DCP 268 Working Group Meeting 14

13 March 2018 at 10:00am
Skype Meeting

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Andrew Enzor [AE]	Northern Powergrid
Chris Ong [CO]	UK Power Networks
Claire Campbell [CC]	SPEN
Dan Hickman [DH]	Npower
Dave Wornell [DW]	WPD
Emma Clark [EC]	SSE
George Moran [GM]	British Gas
Julia Haughey [JH]	EDF
Lee Wells [LW]	Northern Powergrid
Tony Collings [TCo]	SSE
Tracey Pitcher [TP]	WPD
Mark James [MJ]	UKPN
Neil Brinkley [NB[	B.UK
Code Administrator	
John Lawton [JL] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Dan Fittock [DF] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Observers	
Angela Picciariello [AP]	Ofgem
Dylan Townsend [DT]	ElectraLink

Apologies	Company
Tom Chevalier	Power Data Associates
Kathryn Evans	Scottish Power

1. Welcomes and Apologies

1.1 The Secretariat noted the welcome and apologies for this meeting.

2. Administration

2.1 The Working Group reviewed the minutes and agreed that they were a fair and accurate representation of the discussions held.

2.2 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.

3. Purpose of the Meeting

3.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting is to review the DCP 268 Consultation responses and agree the next steps.

4. Review of DCP 268 Consultation Responses

4.1 Working Group reviewed the DCP 268 Consultation Responses which can be found as Attachment 1. The main points of discussion have been highlighted below:

- In response to Question 1 'Do you agree with the Working Group's use of actual RAG usage values calculated from settlement data for intermittent generation in preference to the average of intermittent and non-intermittent values? Please provide your rationale', the Working Group noted that SSE's response stated that there were in some errors in the impact assessment spreadsheet due to SEPD having no volume against the LV Sub Generation and as such this was affecting the results on LV Sub Generation NHH and LV Sub Generation Intermittent no RP Charge tariffs since the LV Sub Generation tariff is used as a proxy for the other two. The Working Group agreed that this would not have an impact on the intent of the proposal as a whole but if SSE was concerned they could use the profiled data for the NHH tariff and the actual data LV Sub Generation Intermittent no RP Charge tariffs to indicate what the impact would be;

- In response to Question 2 'Do you agree with the Working Group's use of intermittent generation RAG values for NHH generation and no reactive power charge intermittent generation tariffs in preference to the average of intermittent and non-intermittent values?

Please provide your rationale', SSE's response noted some errors on the last page of the updated IA files for the SEPD, EMEB and MIDE areas. Upon closer inspection this was due to the results in these areas adding up to 99.99% rather than 100% in the collation exercise. The Working Group agreed that this would not have an impact on the Impact Assessment outcomes or the intent of the proposal as a whole. Similarly SSE referred to the same issue as identified in question 1, the outcome of which was provided under that question;

- The Working Group noted British Gas' response to Question 3 'Are the charging objectives better facilitated for generation customers, giving due regard to the removal of the distinction between intermittent and non-intermittent generation? Please provide your rationale' noting that they were concerned that solar generators may benefit from higher credit payments to that of wind. Following a review of the original Reckon analysis on Generation types undertaken as part of the initial DCP 268 development, the Working Group noted that aligning Generation and Demand methodologies could be considered a better outcome for DCP 268, even with this recognised flaw, although some doubt was placed on the analysis bu a number of Working Group members. The Working Group agreed that this should be considered in the Change Report when considering DCP 268 against the DCUSA Charging Objectives;

- The Working Group discussed the responses to Question 4: 'Do you agree with the Working Group that the implementation date should be the 1st April 2020? If not please provide your rationale' and noted that there were varying views, with some respondents arguing that due to the long development time of DCP 268 an implementation date of April 2020 would be more appropriate, whereas other respondents believed that an April 2021 implementation would be more appropriate as it would allow for a greater lead time for system changes to take place and reduce the likelihood of derogation requests; and

- Reviewing the responses to Question 5: 'Does this CP impact the wider work being progressed in this area, such as the Charging Futures Forum Access and Forward Looking Charges Task Forces?', the Working Group noted that as the Charging Futures Forum and its Task Forces packages of change are yet to be defined, there was general support for DCP 268 to continue to Change Report stage.

4.2 Due to the unclear direction regarding the implementation date for DCP 268, the Working Group undertook a vote on the issue with a slight majority being in favour of an April 2020 implementation date. Due to there being only a slight majority for April 2020, the Working Group agreed that the pros and cons should be included within the Change Report for the two implementation date options. Consideration was given to whether DCUSA an alternative implementation date. It was felt that this was not the case. DCUSA allows for an alternative solution. It was noted that the Panel can change the implementation date and the Authority subject to party responses.

4.3 ElectraLink agreed to take an action to update the Change Report as a result of today's discussions and issue this to the Working Group for review ahead of the next meeting.

ACTION : 14/01 - ElectraLink

5. Next Steps

5.1 The DCP 268 Working Group agreed the following next steps:

- ElectraLink to issue the updated Change Report to Working Group members;
- The Working Group to meet on 28 March to finalise the Change Report; and
- The finalised Change Report to be submitted to the April DCUSA Panel meeting.

6. Work Plan

6.1 The Working Group updated the Work Plan to reflect the next steps, which can be found as Attachment 2.

7. Any Other Business

7.1 There were no items of any other business discussed.

8. Date of Next Meeting

8.1 The next Working Group meeting will be at 2pm on 28 March 2018.

Attachments

- Attachment 1 – DCP 268 Consolidated Consultation Responses with Working Group comments
- Attachment 2 – DCP 268 Work Plan

Appendix 1: New and open actions

Open actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
14/01	To update the Change Report as a result of today's discussions and issue this to the Working Group for review ahead of the next meeting.	ElectraLink	

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
13/01	To make the required changes to the IA spreadsheets and circulate these to the Working Group once the amendments were completed	ElectraLink	Completed post-meeting
13/02	To review the Impact Assessment after updating the IA spreadsheets and compare with the one in the change report and reflect any changes in the consultation document.	ElectraLink	Completed.