

DCP 328 Working Group Meeting 14

5th August 2019 at 13:00

Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Chris Barker (CB)	BU-UK
Will Ellis (WE)	Leep Utilities
Donna Townsend (DT)	ESP Electricity Limited
Tom Chevalier (TC)	Power Data Associates
Rebecca Cailles (RC)	BU-UK
Nigel Kempson (NK)	WPD
Paul Jeffries (PJ)	Leep Utilities
Pamela Howe (H)	NPg
Derek McGlashan (DMcG)	Forthports
Christine Jamieson	Xero Energy Limited
Code Administrator	
John Lawton (JL) (Chair)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RJC] (technical secretariat)	ElectraLink

Apologies	Company
Julie Haughey (JH)	EDF
Dave Wornell (DW)	WPD
Lee Stone (LS)	EON
Donald Preston (DP)	SSEN

12 August 2019

Chris Ong (CO)	UKPN
Kara Burke (KB)	NPg

1. Administration

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the members to the meeting.
- 1.2 The Working Group reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance”. All Working Group members agreed to be bound by the Competition Laws Guidance for the duration of the meeting.
- 1.3 The Working Group noted that they were happy with the minutes from the previous meeting held on 24th April 2019, except for one mistake. Dave Wornell was stated as representing “DW” instead of “WPD”. This has been updated and can be found in Attachment 1.
- 1.4 An update on the actions can be found in Appendix 1.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was to finalise the legal text and modelling specification document and review the draft consultation document.

3. Review of Draft Legal Text

- 3.1 The Working Group reviewed the draft legal text for both solutions. An amendment was made to the title of the solution so that it matched the consultation document.
- 3.2 The Working Group discussed the comment raised by Andrew Enzor regarding the definition of “Designated Property”. It is effectively the same issue which arises for HV and LV customers connected to LDNO networks which are themselves connected at EHV. An LDNO network connected at EHV does not meet the definition of ‘Designated Property’; rather it meets the definition of ‘Designated EHV Property’. Therefore, clause 1A of Schedule 16 which tells you to only use schedule 16 to calculate charges for ‘Designated Properties’ means that you can’t use schedule 16 to calculate charges for HV and LV customers connected to LDNO networks which are themselves connected at EHV.
- 3.3 The Working Group agreed that the same issues exist for DCP 328 because the option which introduces new tariffs will need to calculate tariffs for HV and LV customers which are connected to private networks which are themselves connected at EHV. Those private networks will not meet the definition of ‘Designated Property’ and therefore Schedule 16 cannot be used to calculate tariffs for those customers.
- 3.4 To resolve the issue described in paragraph 3.2 above, a new DCUSA Schedule (29 - Calculation of Discount Percentages for the Purpose of Determining Certain LDNO Use of System Charges Under Schedules 16, 17 and 18) was produced. The Working Group agreed that further work was required to determine whether a similar solution is needed for DCP 328.

ACTION 14/01: Secretariat to investigate Schedule 29 further and seek advice on whether a similar solution is required for DCP 328.

4. Review and Finalise Modelling Specification Documentation

- 4.1 The Working Group reviewed the modelling specification document and an update version of the document can be found in Attachment 2.

ACTION 14/02: The Working Group to review and provide comments on the modelling specification document by Friday 16th August.

5. Review of Draft Second Consultation

- 5.1 The Working Group reviewed the draft second consultation. An update version of the consultation document can be found in Attachment 3. Key points are detailed below:
- The “How” section within section 1 has been updated to reflect the Working Groups proposed solutions.
 - The commentary regarding the background to DCP 328 which was included within the first consultation has been summarised and included in the second consultation.
 - In regard to paragraph 4.30 which discusses the allocation of fixed and capacity charges, NK took an action to update the example of how this is undertaken (post meeting note, this has now been completed and can be found in Attachment 4).
 - The Working Group agreed that at this stage they do not want to charge for export MPANs, because the likelihood is that this would be very small. A question has been added to the consultation to seek industry views on this.
 - Regarding no residual charging being applied for both options, the Working Group agreed to seek advice on whether this is an acceptable approach. An explanation as to why no residual charging would not apply will be needed. The Working Group also agreed that they will seek advice on competition law so that a section can be added to the consultation demonstrating consideration for each solution.
 - It was agreed that the consultation will be released for four weeks, based on the complexity of the consultation request.

ACTION 14/03: Secretariat to seek advice regarding the impacts of not applying residual charging, particularly on competition law.

6. Any Other Business

6.1 There were no further items of AOB and the Chair closed the meeting.

7. Date of Next Meeting

7.1 The date of the next meeting is to be determined.

8. Attachments

- Attachment 1: Updated DCP 328 Working Group Meeting 13
- Attachment 2: DCP 328 Modelling Specification Document
- Attachment 3: DCP 328 Draft Second Consultation Document
- Attachment 4: DCP 328 Example EDCM Energy Park

New and open actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/01	ElectraLink to consider approaches to ensure appropriate engagement with private network operators.	ElectraLink	Ongoing and considered at each meeting or consultation circulation
09/01	RC to contact Ofgem to clarify whether option 3 would place an obligation on PNOs to have an approved charging methodology.	ElectraLink	Ongoing
10/04	Secretariat to seek legal advice on how long after the billing period can a claim be made by a PNO if Option B was implemented	ElectraLink	Ongoing
14/01	Secretariat to investigate Schedule 29 further and seek advice on whether a similar solution is required for DCP 328.	ElectraLink	
14/02	The Working Group to review and provide comments on the modelling specification document by Friday 16 th August.	ElectraLink	
14/03	Secretariat to seek advice regarding the impacts of not applying residual charging, particularly on competition law.	ElectraLink	

Closed actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
13/01	Draft legal text for both solutions to be circulated to Working Group for comments by Friday 19 th July.	ElectraLink	Completed
13/02	Kara Burke to provide clarity on the comments made by Andrew Enzor regarding Section 1A of Schedule 16	KB	Completed
13/03	The Secretariat to produce draft second consultation document and circulate to the Working Group for review by Monday 29th July.	ElectraLink	Completed