

DCP 204 Working Group Minutes

Meeting Name	DCP 204 Working Group Meeting
Meeting Number	18
Date	19 November 2015
Time	10:00
Venue	Web-conference

Attendee	Company
David Brogden [DB] (Chair)	SSEPD
David Boyer [DBo]	UKPN
Dominique Tilquin [DT]	SSEPD
Emsile Law [EL]	SSE
Helen Fosberry [HF]	E.on
John Lawton [JL]	ENWL
Kerren Kelly [KK]	Npower
Kevin Woollard [KW]	British Gas
Maria Hesketh [MH]	Scottish Power
Paul Saker [PS]	EDF Energy
Rosalind Timperley [RT] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink Limited

Apologies	Company
Rory McCarthy [RM]	Ofgem
Chris Allanson [CA]	Northern Powergrid

1 ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 All attendees agreed to the terms set out in the "Competition Law Do's and Don'ts" document.
- 1.2 The Working Group approved the minutes for the previous meeting with no amendments.
- 1.3 The Working Group reviewed the actions log. Updates on all actions are provided in Appendix 1.

2 REVIEW OF WPD PROPOSED LEGAL TEXT

- 2.1 The Working Group considered the proposed legal text prepared by WPD and the accompanying comments. The group discussed comments and responded to each in turn; these responses are provided as Attachment 1. ElectraLink took an action to feedback to WPD on the Working Group's response.

Action 18/01: ElectraLink

- 2.2 The group noted that the legal text proposed by WPD is a significant deviation from the current DCP 204 legal text and would require a further industry consultation were it to be progressed. It was also highlighted that Ofgem had sent DCP 204 back to the Working Group asking for additional justification for the change, not because there were fundamental concerns with the legal text.

- 2.3 It was observed that the majority of Working Group members and consultation respondents were comfortable with the existing legal text. The Working Group agreed to progress the current version of the DCP 204 legal text rather than the WPD proposed version.

3 REVIEW OF CHANGE REPORT

- 3.1 The Working Group walked through the latest version of the DCP 204 Change Report and agreed amendments to it. The latest version of the Change Report, with the amendments agreed at the meeting shown as tracked changes, is provided as Attachment 2.
- 3.2 ElectraLink took an action to correct the paragraph numbering in the document and add in WPD's comments and the Working Group's response.

Action 18/02: ElectraLink

4 WORK PLAN

- 4.1 The next steps for the progression of DCP 204 were agreed as follows:
- ElectraLink to update Change Report and circulate to Working Group members by 27 November 2015;
 - Working Group to review Change Report by 7 December 2015; and
 - Change Report to be submitted to the December 2015 DCUSA Panel meeting.

5 NEXT MEETING

- 5.1 No further meetings of the Working Group are scheduled.

LIST ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1 – Response to WPD comments
- Attachment 2 – Change Report

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

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
14/01	DNO Working Group members that operate load managed areas to provide an estimated value for avoided network reinforcement costs for inclusion in the DCP 204 Change Report	DNOs	Ongoing – DB to write to the DNOs with LMAs requesting information. DB has discussed with WPD.
18/01	ElectraLink took an action to feedback to WPD on the Working Group's response to its legal text concerns.	ElectraLink	
18/02	Update the DCP 204 Change Report	ElectraLink	

ACTIONS CLOSED AT THE MEETING

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
14/02	Discuss internally the costs and benefits of DCP 204 and whether you can quantify them.	All	Closed
14/03	Ask National Grid if they are able to identify any benefits that they would receive from the implementation of DCP 204 and assign a financial value to these benefit.	ElectraLink	Ongoing - National Grid have provided the following initial response. They have been asked to provide additional detail on the benefits: As DCP 204 is essentially replicating existing functionality in the new technologies, it is not clear to

			<p>say that National Grid are benefiting but rather more accurate to say that potentially new risks and costs are being mitigated against in advance.</p> <p>The value of these costs can be seen as any potential fine from Ofgem in breaching the code and costs of services to deal with spikes in demand. However, I would rather that the benefit is seen as a mitigation of potential risks of cut-offs to supply which should be what Ofgem is really worried about. Perhaps we could give Ofgem some of the examples of load amounts that could be tripped from a single switch and we can convert that into # of houses?</p> <p>7/09/15: Electralink to chase up response and ask if National Grid could make a statement that the 600 seconds is appropriate, as Ofgem have asked for justification that this value is appropriate.</p> <p>22/10/2015: National Grid has been sent an email regarding the 600 seconds in accordance with action 17/04.</p> <p>Closed</p>
17/01	Ask WPD to prepare suggested legal text that addresses the concerns that they have raised in their consultation response.	ElectraLink	<p>19/11/2015: suggested legal text has been provided by WPD</p> <p>Closed</p>
17/02	Working Group members to confirm whether they would be comfortable with a 1 September 2016 implementation date.	All	Closed

17/03	Seek clarification from Scottish Power Energy Retail Limited regarding their response to consultation question 5.	ElectraLink	19/11/2015: Party response: “Although we understand the rationale for the proposed change, we rather think it represents a blurring of the lines between Supplier and Network Operator responsibilities.”
17/04	Contact National Grid to confirm if their whether their feedback on setting the randomisation period at 600s relates to all customers or just customers in Load Managed Areas.	ElectraLink	19/11/2015: NG response: “As Load Managed Areas would appear to be a designation determined by the DNOs and to not be uniform across all DNO areas then from a GBSO point of view I don’t think that this is enough and the requirements for randomisation would need to be across all areas. The rationale for this is essentially the same as previously stated – if randomisation only applied within LMAs then the effectiveness of this would need considerably more work to determine whether it achieved randomisation to the correct extent.” Capture in Change Report
17/05	Update the Change Report to include the consultation responses and Working Group’s comments on these responses. It should also include National Grid’s feedback on setting the randomisation period at 600 second.	ElectraLink	Complete