DCP 480 / DCP 482 Working Group - Meeting 03

04 November 2026 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Ian Goudge [IG]	SSE
Peter Waymont [PW]	UKPN
Philip Mark [PM]	SSEN
Code Administrator	
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Jo Brown [JB]	NGED

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.

1.6 **Action 02/02:** The Chair confirmed that DJ had sought wider IDNO feedback. Feedback indicated that DCP 480 was already supported through a configurable flag for each Supplier, with no implementation identified. For DCP 482, the impact would depend on where splitting occurred. Splitting at Supplier level would be simpler than splitting within charge info, which would require fragments to be reassembled. An indicative implementation effort of one week to ten days was reported for the latter.

1.7 It was noted that ESP supported the intent of the changes but was awaiting confirmation from its billing-system provider on implementation timescales. Its initial view was that February could be challenging if significant changes were required. The Chair noted that DJ had also raised the matter at the IDNO forum.

1.8 Following the above update, the Chair agreed to follow-up with DJ for any further IDNO feedback and incorporate the relevant DCP 480 system-impact implementation comments into the Change Report.

ACTION 03/01: The Secretariat to follow-up with DJ for any further IDNO feedback and incorporate the relevant DCP 480 system-impact implementation comments into the Change Report.

1.9 **Action 02/05:** The Chair confirmed that the REC response had been circulated. A BSC response on the coordination of the REC data specification and DIP schema/validation changes remained outstanding despite repeated contact and referral through the Cross-Code Steering Group. The Chair agreed that the matter required escalation.

ACTION 03/02: The Secretariat to escalate the outstanding BSC/DIP coordination enquiry and confirm the consequential change and release-alignment requirements for DCP 482.

1.10 **Action 02/08:** The Chair stated that they are awaiting confirmation of CP1648's final design, maturity and implementation timing. February 2027 remained the published timing he had seen, although a possible move to June 2027 had been discussed.

1.11 PW understood that the change might become effective in February 2027 with system changes live in June 2027 but emphasised that this required confirmation. Members noted uncertainty over when REP-900 messages might exceed 1MB and the need to allow sufficient implementation lead time – the Chair agreed to take an action to follow this up with the BSC representative (Jenny).

ACTION 03/03: The Secretariat to follow-up with the BSC representative (Jenny) in regard to confirming the design maturity and implementation timing of CP1648.

1.12 **Action 02/09:** On testing, the Chair reported that the REC response indicated testing would be available, subject to discussion with the DIP Manager. Details of end-to-end testing, non-production test messages, charges and dependencies remained to be established. The Chair suggested inviting the DIP Manager to the next meeting to clarify these arrangements.

ACTION 03/04: The Secretariat to invite the DIP Manager to the next DCP 480/482 Working Group meeting.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

2.1 The Chair explained that the purpose of this meeting is to review the DCP 480 draft Change Report and discuss the outstanding DCP 482 solution details within the Working Group and agree next steps.

3. Review DCP 480 Draft Change Report

3.1 The Chair presented the DCP 480 Draft Change Report 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 noted that the proposal remained a Standard Change and a Part 2 Matter. The opening sections reflected the original proposal, with no amendments proposed to the main body of DCUSA.

3.4 The Chair corrected the Consultation response total in the report from eleven to eight and provided the group with an overview of the responses to each question.

Q1 – Understanding

3.5 All eight respondents understood the intent of DCP 480, recognising the aim of standardising cancellation-value treatment and removing differences between sending parties.

Q2 – Support for the principles

3.6 All eight respondents supported the principles. Five DNOs and one IDNO provided unqualified support. The two Supplier responses highlighted the benefits of a single convention, reduced sender-specific processing and a lower risk of missed or double-counted cancellations.

Q3 – Sign convention

3.7 Five DNOs supported the proposed approach, and the IDNO noted consistency with Schedule 19 portfolio billing. One Supplier requested clear guidance and worked examples using the CAN invoice type. The other supported the intended outcome but proposed reversing the applicable original invoice values, recognising that cancellation of a negative original value would require a positive value. It also requested identification of the relevant data items.

Q4 – Proposed wording

3.8 Five DNOs proposed no amendments, and the IDNO considered the wording sufficiently clear. The Supplier responses requested worked examples and more detailed drafting covering applicable values, references to the original invoice, subsequent rebills, the status of the requirement and treatment of non-compliant cancellations.

Q5 – Implementation and system impacts

3.9 Two DNOs reported no impact, one anticipated no significant impact but could not rule it out, and another recommended engagement with the DuraBill provider. The IDNO already supported negative cancellation credits. One Supplier requested sufficient notice to assess requirements. The

other assessed the impact as low, mainly affecting reconciliation and reporting, while retaining exception checks because the DIP did not validate the sign of values.

Q6 – Data-item references

3.10 Respondents supported explicit references to DI585/DI20374 to clarify scope and promote consistency. Qualifications included avoiding unnecessary complexity or restrictions on future applicability. Supplier comments also sought a worked example and a clear, testable requirement.

Q7 – DCUSA Objectives

3.11 The responses supported better facilitation of DCUSA General Objective 4 through greater consistency, efficiency and reduced sender-specific processing. PW considered the separate bullet on efficiency and standardisation under MHHS redundant, since REP-900 applied to migrated MPANs. The Chair agreed to remove the duplicate MHHS efficiency bullet which was completed live-on-screen.

Q8 – Implementation

3.12 All respondents supported the next appropriate DCUSA release following approval. Supplier qualifications concerned readiness and sufficient notice. One Supplier proposed implementing DCP 480 and DCP 482 in the same message version and identifying the billing run from which each Distributor would apply the convention.

Q9 – Wider developments

3.13 Three DNOs, one Supplier and the IDNO identified no wider developments. Other responses referred to DCP 482, CP1648, CP1649, DCP 428, MHHS-related message-volume growth and DCP 484.

Q10 – Other comments

3.14 Supplier comments reiterated the request for examples and asked about the need for an Authority decision, whether the note would be binding, identification and correction of non-compliance, and alignment with the REC specification. Members agreed to use 'Distributor' rather than 'LDSO' consistently in the report.

3.15 Working Group Conclusions and Proposed Solution

3.16 The Chair presented the proposed final-solution wording, which focused on cancellations reversing original invoice values so that the transactions netted to zero. PW challenged this emphasis, explaining that the original intent was broader: negative amounts should be shown as negative, with cancellation identified as a case where the sign must not be inferred solely from the invoice type. PM supported this clarification.

3.17 PW noted that the same principle applied to other credits, including generation credits. A cancellation of a negative invoice could itself be positive. The purpose was therefore not to state that all cancellations must be negative, nor to impose an additional netting exercise. Original invoices and their cancellations could occur many months apart.

3.18 The Chair accepted the clarification and amended the draft on screen using wording from the original proposal.

3.19 Explanatory Examples

3.20 Members reviewed the examples already included by the Chair. PW advised removing references to rebills because the original invoice could itself be a rebill. PW and IG questioned the need for a net-value entry; the Chair removed this live on screen. Simple examples remained the preferred approach.

3.21 PW agreed to review the examples further, including whether they should show quantities as well as values and how DuraBill treated the relevant signs. The quantity treatment was not confirmed during the meeting. Members noted that the examples would not replace existing message validation, population or calculation rules.

3.22 Objectives, Wider Impacts and Implementation

3.23 The Chair reviewed the report's assessment against General Objective 4. Consistent processing and improved efficiency remained the stated benefits.

3.24 PW challenged the inclusion of CP1648 and CP1649 as wider impacts for DCP 480, explaining that they concerned file splitting and did not affect the credit-sign clarification. The Chair agreed to remove those references from the wider-impacts section. DCP 482 remained relevant to the potential convenience of a combined system update, rather than as a dependency preventing DCP 480 from progressing.

ACTION 03/05: The Secretariat to remove CP1468 and CP1469 from the DCP 480 Change Report 'Wider-Impacts' Section.

3.25 The proposed implementation approach remained the next release following approval, as soon as reasonably possible and subject to required system changes.

3.26 The Chair referred to the November Panel meeting on 18 November 2026 as a possible submission point and a 15 Working Day period in the draft recommendation.

3.27 Members discussed how the message amendment would be submitted and published. The Chair had received a portal link from Bella but needed clarification of the process. PW noted that the flow was not REC-owned and questioned whether REC processes should constrain its effective date. Following this, the Chair agreed to reach out to Bella to confirm the process and timing for submitting and publishing the DCP 480 message amendment, how it becomes effective, and any implications for Panel submission and implementation.

ACTION 03/06: The Secretariat to reach out to Bella to confirm the process and timing for submitting and publishing the DCP 480 message amendment, how it becomes effective, and any implications for Panel submission and implementation.

3.28 The Chair considered that a November release might be achievable if the publication process was quick, but this was not confirmed. The Chair agreed to insert the relevant IDNO billing-system feedback and circulate the updated report post-meeting.

ACTION 03/07: The Secretariat to insert the relevant IDNO billing-system feedback and circulate the updated report post-meeting.

4. Review Outstanding DCP 482 Solution Details

4.1 The Chair opened discussions to the Working Group regarding the outstanding DCP 482 solution details.

4.2 The key points can be found below:

4.3 The Chair mentioned the outstanding invoice-volume threshold - PW confirmed that information had been received from DuraBill on Tuesday 03 November, however, he had not yet reviewed it in detail. Following this, both PW and PM agreed to review the Durabill information and produce a proposed invoice-volume threshold for the Working Group to review (Action 02/06).

4.4 The Chair proposed preparing a skeleton draft Change Report with placeholders for outstanding matters. PW agreed that the substance was available but that important detail remained unresolved, particularly message volumes and the current BSC design.

ACTION 03/08: The Secretariat to produce a skeleton DCP 482 Change Report for the Working Gorup to review and further develop.

4.5 PW highlighted that DCP 482 would not achieve its purpose if a required DIP update was not made. The process for raising the DIP change, testing arrangements and implementation lead times therefore needed to be understood.

4.6 The Chair proposed a further Working Group meeting on 20 November, allowing members approximately a week to review the draft Change Report. The Chair proposed inviting DIP and BSC representatives to answer questions on design, testing and implementation (Action 03/04).

ACTION 03/09: The Secretariat to schedule the next Working Group meeting for 20 November 2026.

4.7 PW emphasised that enquiries should not wait until the next meeting. If billing could be affected before the related BSC changes were implemented, DCP 482 should not automatically be constrained by their implementation dates. The Working Group needed prompt confirmation of the DIP change process and lead times so that a necessary request could be raised without delay.

4.8 Members discussed different possible lead times as illustrations, not confirmed delivery estimates. The Chair recognised that a lengthy lead time could increase the risk of messages exceeding 1MB and might require consideration of interim arrangements.

4.9 The Chair reiterated that members could provide further comments on both the DCP 480 and DCP 482 draft Change Reports and examples following circulation.

5. Agreed Next Steps

5.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:

- The Secretariat to revise and circulate the DCP 480 Change Report to the Working Group.
- PW to review the DCP 480 examples.

- The Secretariat to clarify the message-amendment publication proves with Bella.
- PW and PM to review the DuraBill information on the DCP 482 invoice threshold.
- The Chair to circulate an outline DCP 482 Change Report before 13 November 2026.
- The Chair to pursue the outstanding BSC and DIP enquiries immediately and seek representatives' attendance at the proposed 20 November meeting.

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 – 20 November 2026

7.1 The next Working Group meeting is scheduled to be held on 20 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	**Ongoing.**
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	**Ongoing.**
03/01	The Secretariat to follow-up with DJ for any further IDNO feedback and incorporate the relevant DCP 480 system-impact implementation comments into the Change Report.	Secretariat	**New Action.**
03/02	The Secretariat to escalate the outstanding BSC/DIP coordination enquiry and confirm the consequential change and release-alignment requirements for DCP 482.	Secretariat	**New Action.**
03/03	The Secretariat to follow-up with the BSC representative (Jenny) in regard to confirming the design maturity and implementation timing of CP1648.	Secretariat	**New Action.**
03/04	The Secretariat to invite the DIP Manager to the next DCP 480/482 Working Group meeting.	Secretariat	**New Action.**
03/05	The Secretariat to remove CP1468 and CP1469 from the DCP 480 Change Report 'Wider-Impacts' Section.	Secretariat	**New Action.**
03/06	The Secretariat to reach out to Bella to confirm the process and timing for submitting and publishing the DCP 480 message amendment, how it becomes effective, and any implications for Panel submission and implementation.	Secretariat	**New Action.**

03/07	The Secretariat to insert the relevant IDNO billing-system feedback and circulate the updated report post-meeting.	Secretariat	**New Action.**
03/08	The Secretariat to produce a skeleton DCP 482 Change Report for the Working Gorup to review and further develop.	Secretariat	**New Action.**

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update
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	**Closed.** *The Chair confirmed that DJ had sought wider IDNO feedback.*
02/03	The Secretariat to remove the Authority-decision row from the DCP 480 timetable as this CP is a Part 2 Matter.	Secretariat	**Closed.**
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	**Closed.**
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	**Closed.** *The Chair confirmed the REC response has been circulated; however, the BSC response has not been received. This action has been closed, and a new action has been agreed (Action 03/02) to escalate the BSC response.*
02/07	The Secretariat to incorporate IG's additional lead-time comment in the DCP 482 collated Consultation responses document (SSE Energy Supply).	Secretariat	**Closed.**

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	**Closed.** *This action has been closed, with a new action superseding this to follow up with the BSC representative (Jenny) for confirmation (Action 03/03).*
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	**Closed.**
03/09	The Secretariat to schedule the next Working Group meeting for 20 November 2026.	Secretariat	**Closed.**