DCUSA

DCP 328 Working Group Meeting 09

24th April 2019 at 10:00am
Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Chris Barker (CB)	BU-UK
Donna Townsend (DT)	ESP Electricity Limited
Tom Chevalier (TC)	Power Data Associates
Lee Stone (LS)	EON
Andrew Enzor (AE)	NPg
Donald Preston (DP)	SSE
Rebecca Cailes (RC)	BU-UK
Nigel Kempson (NK)	WPD
Chris Ong (CO)	UKPN
Paul Jeffries (PJ)	Leep Utilities
David Stearstree (DS)	Leep Utilities
Derek McGlashan (DMcG)	Forthports
Code Administrator	
John Lawton (JL) (Chair)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RJC] (technical secretariat)	ElectraLink

Apologies	Company
Julie Haughey (JH)	EDF
Dave Wornell (DW)	WPD

1st May 2019

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 20th March 2019. These minutes can be found in Attachment 1.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

2.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was to continue with the review the consultation responses.

3. Review of solutions

Review proposed alternative solution

3.1 The Working Group reviewed the proposed alternative solutions raised by UKPN and further defined by AE (see paper DCP328AlternativeSolution_190424_02). Key points of these discussions are below:

- The solution proposed two options:
  - Option A - Charge a single party for units flowing at the DNO to private network boundary, with no charge levied in respect of usage of individual private network connectees.
  - Option B - Create tariff structures which only include active unit charges, and so can be applied to the usage of all private network connectees and will sum to the total which would have been applied at the boundary.
- For all sites using the difference metering arrangements, option A would be used.
- For all sites using full settlement or shared metering arrangements, option B would be used.
- The Working Group concluded that this option would work best if combined with option 5 to a point where it could be applied to all sites with full settlement or shared metering.

Which solutions should be considered further?

3.2 The Working Group reviewed all solutions to determine which should be considered further. These options can be found in paper DCP328Solutions_190424_03. Key points of these discussions are below:

- The Working Group concluded that option 1 should be progressed further but acknowledge that this option only works where there is boundary metering and settlement metering in place. Therefore, it was agreed that this CP would need to be put forward with another solution to cater for fully settled metering or shared metering.
- Regarding catering for fully settled metering and shared metering the group concluded that option 5 should be merged with the newly proposed solution discussed in 3.1 above.

- Following a review of whether option 2 could be merged with the new option proposed in 3.1, the Working Group concluded that option 2 should not be progressed further.
- Option 3 proposes to invoice all Suppliers as if the customer were connected to the Distributor's network, with the private network operator able to 'claim' some use of system revenue back from the Distributor in respect of private network assets. It was noted that this option could work for the smaller PNOs but would likely be unsuccessful if these smaller PNOs needed an approved charging methodology in place to be eligible to claim back from the Distributor. The Secretariat took an action to contact Ofgem for advice on whether this option would require PNOs to have an approved charging methodology. The Working Group concluded that option 3 should be considered further.
- The Working Group concluded that option 3 does not work for differencing metering but should be developed further as a potential solution for fully settled metering. AE and TC took an action to look at developing this option further.
- As stated in previous minutes, option 4 will not be progressed further.

Summary

3.3 Option 1 to be developed further for difference metering, considering the pros and cons of this solution

3.4 Option 3 to be developed further to see if the solution could work for fully settled metering.

3.5 Option 5 and 6 (Option within 3.1 above) to be merged to cater for fully settled and shared metering, considering the pros and cons of this solution.

ACTION 09/01: RC to contact Ofgem to clarify whether option 3 would place an obligation on PNOs to have an approved charging methodology.
ACTION 09/02: JL to develop option 1 further, considering the pros and cons.
ACTION 09/03: AE and TC to develop option 3 further to see if this solution could work for fully settled metering.
ACTION 09/04: JL to merge option 5 and 6 to cater for fully settled and shared metering, considering the pros and cons of this solution.

4. Work Plan

4.1 An updated version can be found in Attachment 2.

5. Agenda Items for the next meeting

5.1 It was agreed to add the following item to the next agenda:

- Review of the further developed options as per the actions above.

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 It was agreed that the next Working Group would be on 17th May 2019 (1pm t0 4pm).

8. Attachments

- Attachment 1: DCP 328 Minutes – 20th March 2019
- Attachment 2: Updated DCP 328 Work Plan

New and open actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/01	ElectraLink to consider approaches to ensure appropriate engagement with private network operators.	ElectraLink	
07/01	Investigate the comment regarding competition law to fully understand what needs to be considered.	ElectraLink	
09/01	RC to contact Ofgem to clarify whether option 3 would place an obligation on PNOs to have an approved charging methodology.	ElectraLink	
09/02	JL to develop option 1 further, considering the pros and cons.	ElectraLink	
09/03	AE and TC to develop option 3 further to see if this solution could work for fully settled metering.	AE and TC	
09/04	JL to merge option 5 and 6 to cater for fully settled and shared metering, considering the pros and cons of this solution.	ElectraLink	

Closed actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/02	ElectraLink to circulate details of the change proposal that look at introducing NTC to DEHs.	ElectraLink	Completed
01/03	AE to expand on option 2 and consider whether there is a need for a fifth option	AE	Completed
01/03	The Secretariat to update work plan and circulate for approval	ElectraLink	Completed
02/01	The secretariat to circulate the outcome of the discussions regarding pros, cons and consumer impacts for each option and the Working Group to provide responses to the questions posed (see Appendix 1).	ElectraLink	Completed
02/02	The secretariat to produce draft consultation and circulate prior to next meeting.	ElectraLink	Completed
03/01	Updated the draft consultation document	ElectraLink	Completed
03/02	Working Group to provide comments on draft consultation by 11th January 2019	ElectraLink	Completed
04/01	Updated the draft consultation document and circulate to Working Group by 11th January.	ElectraLink	Completed
04/02	Update the example diagrams and text within Section 3 of the document in regards to how the meters are referenced.	AE	Completed
04/03	Circulate DCP 158 CP and background information which looked at how to bill DUoS where there is a supplier within a PNO network.	JL	Completed
05/01	Updated the draft consultation document and circulate to Working Group prior to next meeting.	ElectraLink	Completed

06/01	Publish consultation on 1st February for a period of three weeks.	ElectraLink	Completed
08/01	The working group is to reflect on the consultation responses and consider the following: - What would the option 6 (UKPN) solution look like both at the boundary MPAN and for embedded MPANs? - Can option 6 forms part of the solution associated with option 2 or 5? If yes what would it look like. - What are the pros and cons for Option 6 and any variation to option 2 and 5 that incorporates option 6 and whether they can operate against the three metering types?	All	Completed
08/02	All the options to be considered further to determine whether they are appropriate for: - each PNO type; - Settlements (NHH v HH); and - CDCM or EDCM.	All	Completed
08/03	Secretariat to update the consultation responses document with the Working Groups comments and circulate to group for final review by Monday 1st April.	ElectraLink	Completed