 The Working Group supported the additional clarity while noting this consideration and the earlier agreement to provide explanatory examples.
- 3.23 **Q7**
- 3.24 The Chair confirmed that all eight respondents identified efficiency and standardisation benefits consistent with General Objective 4.
- 3.25 The Working Group noted that a common convention should reduce inconsistent interpretation, sender-specific processing, exceptions and associated queries, improving the implementation and administration of the DCUSA.
- 3.26 **Q8**

- 3.27 The Working Group agreed that DCP 480 should not be tied to DCP 482 or delayed by uncertainty over CP1648 and agreed that the changes could proceed independently. However, sufficient time was needed for parties not already following the convention to update their systems. The Chair noted that only one IDNO had responded and had confirmed its system already supported negative values; wider IDNO readiness therefore remains uncertain.
- 3.28 Following the above discussion, the Chair agreed to contact DJ (Donna Jamieson) to seek feedback through the IDNO forum rather than issue a formal RFI. The implementation date could be adjusted within the Change Report if feedback demonstrated a need.

ACTION 02/02: The Secretariat to contact Donna Jameison to seek wider IDNO feedback on DCP 480 system impacts, implementation concerns and required lead times, and use the feedback to inform the proposed implementation date.

- 3.29 **Q9**
- 3.30 The Chair informed the group that respondents identified DCP 482 '[REP-900 Splitting](#)', CP1648 '[REPS Potentially Exceeding DIP 1 MB Limit](#)', CP1649 '[IF-014 Potentially Exceeding the DIP 1 MB Limit](#)', [MHHS migration](#) and DCP 484 '[REP-900 Processing](#)' as relevant developments.
- 3.31 The Working Group agreed that these interactions should be acknowledged in subsequent documentation, however, members did not identify a reason to make DCP 480 dependent on their delivery. DCP 484's relationship to wider REP-900 processing obligations was noted.
- 3.32 **Q10**
- 3.33 The Chair explained that one respondent reiterated its request for examples, addressed under Q4. Another respondent queried the Authority-decision entry in the timetable. As DCP 480 was a Part 2 matter, the Working Group agreed that an Authority-decision row was unnecessary and should be removed rather than marked TBC.

ACTION 02/03: The Secretariat to remove the Authority-decision row from the DCP 480 timetable as this CP is a Part 2 Matter.

- 3.34 The Working Group considered whether the note would be binding and how non-compliance would be addressed. Members understood that a requirement incorporated into the REC data specification would be mandatory rather than optional guidance. Recipients would identify discrepancies and seek correction from senders through existing processes, including applicable invoice-dispute arrangements; DCUSA would not centrally monitor individual messages. Members acknowledged that current wording was insufficiently clear and the change was intended to remove that ambiguity.
- 3.35 It was noted that the alignment of the REC data specification and DCUSA documentation would be coordinated through the existing Cross-Code Steering Group arrangements.
- 3.36 **Working Group Discussion**
- 3.37 The Working Group did not consider a second Consultation necessary for DCP 480. The Chair agreed to start drafting the Change Report on the basis of the consulted implementation approach, subject to IDNO feedback, incorporating the discussion of Consultation responses and PW's examples.

- 3.38 The intention was to circulate a draft Change Report by 23 October 2026 for the Working Group to review, ahead of consideration at the November DCUSA Panel meeting.

ACTION 02/04: The Secretariat to prepare and circulate the DCP 480 draft Change Report, aiming for 23 October 2026, incorporating the Working Group's Consultation conclusions and explanatory examples, with the implementation proposal subject to IDNO feedback.

4. Review DCP 482 Collated Consultation Responses

- 4.1 The Chair presented the DCP 482 collated Consultation responses document live on screen for the Working Group to review and further discuss.
- 4.2 The key points can be found below:
- 4.3 The Chair confirmed that eight responses had been received: five DNOs and three Suppliers, with no IDNO response. The Chair noted that an updated collated Consultation response document included a late Supplier response.
- 4.4 **Q1**
- 4.5 The Chair confirmed that respondents understood the intent of DCP 482.
- 4.6 **Q2**
- 4.7 The Chair confirmed that respondents broadly supported the intent and principles of DCP 482. The Working Group proceeded to consider the detailed design and implementation comments.
- 4.8 **Q3**
- 4.9 The Chair informed the group that all eight respondents supported populating the partition information block on every REP-900 message, including "one of one" where no splitting occurred. This would remove ambiguity and allow recipients to identify whether all expected parts had arrived.
- 4.10 One respondent requested consistent data-item names and meanings with CP1648, coordinated DIP schema and REC specification updates, and a defined threshold. The Working Group agreed that technical alignment with CP1648 was important.
- 4.11 PW highlighted the risk of new-format messages being rejected if the DIP validation schema was not updated alongside the REC specification. The Chair agreed to establish how these updates were coordinated through the Cross-Code Steering Group.

ACTION 02/05: The Secretariat to confirm through the Cross-Code Steering Group how the REC data specification and DIP schema/validation changes required for DCP 482 will be coordinated, including any consequential change requests and release alignment, and report back to the Working Group.

- 4.12 **Q4**
- 4.13 Respondents supported keeping individual invoices intact. One respondent proposed that each part should be an independently valid REP-900, processable on arrival, with clarity on header and summary information. Members questioned whether repeating headers would amount to creating

separate REP-900 messages rather than splitting one report. The Working Group's approach remained to mirror the related Elexon solution rather than adopt a different mechanism for REP-900; the detailed specification remained subject to confirmation.

4.14 Another respondent proposed partitioning at R900-03 (site information) rather than R900-04 (invoice level) so that all invoices for one site remained together. PW explained that sites could have widely varying invoice counts, particularly during retrospective cancellation and rebilling. Invoice-level splitting would allow a predictable threshold during report generation, whereas site-level splitting could require dynamic size calculations. The Working Group retained its preference for invoice-level splitting and would explain its reasoning in subsequent documentation.

4.15 **Q5**

4.16 Respondents supported a fixed invoice-volume threshold rather than dynamically calculating each message's size. Two respondents requested a justified and tested threshold, allowing sufficient headroom below the 1 MB limit. One of these respondents also proposed a configurable parameter and a size-check backstop; the other respondent sought clarity on how the threshold would be determined and reviewed.

4.17 PW clarified that the TBC value was intended to be populated before the change progressed. The Working Group favoured assessing the largest permitted invoice and fully populated fields rather than relying on typical or average sizes. Future changes would be managed through existing change-control and cross-code processes.

4.18 PW and PM agreed to seek a proposed threshold through their DuraBill discussions and then sense-check it with users of other systems.

ACTION 02/06: PW and PM to seek a proposed invoice-volume threshold (X) and supporting size analysis through the DuraBill forum, for review by the Working Group and sense-checking with non-DuraBill users.

4.19 **Q6**

4.20 DNO responses identified changes to generate the metadata block, group invoices against the agreed threshold, produce multiple messages and support error handling or retransmission. Receipt and processing of Level 4 status messages could add development requirements if included in the final solution.

4.21 One respondent noted that its vendor's cost estimate could change if further complexity was introduced. Another respondent identified no material billing-system changes at that stage, but noted requirements for completeness checks, ordering and prevention of duplicate or incomplete processing.

4.22 One respondent anticipated data-platform changes covering partition information, deduplication and batch completeness, alongside confirmation of its DIP adapter's behaviour, whilst another respondents' system impacts remained TBC.

4.23 The Working Group noted that final impacts depended on the agreed technical solution.

4.24 **Q7**

- 4.25 The Chair informed the group that one respondent preferred six months implementation lead time, whilst several DNO responses referred to planned DuraBill 7.2 delivery alongside CP1648 and CP1649 in February 2027 (subject to confirmed requirements).
- 4.26 Two respondents identified a minimum two-month vendor development period after requirements were agreed, with additional time required for LDSO testing and implementation. Another respondent had no specific lead-time requirement but requested adequate notice and end-to-end testing. An additional respondent indicated six weeks from a final specification, subject to technical prerequisites, and requested test messages at least two months before go-live.
- 4.27 IG added to SSE Energy Supply's TBC response, advising that a minimum one-month lead time was required in relation to the industry decision and confirmation of the preferred approach. The Chair agreed to incorporate this update.

ACTION 02/07: The Secretariat to incorporate IG's additional lead-time comment in the DCP 482 collated Consultation responses document (SSE Energy Supply).

- 4.28 The Working Group discussed the need to distinguish when CP1648's design would be fixed from when its functionality would be used. February 2027 remained an aspiration, not a confirmed date.
- 4.29 Following the above discussion, the Chair agreed to raise the unresolved issues with Elexon and the Cross-Code Steering Group, including the final threshold (X), testing arrangements, sample messages, whether early splitting is permitted before the implementation date, DIP schema changes, and alignment of error handling.

ACTION 02/08: The Secretariat to obtain an update from Elexon on CP1648's final design, decision and implementation timing, and use this as a basis for DCP 482.

- 4.30 The group noted that no IDNO had responded to DCP 482, so wider readiness information was also required.

4.31 **Q8**

- 4.32 One respondent expressed the need for wider awareness that REP-900 messages must be received and processed and could be split. Members noted readiness concerns affecting both senders and recipients. The Chair agreed that communications should extend beyond routine change notifications and considered existing DCUSA forums, including the SIG, appropriate channels.
- 4.33 The Chair informed the group that respondents highlighted missing, duplicate and out-of-sequence parts; batch identifiers and counts; completeness checks; timeouts; retransmission; and the treatment of summary information. One respondent sought clarity on whether only missing parts or whole batches would be resent, retention of identifiers and operational fallback. These were requests for clarification, not agreed design requirements.
- 4.34 Another respondent queried the process following a Level 4 status message, including the six-hour timeout described in the related guidance, resending missing parts, batch-ID retention, duplicates and batch-ID format. PW noted that the Working Group needed to decide whether Level 4 messaging

or direct billing-team contact should be used and how the sender should respond. These matters remained open for further review against CP1648.

4.35 **Q9**

4.36 The Chair confirmed that all eight respondents identified efficiency benefits consistent with General Objective 4.

4.37 A defined splitting method should reduce transmission failures arising from the 1 MB limit and enable consistent processing. One respondent additionally identified a neutral-to-positive effect on General Objective 2 through timely and accurate allocation of DUoS costs. The Working Group noted these views.

4.38 **Q10**

4.39 The Chair informed the group that respondents supported implementation as soon as practical, with technical alignment to CP1648 and sufficient development, testing and deployment time. February 2027 was the consulted target, but respondents referred to possible movement in CP1648's timetable. One respondent also requested coordination of REC and DIP releases, first-billing-run information and a defined transition if cutover dates differed.

4.40 The Working Group was concerned that delaying until June 2027 could expose REP-900 messages to the 1 MB limit as migration and billing volumes increased. Members did not have sufficient visibility of current message sizes to quantify when that risk would arise.

4.41 PW and PM discussed seeking sample messages or size information through their system-provider discussions. No definitive implementation date or transitional arrangement was agreed; the threshold analysis and Elexon update would inform the next review.

4.42 **Q11**

4.43 The Chair noted that respondents identified CP1648, CP1649, MHHS migration, the DIP release schedule and REC specification publication as relevant dependencies. One respondent reported that its vendor had been advised of a possible June 2027 implementation for CP1648's REP-002A/REP-002B splitting. The Working Group agreed that confirmed Elexon information was needed first.

4.44 Another respondent noted that CP1648's partition block was optional whereas DCP 482 proposed a mandatory block. The Working Group retained the mandatory approach for REP-900 and agreed that this difference needed to be made explicit so that implementers did not assume the two solutions were identical.

4.45 **Q12**

4.46 Several DNOs and Suppliers requested clarity on error handling, retransmission of individual parts or full batches, Level 4 status messages and consistency with CP1648. PW emphasised that a recipient should promptly notify incomplete receipt and the distributor should take remedial action, rather than discover missing data only when payment became due.

- 4.47 Members recognised that legal text might be required to place obligations on recipients to report incomplete messages and on distributors to respond. The proposal had previously focused on message specifications. The Working Group agreed that it was not yet ready to produce the DCP 482 Change Report: the CP1648 position, error handling, possible legal text, threshold and testing arrangements required further work. Whether a second Consultation would be needed remained undecided.
- 4.48 One respondent also asked about increasing the DIP limit, splitting before implementation, test-message availability and the “parting” label in Attachment 3. Members regarded the label as a typographical point. No agreed interim splitting route was identified.
- 4.49 The feasibility of changing the DIP limit was outside the Working Group’s direct control, but the Chair agreed to ask the question. End-to-end testing requirements, sample messages, access and any associated charges also needed clarification.

ACTION 02/09: The Secretariat to confirm with the REC/Cross-Code Steering Group what end-to-end testing is required, whether test messages will be available in DIP non-production environments, and whether any testing charges or dependencies apply.

4.50 Working Group Discussion

- 4.51 The Working Group discussed the next steps for both CPs and agreed that DCP 480 would progress to a draft Change Report, subject to readiness feedback and inclusion of explanatory examples. DCP 482 would return to the Working Group for further technical and implementation discussion before a Change Report or potential second Consultation was agreed.
- 4.52 The Chair confirmed that at the next meeting, the group will review the DCP 480 draft Change Report and receive updates on CP1648, REC/DIP coordination, testing, the proposed invoice threshold and possible legal-text requirements for DCP 482.

5. Agreed Next Steps

- 5.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
- The Secretariat to produce a draft Change Report for DCP 480 for the Working Group to review.
 - The Secretariat to confirm whether IDNOs have system concerns or require additional lead time to implement DCP 480.
 - PW to produce DCP 480 examples (identifying the applicable REP-900 fields, illustrating how original and cancellation values should net to zero; including positive and negative originals).
 - The Secretariat to confirm through the Cross-Code Steering Group how the REC data specification, DIP schema and validation arrangements will be updated consistently with DCP 482.
 - PW and PM to seek a proposed invoice-volume threshold (X) and supporting size analysis through the DuraBill forum, for review by the Working Group and sense-checking with non-DuraBill users.

- The Secretariat to obtain an update from Elexon on CP1648's final design, decision and implementation timing, and use this as a basis for DCP 482.
- The Secretariat to confirm with the REC/Cross-Code Steering Group what end-to-end testing is required, whether test messages will be available in DIP non-production environments, and whether any testing charges or dependencies apply.

6. Any Other Business

- 6.1 The Chair asked the group whether there were any other items of business to discuss.
- 6.2 There were no other items raised.

7. Date of Next Meeting – 04 November 2026

- 7.1 The next Working Group meeting is scheduled to be held on 04 November 2026 at 10am.

8. Attachments

- Attachment 1_DCP 480 Work Plan
- Attachment 2_DCP 482 Work Plan

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
02/01	PW to draft and circulate simple explanatory examples for DCP 480, identifying the relevant REP-900 fields and illustrating cancellation of positive and negative original values (to be included within the Change Report).	Peter Waymont	New Action.
02/02	The Secretariat to contact Donna Jameison to seek wider IDNO feedback on DCP 480 system impacts, implementation concerns and required lead times, and use the feedback to inform the proposed implementation date.	Secretariat / Donna Jamieson	New Action.
02/03	The Secretariat to remove the Authority-decision row from the DCP 480 timetable as this CP is a Part 2 Matter.	Secretariat	New Action.
02/04	The Secretariat to prepare and circulate the DCP 480 draft Change Report, aiming for 23 October 2026, incorporating the Working Group's Consultation conclusions and explanatory examples, with the implementation proposal subject to IDNO feedback.	Secretariat	New Action.
02/05	The Secretariat to confirm through the Cross-Code Steering Group how the REC data specification and DIP schema/validation changes required for DCP 482 will be coordinated, including any consequential change requests and release alignment, and report back to the Working Group.	Secretariat	New Action.
02/06	PW and PM to seek a proposed invoice-volume threshold (X) and supporting size analysis through the DuraBill forum, for review by the Working Group and sense-checking with non-DuraBill users.	Peter Waymont / Philip Mark	New Action.

02/07	The Secretariat to incorporate IG's additional lead-time comment in the DCP 482 collated Consultation responses document (SSE Energy Supply).	Secretariat	New Action.
02/08	The Secretariat to obtain an update from Elexon on CP1648's final design, decision and implementation timing, and use this as a basis for DCP 482.	Secretariat	New Action.
02/09	The Secretariat to confirm with the REC/Cross-Code Steering Group what end-to-end testing is required, whether test messages will be available in DIP non-production environments, and whether any testing charges or dependencies apply.	Secretariat	New Action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.		Update	
01/01	The Chair to contact the BSC to obtain updates regarding the CP1648 change to ensure that the solution put forward for DCP 482 can be consistent.	Secretariat	Closed. <i>Agreed to keep using the CCSG for updates.</i>
01/02	The Secretariat to produce draft consultation documents for both DCP 480 and DCP 482 and circulate to Working Group members by COP on 17 th September 2026.	Secretariat	Closed.
01/03	Working Group members to provide feedback on the draft consultation documents, including providing support for the documents if they are happy with the drafting.	All Working Group	Closed.
01/04	The Secretariat to issue the finalised Consultation documents to DCUSA Parties for 10 Working Days by close of play on Thursday 24 th September 2026.	Secretariat	Closed.