

DCP 289 Working Group Meeting 01

08 May 2017 at 10:00am

Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Andrew Sherry [AS]	Electricity North West Ltd
Angus Rae [AR]	SSE
Chris Ong [CO]	UK Power Networks
George Moran [GM]	British Gas
Lee Wells [LW]	Northern Powergrid
Oliver Day [OD]	UKPN
Pat Wormald [PW]	Northern Powergrid
Simon Yeo [SY]	Western Power Distribution
Vivian Marangoni [VM]	Ofgem
Code Administrator	
Claire Hynes [CH] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Dan Fittock [DF] (technical secretariat)	ElectraLink

Apologies	Company
Claire Campbell	Scottish Power

1. Administration

1.1 The Chair welcomed the members to the meeting.

- 1.2 The Working Group reviewed the “Competition Law Do’s and Don’ts”. All Working Group members agreed to be bound by the Competition Laws Do’s and Don’ts for the duration of the meeting.
- 1.3 The Terms of Reference for the meeting were reviewed and the Working Group agreed that these were a fair and accurate representation of the Working Group’s objectives.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The secretariat set out that the purpose of the meeting is to review the DCP Change Report.

3. Review of the DCP 289, DCP 289A and DCP 289B Legal Text

3.1 DCP 289A

- 3.2 The Working Group reviewed the legal text for DCP 289A following a review by the DCUSA Legal Advisor.

- 3.3 It was noted that a number of amendments were made in order to maintain clarity throughout the document and the Working Group agreed with all of the amendments made, and agreed that this legal text should be used for the final Change Report.

3.4 DCP 289B

- 3.5 The Working Group reviewed the legal text for DCP 289B following a review by the DCUSA Legal Advisor.

- 3.6 It was noted that the definition for TN was different to the TN definition used in the SCP 289A legal text, with Working Group members explaining that where TN is constrained by the subclause that it is in, it should be read in conjunction with clause 2.9B.2 and thus means in respect of each DNO Party.

- 3.7 It was noted that a number of amendments were made in order to maintain clarity throughout the document and the Working Group agreed with all of the amendments made, and agreed that this legal text should be used for the final Change Report.

- 3.8 VM – estimated annual cost for the forum at the last meeting? CH – there was no forecast cost , the discussion was around a line item. Cost of the DCMDG was too small for a line item. For 289B parties will take into consideration when calculating for the line item, this wouldn’t be included. VM – estimate of cost? CO – Oliver mentioned £20k? CH – that was the threshold for a line item, at least 20k. VM – any idea of cost? CH – MIG part of our contract and cannot disclose due to agreements with DNOs. PW – if confidential can we share directly with Ofgem? CH – is that something we want to do? CO – don’t see that as an issue if offline discussion with Ofgem, just not in the change report. CH – have contract with ENA so will need to seek permission from the ENA to share the DCM costs.

4. Review of the DCP 289 Change Report

- 4.1 The Working Group reviewed the...
- 4.2 The Ofgem representative queried whether the cost of running the DCMDG had been confirmed since the last meeting, with the Chair confirming that there was no forecast cost and the discussions held regarded the cost being added as a line item in DNO pricing calculations with the cost of the DCMDG being too small to be added as a line item as it was under £20k.
- 4.3 The Ofgem representative further explained that having an estimated cost would allow Ofgem to make a determination regarding this proposal, to which the Chair explained that the DCMF MIG forms part of a contract with DNOs and ElectraLink could not freely share this information directly with Ofgem without prior consent from the DNOs. ElectraLink agreed to take an action to discuss this with the DNOs and contact Ofgem outside of the meeting regarding the matter.

ACTION: 03/01 - ElectraLink

- 4.4 The Chair queried whether an additional consultation would be required for DCP 289B as the industry had already been consulted for the DCP 289 and DCP 289A solutions and an additional consultation for DCP 289B may aid Ofgem in their determinations for the proposal. Both Working Group members and the Ofgem representative agreed that Parties would have an opportunity to comment during the voting process and that the funding mechanism for DCP 289B wasn't seen as material against the intent of the change due to the minimal impact on DNOs as the cost recovery will not be an additional line item in their calculations.
- 4.5 Following a number of minor amendments to the Change Report to ensure clarity and continuity of content, the Working Group agreed that the Change Report should be circulated to the Working Group for comments and, following these comments being included within the Change Report, submitted to the May DCUSA Panel.

ACTION: 03/02 - ElectraLink

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 The DCP 289 Working Group agreed to the following next steps:
- Circulate the draft Change Report to the Working Group with comments by tomorrow; and
 - Submit the Final Change Report to the May DCUSA Panel.

6. Work Plan

- 6.1 The DCP 289 Working Group reviewed the Work Plan and ElectraLink agreed that the Work Plan was correct as per the discussions held.

7. Any Other Business

- 7.1 There were no items of AOB and the Chair closed the meeting.

8. Date of Next Meeting

- 8.1 It was agreed that due to the Change Report being submitted to the May DCUSA Panel, no further Working Group meetings are expected.

9. Attachments

- Attachment 1 - DCP 289 Draft Change Report with Working Group comments.
- Attachment 2 – DCP 289 Work Plan

New and open actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
03/01	To discuss whether the DCMF MIG funding arrangements can be shared with Ofgem with the DNOs and contact Ofgem outside of the meeting regarding the matter.	ElectraLink	Completed post-meeting.
03/02	To circulate the DCP 289 Change Report to the Working Group with the view of submitting this to the May DCUSA Panel.	ElectraLink	Completed post-meeting.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/01	To ensure that the Terms of Reference for the DCMDG reflect that commercial discussions are not permitted.	ElectraLink	Completed
01/02	To prepare the background document for attachment to the consultation.	Pat Wormald	Completed and included in the consultation.
01/03	To review and provide and feedback any amendments to the draft consultation document.	Working Group Members	Completed.
01/04	To prepare the consultation document based on today's discussions and circulate this to the Working Group for comment.	ElectraLink	Completed post-meeting.
01/05	To update the Work Plan to reflect today's discussions.	ElectraLink	Completed post-meeting.
02/01	To draft the change proposal form and legal text for DCP 289B and circulate this to the Working Group.	GM & ElectraLink	Completed post-meeting.