

Minutes

DIP Change and Advisory Board (DCAB)

Meeting number
17

Venue
Hybrid

Date of meeting
12 May 2026

Classification
Public

Attendees and apologies

Attendees	Role
Sean Dryden-Woods	DIP Manager
James Stokes	DCAB Chair
Jessica Davis	DIP Manager
Ayi Edet	DIP Manager
Robert Golding	DIP Manager
Harriet Truss (External)	RECCo Observer
Andrew Wallace	DCAB Member
Clare Hannah	DCAB Member
Heap, Bryan	Observer
Andrew Humby (External)	DCAB Member
Martin Brailsford (External)	DCAB Member
Jane Lucy (External)	DCAB Member
Miriam Ellis	Observer
Erin You	DIP Manager
Cathy Mulliss (E.ON Next) (External)	DCAB Member
Marianne Haslam	Elexon Observer
Rebecca Bennett (External)	Observer
Rachael Prosser	DCAB Member
Reece Harris (UK) (External)	Observer
Andrew Margan	Observer
Andy MacFaul (External)	Ofgem Representative
Samraj Gill	Elexon Observer
Joe Ashworth (UK) (External)	Observer

1. Welcome and introductions

- 1.1 The DIP Manager welcomed DCAB members and observers to DCAB017 and confirmed the meeting was quorate.

2. DIP Manager Report (17/01)

- 2.1 The meeting opened with a welcome to attendees and confirmation that the session would be chaired by the new chair. It was explained that over the coming weeks there would be engagement with members individually to better understand what participants needed from DCAB and how the forum could be improved. The meeting was confirmed as quorate, and attendees were reminded to raise questions throughout the session where appropriate.
- 2.2 An update was then provided on the DIP management system report and the August release programme. Delivery activity remains focused on the August release, currently scheduled for 13 August, covering twelve system changes across DIP and the DIP portal. It was explained that the previously planned June release had been intentionally deferred to allow for additional build testing, operational assurance, and a more stable consolidated deployment approach. Since the March release, the platform has reportedly remained stable with no major operational issues identified.
- 2.3 The most significant update since the previous DCAB relates to replay REQ capability and archive retention functionality. Following further design and delivery reviews, significant concerns were identified around archive costs, scalability, and the existing blob index tag approach. As a result, both bulk replay REQ and state-transition replay functionality have now been removed from the August release scope and are provisionally targeted for the November release, subject to redesign and governance outcomes. It was stressed that this represented a strategic design decision rather than a delivery failure.
- 2.4 Discussion then focused on the status of the August delivery backlog. Clarification was requested regarding one previously listed item that had been marked as completed in March. It was explained that a fix delivered as part of the March release had resolved the underlying issue, making the original requirement obsolete. Questions were also raised regarding whether any dependencies existed between items marked amber and those marked green within the backlog. It was confirmed that the amber items were simply progressing through testing and were not dependent on other delivery items, while the red items alone had been formally de-scoped.
- 2.5 Further discussion explored the use of the phrase “broadly on track” in relation to the August release. Clarification was sought on whether additional items could still be removed from scope. In response, it was confirmed that the majority of items had already completed development and that those still marked amber were currently in testing, giving confidence that the August delivery date remained achievable.
- 2.6 A process improvement suggestion was then raised regarding traceability of changes across the forward schedule of change, release notes, monthly reports, and DIP change requests. It was suggested that introducing consistent reference numbers across all documentation would improve traceability and make it easier for participants to follow changes through the various governance documents. This suggestion was acknowledged and agreed for further consideration.
- 2.7 The meeting then moved to the archive retention and replay redesign activity. An overview was provided explaining that current work focused on redesigning archive and replay functionality, preparing the associated DIP change request and consultation, and aligning responsibilities with the Data Acquisition Hub (DAH). It was noted that while the technical implementation itself was relatively straightforward, the main challenge involved confirming the strategic operating model, governance arrangements, and industry direction before implementation could proceed.
- 2.8 Questions were raised regarding whether the plans presented were dependent on the outcome of the industry consultation. It was confirmed that they were, and that if consultation responses indicated support for retaining the existing longer-term archive arrangements despite the associated costs, then the proposed delivery direction would need to be reconsidered. It was also explained that the consultation and governance timelines were therefore, intentionally tight.
- 2.9

- 2.10 Further discussion focused on the proposed 90-day retention period and whether alternative retention periods could be accommodated depending on consultation feedback. It was confirmed that flexibility had already been considered, including the possibility of different retention periods for different business processes. Additional technical context was provided explaining that only a limited number of functional flows currently depended on the DIP archive capability, including IF15/16-related flows and IF36-triggered IF41 messaging. Ongoing consideration is being given to moving some of these enduring archive responsibilities into DAH so that DIP can focus primarily on operational replay functionality.

The DCAB **NOTED** the system change report.

3. **DIP Change Report (17/02)**

- 3.1 DIP Manager provided a summary of current change activity.
- 3.2 An update was provided on several new change requests that had been raised after publication of the original change report. The first change related to alignment between DIP and MDS, which was described as a relatively minor amendment intended to ensure consistency between systems. It was noted that engagement had already taken place with impacted parties and that no material impacts had been identified.
- 3.3 The second change request concerned clarification of the SUR format within the DIP rules. It was explained that although there had always been an expectation that SUR values would be alphanumeric, this requirement was not explicitly prescribed within the legal text. The proposed change therefore, introduces formal wording within Annex 2 requiring SUR values to contain only alphanumeric characters, meaning special characters such as hyphens would no longer be permitted. As this involved a legal text amendment, the proposal has been issued for consultation and is currently considered a Tier 2 change. It was also confirmed that parties currently submitting non-compliant values had already been contacted proactively and were working towards compliance ahead of implementation.
- 3.4 Further discussion revisited the proposed reduction of the DIP archive retention period from twenty-four months to ninety calendar days. It was explained that the primary driver for the proposal was the significant storage and indexing costs associated with the existing archive approach. While the exact costs were not disclosed due to commercial sensitivity, it was confirmed that they were substantial enough to justify raising the change in the interest of maintaining an efficient and cost-effective service. It was clarified that the proposal specifically related to the DIP archive and did not affect the retention periods participants themselves are required to maintain under existing obligations. The change remains under consultation, with feedback being sought regarding operational impacts and whether industry participants would support retaining the longer archive period despite the associated costs. It was also noted that a virtual engagement session would be held to provide additional context and answer stakeholder questions. Due to the urgency associated with the costs involved, it was highlighted that an ad hoc DCAB meeting may be required following consultation closure in order to progress the decision quickly.
- 3.5 Attention then turned to an upcoming change request relating to onboarding arrangements for market participants progressing through qualification and migration pathways. It was explained that particularly high participant volumes are expected within migration pathways 8 and 12, creating a risk that onboarding support demand could exceed available capacity. To mitigate this risk, a proposal is being prepared to amend the DIP rules to permit parties to be onboarded to the production DIP environment before formal qualification approval has been granted.
- 3.6 The proposed approach would only apply during the specific qualification period associated with the migration waves and would include strict controls. Parties would still be required to complete all prerequisite onboarding activities before early onboarding could occur, and their effective-from dates would remain set in the future, preventing operational use of the production environment before qualification approval. It was also explained that parties would not be onboarded earlier than the immediately preceding migration pathway, limiting the timing difference to approximately two weeks.
- 3.7 Questions were raised regarding whether the proposed timetable allowed sufficient time both for approval of the change request and for participants to become aware of the process. In response, it was confirmed that the latest approval date required would be mid-July and that communication activities were already underway through qualification working groups and direct engagement with parties expected to experience the highest onboarding volumes.

- 3.8 Additional discussion focused on qualification dependencies under REC arrangements and the need to ensure these were fully reflected in the proposal. Clarification was also requested regarding the operational risk of parties being present within the production environment prior to qualification approval. It was confirmed that the production environment itself would not provide operational capability before the effective-from date became active, and that this date could easily be amended or deferred if qualification issues arose. It was further explained that organisations can already exist within the production environment with future-dated activation periods, meaning the proposed change primarily affects onboarding timing rather than operational access.
- 3.9 Further questions explored scenarios in which qualification approval might ultimately not be granted. It was confirmed that effective-from dates could readily be moved further into the future on a case-by-case basis, or that parties could be removed from the production environment entirely if necessary. It was also noted that broader mitigation activity was already underway to reduce pressure on the qualification process overall, including attempts to move some participants into earlier migration pathways where possible.
- 3.10 A brief review of outstanding change requests already referenced within the published change report. Updates were provided on several delayed or planned items, including ongoing legal text review work associated with incident management obligations and upcoming work on status error messaging. Clarification was also requested regarding a previous housekeeping change request linked to formatting inconsistencies between published versions of documentation. It was confirmed that this change involved formatting corrections only and did not alter any underlying legal wording. Discussion followed regarding whether similar formatting-only changes would require formal change requests in future, with it being acknowledged that the DIP manager likely already has discretion to make such housekeeping amendments without formal governance approval.
- 3.13 The Forward Schedule of System Change will continue to be updated regularly to provide visibility of upcoming changes.
- 3.14 The DCAB **NOTED** the change report.

4. **DIP Change Request 00 15**

- 4.1 Discussion continued on DCR0015, which proposes introducing response codes into the DIP Rules to enhance Level 3 (L3) and Level 4 (L4) message validation requirements. It was explained that the existing rules already referenced the requirement for validations at levels one to four, but did not explicitly define the required response codes for L3 and L4 validations. This had created ambiguity for DIP users when developing their systems, particularly because earlier documentation wording had implied that some examples were illustrative rather than mandatory.
- 4.2 To resolve the issue, legal text had been drafted to formally introduce the response codes into the DIP Rules through an annex. The purpose of the change is to provide clarity and consistency so that market participants understand what response codes they are expected to send and receive when handling DIP messages at validation levels three and four.
- 4.3 An overview of the consultation outcome was then provided. Twenty-two responses had been received, with all respondents agreeing both with the identified issue and with the proposed solution. However, several respondents raised concerns regarding elements of the legal drafting, implementation timelines, and the practicalities of compliance. Some respondents noted that system development work would be required to implement the response codes correctly and that the originally proposed implementation date would not provide sufficient time for development, testing, and deployment activities.
- 4.4 In response to this feedback, the proposed implementation date was moved from June to 5 November. It was explained that the extended implementation window would provide market participants with sufficient time to update their systems while also allowing the DIP Manager to run education and drop-in support sessions to help users understand the new requirements and their practical implications.
- 4.5 Questions were raised regarding consultation responses and whether detailed answers had been provided to stakeholders who had requested additional clarification or had indicated uncertainty around implementation costs. It was confirmed that all consultation responses had been addressed within the final assessment report, including detailed DIP Manager responses explaining the rationale behind the proposal and the decision to proceed with the amended implementation approach.
- 4.6 Further discussion focused on how compliance with the new L3 and L4 response code obligations would be monitored and assured once implemented. It was explained that broader assurance and reporting processes are currently being developed and that enhanced reporting capabilities are expected later in the year, including

visibility of L3 and L4 response activity. It was noted that onboarding and testing processes would also include checks relating to these response codes, and that future audit and assurance activity would likely focus on compliance with the new obligations once formally incorporated into the DIP Rules.

- 4.7 Additional clarification was provided that the DIP Manager intends to build wider assurance and escalation processes over the coming months, including approaches to identifying non-compliance, managing escalations, and reporting issues back through governance channels where appropriate. It was emphasised that the intention is not to create a separate performance assurance board structure, but rather to ensure that appropriate governance and compliance monitoring arrangements exist within the existing framework.
- 4.8 Discussion also covered concerns around onboarding and qualification testing. It was acknowledged that introducing additional mandatory testing requirements during the current programme qualification phase had previously received resistance because some parties had already progressed through testing. As a result, the current approach focuses on introducing the legal obligation first, alongside education and assurance activity, before progressively strengthening compliance monitoring within enduring operations.
- 4.9 Before approval was sought, additional comments were raised regarding the legal drafting itself. Clarification was requested regarding the latest version of the legal text and the importance of maintaining version control so that participants could clearly identify which version was being approved. It was confirmed that corrections had already been made to some drafting inconsistencies identified earlier in the process.
- 4.10 Further technical comments were also raised concerning terminology used within one of the response code tables, specifically relating to references to DI979 and consistency between the legal text and accompanying guidance documentation. It was agreed that several minor drafting amendments and corrections would be made prior to final publication and implementation of the approved text.
- 4.11 The chair then summarised the requested decisions for DCAB members, namely:
- noting the consultation responses,
 - agreeing the revised implementation approach,
 - agreeing the amended legal text subject to the final drafting corrections discussed during the meeting,
 - and approving DCR0015.
- 4.12 Approval was then sought through the meeting chat function. Sufficient approvals were received to confirm quoracy, including one conditional approval subject to the agreed drafting amendments being completed. DCR0015 was therefore approved by DCAB.

5. Actions and Minutes (16/05)

- 5.1 DIP Manager confirmed that actions and minutes are being published on the website, with improvements made to include target dates for actions.

Summary and close

- 5.2 The Chair thanked attendees for their contributions and confirmed that no further questions were raised.

6. Actions

Action	Owner	Due
Finalise and publish the amended legal text and decision documentation for DCR0015, including agreed drafting corrections and version control improvements.	Change Lead	May 2026
Deliver stakeholder education and support activities ahead of the November implementation of L3	DCAB Secretary	Ongoing

and L4 response code requirements.

Continue developing assurance, reporting, escalation, and compliance monitoring processes for DIP obligations, including future reporting of non-compliance through DCAB governance.

Product Owner

Ongoing

Progress the archive retention consultation and determine whether an ad hoc DCAB meeting is required following consultation responses.

Product Owner/Service
Owner/Change Lead

June 2026

Continue engagement with industry participants regarding archive retention changes and onboarding risks for high-volume migration pathways.

Product Owner/Service
Owner/Change Lead

May 2026

7. Next Meeting

7.1 Tuesday 9 June 2026.