

# DCP 341/342 Joint Working Group

## Meeting 05

30 May 2019 at 10:00am

Skype Meeting / Teleconference

| Attendee                                    | Company            |
|---|--------------------|
| <b>Working Group Members</b>                |                    |
| Andrew Enzor [AE]                           | Northern Powergrid |
| Catalina Rozo [CR]                          | Zenobe             |
| Chris Barker [CB]                           | ENWL               |
| Emma Clark [EC]                             | SSEN               |
| Rebecca Cailles [RC]                        | BU-UK              |
| Claire Campbell [CC]                        | SP Energy Networks |
| <b>Observers</b>                            |                    |
| Ankita Mehra [AM]                           | Ofgem              |
| Nicholas Rubin [NR]                         | Elexon             |
| <b>Code Administrator</b>                   |                    |
| John Lawton [JL] (Chair)                    | ElectraLink        |
| Dylan Townsend [DT] (Technical Secretariat) | ElectraLink        |

| Apology          | Company     |
|------------------|-------------|
| Karl Maryon [KM] | Haven Power |

## 1. Administration

---

- 1.1 The Secretariat welcomed those in attendance and noted the apologies for this meeting.
- 1.2 The Working Group reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance”. All Working Group members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.
- 1.3 The Working Group reviewed the minutes for meeting 04 and agreed that they were an accurate record of proceedings.
- 1.4 The Working Group reviewed the items on the actions list from the last meeting. Updates on all actions are provided in Appendix A.
- 1.5 During the review of the actions, the Ofgem representative explained that there is an expectation that the Working Group will give due consideration to other industry code modifications, specifically those that have the potential to interact or impact upon DCP 341/342 or vice versa. The Chair noted that the Working Group have given consideration to a number of directly relevant industry code modifications. Further to this the Chair explained that due to the timescales that the group needs to adhere to, it has not given detailed consideration to modifications that might potentially interact with DCP 341/342 especially if those modifications have yet to develop concrete solutions.

## 2. Review of completed modelling and impact assessment

---

- 2.1 It was noted that the updated models and impact assessment were circulated prior to the meeting and that one Working Group member had subsequently provided some comments via email. This email set out that the member was reasonably comfortable with this modelling, however raised two items that required some further work.
- 2.2 The first related to the DCP 342 EDCM model, which was a minor issue for the ‘storage site’ input within the tariffs input worksheet which should have contained validation to ensure only ‘true’ or ‘false’ is entered. The Working Group member noted that this validation had only been applied to the first 16 tariffs and that the remainder had different validation that a numerical value between 0 and the number of days in the year is entered which would need to be removed in order to populate true/false for tariff 17 onwards. The Secretariat noted that as a result of this feedback that they had requested for the DCUSA modelling consultant to update the DCP 342 versions of the EDCM models originally provided to address the issue and that the updated versions will be circulated to the group once received.
- 2.3 The second item covered in the Working Group member’s email confirmed that the DCP 341 tariff impact assessment is as expected but the changes in annual charge show some unexpected results, with some of the half hourly metered tariffs showing decreases in £/customer despite increases in unit rates. The member noted that this is an issue that has been seen before and relates to changes in volumes between the two scenarios, meaning kWh/customer has changed sufficiently to skew the £/customer impact. It was noted that this is explained well in the documentation provided by the DCUSA modelling consultant but the member suggested that the group could create their own version by simply using a constant kWh/customer applied to the old tariffs and new tariffs to come up with the impact £/customer impact assessment.

- 2.4 The Chair asked if the member who'd pointed out the aforementioned item, would be able to create the updated version and if so when it could be provided by, to which the member noted that they should be able to complete during the meeting and circulate for review/comment accordingly.
- 2.5 The Chair highlighted that in issuing the documentation prior to the meeting, a request was made to the DNO Working Group members to undertake testing of the models and to complete an EDCM tariff impact assessment for DCP 342 in readiness for the meeting. Of the DNOs, who are Working Group members and were in attendance only one had supplied a completed impact assessment, and the Chair questioned when the others expected to provide theirs by, to which it was noted that most would be provided by close of play Friday, 31 May. It was noted that two DNO Working Group members from UKPN and WPD were not present at the meeting and the Secretariat took an action to follow up with respect to their expected timescales to provide their EDCM tariff impact assessment for DCP 342.

**POST MEETING NOTE: During their review, a number of actions were taken by the Secretariat and/or the Working Group, however for the sake of simplicity these are not recorded as they were completed in the days that followed and were all in respect of the consultation which was issued prior to these minutes.**

### 3. Review of draft legal text

---

- 3.1 The Chair highlighted that there had been an email exchange related to what is defined as facility for the purposes of these changes. Specifically, whether the current definition is restrictive when considering the different site and metering arrangements that may exist and how the current wording 'whose sole function' was a means by which to differentiate between a standalone storage facility and one that is co-located with some other demand/generation.
- 3.2 The Working Group discussed their interpretations of what actually constitutes a standalone storage facility and whether this as a single boundary connection with a single metering point and a single supplier or whether a site that effectively has two connections, being two boundary points, two metering points and potentially two suppliers.
- 3.3 The Working Group considered a scenario where a factory operates a storage facility onsite, using the same connection to the distribution network. The Working Group agreed that if the storage facility has its own metering (i.e. the factory has distinct metering for its import and the storage facility has distinct metering for its export and its import) then the storage facility should be classed as eligible. The Working Group note that where this is the case, it will mean that a storage facility may be 'co-located' with other demand but can only be classed as eligible if it is separately metered.
- 3.4 Following this discussion, the Working Group reviewed and updated the draft legal text documents for both DCP 341 and DCP 342 and the documents that captures these amendments acts as Attachment 1 to the minutes.

**POST MEETING NOTE: During their review, a number of actions were taken by the Secretariat and/or the Working Group, however for the sake of simplicity these are not recorded as they were completed in the days that followed and were all in respect of the consultation which was issued prior to these minutes.**

## 4. Review of draft consultation document

- 4.1 The Chair noted that upon receiving the modelling and impact assessment from the DCUSA modelling consultant, the Secretariat had made amendments to the version of the draft consultation document that had been circulated with the meeting pack and requested for that version to be circulated to members for review.
- 4.2 The Secretariat explained that they had included some paragraphs into the impact assessment section of the document, included some introductory text and some of the explanatory information from the document provided by the DCUSA modelling consultant.
- 4.3 The Working Group reviewed and updated the consultation document during the meeting and the document that captures these amendments acts as Attachment 2 to the minutes.

**During their review, a number of actions were taken by the Secretariat and/or the Working Group, however for the sake of simplicity these are not recorded as they were completed in the days that followed and were all in respect of the consultation document which was issued prior to these minutes.**

## 5. Next steps and Work Plan

- 5.1 The Working Group reviewed and updated the Work Plan and in doing so agreed that the next steps. The updated Work Plan acts as Attachment 3 to the minutes and a summary of the next steps is below:

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| ElectraLink to update the consultation document and circulate to group for final sign off        | 31 May 2019     |
| ElectraLink to issue consultation for a period of [three weeks]                                  | 05 June 2019    |
| ElectraLink to draft strawman Change Report and circulate to Working Group prior to next meeting | 05-25 June 2019 |
| Consultation responses due [based on three-week consultation period]                             | 26 June 2019    |
| ElectraLink to collate consultation responses and circulate to Working Group members             | 27 June 2019    |
| Working Group meeting to review consultation responses and strawman Change Report                | 28 June 2019    |

## 6. Any Other Business

- 6.1 There were no items of any other business and the Chair closed the meeting.

## 7. List of Attachments

- Attachment 1 – DCP 341/342 Draft Legal Text - Post Meeting Tracked
- Attachment 2 – DCP 341/342 Draft Consultation Document - Post Meeting Tracked
- Attachment 3 – DCP 341/342 Work Plan - Updated

## Appendix A – Actions

### New and Open Actions *(Updates set out in blue)*

| Action Ref. | Action   | Owner         | Update                |
|-------------|--|---------------|-----------------------|
| 03/02       | Consider the case for looking at shared MPANs as this is being discussed within the Workgroup developing BSC modification P379 'Multiple Suppliers through Meter Splitting' that is looking into this. Specifically, to consider what the impacts might be and to understand how DUoS is attributed to the different MPANs.  | Working Group | 16/05/2019 – Ongoing: |
| 03/03       | Find the documentation provided by the Elexon representative during the development of the now withdrawn DCPs 319 and 321 and share these with the Working Group.  | ElectraLink   | 16/05/2019 – Ongoing: |
| 04/01       | Liaise with CR around whether any information from within the storage community exists around the numbers of WC storage facilities that would otherwise be eligible for the new tariff.  | ElectraLink   |                       |
| 04/02       | Review both sets of legal text to ensure the wording 'electricity storage facility whose sole function is electricity storage' is correctly applied throughout. ElectraLink to amend the meaning of the definition for an 'Electricity Storage Facility' in both sets of legal text to state 'means a facility with CT metering where Electricity Storage occurs'. | ElectraLink   |                       |
| 04/03       | Update consultation document as agreed during the meeting and circulate to the Working Group for review.   | ElectraLink   |                       |

### Closed Actions *(Updates set out in blue)*

| Action Ref. | Action   | Owner            | Update  |
|-------------|--|------------------|---|
| 03/01       | The Secretariat and NR liaise with NR and relevant National Grid representatives to understand the expected timelines for change reports and implementation for the other related changes and discuss whether it is believed that alignment can be achieved and what contingency processes might look like if the BSC approach is to be incorporated into the solutions for DCP 341/342. | ElectraLink / NR | 16/05/2019 – Completed: Discussion held on 03 May and update provided to Working Group meeting 04 |