

# Minutes

---

<b>Meeting Name</b>	DCP 206 Working Group
<b>Meeting Number</b>	04
<b>Date</b>	17 July 2014
<b>Time</b>	10:00
<b>Location</b>	RIBA, 66 Portland Place, London W1B 1AD

---

<b>Attendee</b>	<b>Representing</b>
Franck Latremoliere [FL] (Chair)	Reckon LLP
Anika Brandt [AB] (Teleconference) (Part Meeting)	SSE Distribution
Mike Attree [MA]	ENWL
Steven Inglis [SI]	Northern PowerGrid
Chris Ong [CO]	UK Power Networks
Keith Burwell [KB] (Part Meeting)	Ofgem
Iain Morgan [IM] (Part Meeting)	Ofgem
Richard Ellis [RE] (Teleconference) (Part Meeting)	Western Power Distribution
Michael Walls [MW] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink Limited

## 1 ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Mo Sukumaran (SSE Distribution) and Glenn Sheern (E.on).
- 1.2 The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed without amendment.
- 1.3 The actions from the previous meeting, along with those opened and closed at this meeting are included as Appendix A.

## 2 COMPETITION LAW

- 2.1 The Working Group then reviewed the “CDCM Competition Law Dos and Don’ts” and all Working Group members agreed to the terms set out in the document.
- 2.2 It was noted to the Working Group members that the guidance is published on the DCUSA website with the meeting papers.

### **3 REVIEW OF OFGEM'S PRESENTATION**

- 3.1 KB explained to the group that as the Regulator, they requested information from the DNOs and has produced aggregated data for the Working Group to review, this presentation is included as Attachment 1.
- 3.2 The group went through each of the graphs that were provided and discussed the impacts.
- 3.3 The members then discussed the value of adding in Network Use Factors (NUF) to help demonstrate the impacts. SI explained that these NUFs show how much of the network the customer uses; and KB queried how the group would like to see these results displayed.
- 3.4 KB noted that if the data was sent to him by the DNOs that he would collate and present this, but would not want to model the entire process.
- 3.5 KB highlighted that this document was produced because of the confidentiality associated with the EDCM models. It was noted that this was solely to aid the Working Group and help to inform the judgement of the members to progress the CP forward.
- 3.6 FL suggested that further analysis is required in regard to the scaling. SI thought that it should be included within the change report to show how the values move from one area to another.
- 3.7 KB explained that it's a small group on the ends that are affected by this change, either positively or negatively.
- 3.8 MA then put forward the idea that if this Charge 1 is removed, it should be replaced with something that is more sophisticated; although this may be outside the scope of this Working Group.

### **4 REVIEW OF THE CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

- 4.1 The Working Group then reviewed the consultation responses and the collated summary along with the Working Group's comments are included as Attachment 2.

### **5 WORK PLAN AND NEXT STEPS**

- 5.1 The Working Group agreed the following work plan:
  - ElectraLink to email the question about placing DCP 206 on hold and including it within the EDCM Review Group to all Working Group members.
  - FL to email the Working Group in regard to conducting a new RFI in order to garner views from all members

### **6 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- 6.1 There were no other items of business raised at the meeting.

### **7 DATE/LOCATION OF NEXT MEETING**

- 7.1 ElectraLink will look at the calendar and email members a choice of dates for late July/early August in order to continue the review of the consultation responses.

**APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF ACTIONS****NEW AND OPEN ACTIONS**

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
04/01	ElectraLink to progress the CP through the Work Plan, and its associated actions, as agreed by the Working Group. Including following up on all actions by other WG members for the next meeting	ElectraLink	

**ACTIONS AGREED CLOSED AT THE MEETING**

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update