

DCP 203 Working Group Minutes

Meeting Name	DCP 203 Working Group
Meeting Number	13
Date	07 December 2015
Time	10:00
Venue	Web- Conference

Attendee	Company
Neil Fitzsimons [NF] (Chair)	GTC
Donna Townsend [DT] (teleconference)	ESP Electricity
Lesley Ferrando [LF] (teleconference)	Ofgem
Michael Walls [MW] (teleconference)	ESP Electricity
Nigel Birchley [NB]	Power Data Associates
Claire Hynes [CH] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink

Apologies	Company
Andrew Enzor	Northern Powergrid
Chris Ong	UK Power Networks
Peter Waymont	UK Power Networks

1 ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 The minutes of the last meeting were agreed without amendment.
- 1.2 The Working Group reviewed the actions from the previous meeting. A summary of new and outstanding actions is attached as Appendix A.
- 1.3 The Working Group agreed to abide by the Competition Laws Do's and Don'ts for the duration of the meeting.

2 REVIEW OF THE DCP 203 DRAFT CHANGE REPORT

- 2.1 The Working Group reviewed and addressed the comments provided by Andrew Enzor and Peter Waymont on the DCP 203 draft change report which acts as Attachment 1.
- 2.2 DT agreed to:
 - check that the references to EDNO and LDNO were correct throughout the report ;
 - review the wording at 6.12 page 9 of the report:

"The Working Group disagreed with this response as the adoption of networks is solely based on EDNO connections and not on Suppliers. Given the relative value of the UMS connections versus domestic connections the EDNO is unlikely to take this in to consideration for UMS connections" ; and

- check the Elexon BSC¹ CP1414 'Combining LDSO and Embedded LDSOs UMS Inventories on to single LDSO MSID' responses to see if the responses supported the rationale for this change at paragraph 2.6 of the change report.

ACTION 13/01: DT

- 2.3 The Working Group discussed the point at paragraph 2.14 from a member who advised that:

"I disagree with this statement from a DNO perspective – at present IDNO UMS billing is effectively cost neutral as additional lines in the D0314 have little impact; this new solution will require agreement between LDNO and DNO outside of the usual process so could be argued to add admin cost"

- 2.4 The Working Group considered that this comment was based on a misinterpretation and disputed the suggestion that this change introduced additional charges. There needs to be an agreement between the IDNO and DNO but it only depends if you want to challenge the IDNO tariff picked. The majority of customers connected to the network level is the default level. The DNO could choose to audit the D0314 as the tariff and number of MPANs in the dataflow would enable them to see how many connections were MV or LV and why an IDNO chose a certain network level. NF agreed to provide the Working Group response to Andrew Enzor via e-mail.

ACTION 13/02: NF

- 2.5 NF agreed to:

- Add further detail on the names of the tables in Section 9 and describe what is in each of the IDNO tabs in Attachment 7 Impact Assessment excel spreadsheet; and
- Reference Ofgem's decision on the code of practice in relation to competition in connections in the change report.

ACTION 13/03: NF

- 2.6 The Working Group agreed to recommend to the DCUSA Panel that a summary of the outcome of the consultation should be provided in the report rather than a summary of the consultation responses. The consultation responses and the Working Group's comments reflect a certain point in time. By changing the tense of the verbs one may inadvertently change the spirit of the response.

ACTION 13/04: ELECTRALINK**3 NEXT STEPS**

- 3.1 The DCP 203 Working Group agreed the next steps as follows:

- The updated DCP 203 change report to be circulated to the Working Group for their final review by 12:00 on the 09 December 2015. If no substantive or material comments are made the report will be submitted to the DCUSA Panel on the 09 December 2015.

ACTION 13/05: ELECTRALINK, NF & DT**4 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- 4.1 There were no items of any other business.

¹ Balancing and Settlement Code

5 NEXT MEETING

5.1 There are no further scheduled meetings for this CP.

6 ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1 – DCP 203 Draft Change Report Red-lined with Working Group Comments

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

NEW AND OPEN ACTIONS

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
13/01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • check that the references to EDNO and LDNO were correct throughout the report ; • review the wording at 6.12 page 9 of the report: “The Working Group disagreed with this response as the adoption of networks is solely based on EDNO connections and not on Suppliers. Given the relative value of the UMS connections versus domestic connections the EDNO is unlikely to take this in to consideration for UMS connections” ; and • check the Elexon BSC² CP1414 ‘Combining LDSO and Embedded LDSOs UMS Inventories on to single LDSO MSID’ responses to see if the responses supported the rationale for this change at paragraph 2.6 of the change report. 	Donna Townsend	
13/02	Provide a Working Group response to Andrew Enzor’s comment that “this new solution will require	Neil Fitzsimons	

² Balancing and Settlement Code

	agreement between LDNO and DNO outside of the usual process so could be argued to add admin cost”.		
13/03	<p>NF agreed to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add further detail on the names of the tables in Section 9 and describe what is in each of the IDNO tabs in Attachment 7 Impact Assessment excel spreadsheet; and • Reference Ofgems decision on the code of practice in relation to competition in connections in the change report. 	Neil Fitzsimons	07 December 2015
13/04	Recommend to the DCUSA Panel that a summary of the outcome of the consultation should be provided in the report rather than a summary of the consultation responses.	ElectraLink	16 December 2015
13/05	The updated DCP 203 change report to be circulated to the Working Group for their final review by 12:00 on the 09 December 2015.	ElectraLink	07 December 2015

CLOSED ACTIONS

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
10/01	NF and DT agreed to include a section within the Change Report to demonstrate that the impact on cost reflectivity has been considered.	DT and NF	Completed

10/02	The Working Group agreed to email SSE for further information regarding their response to Question 1 of the consultation. In particular, what about the analysis that they perceived not to be robust.	ElectraLink	Completed. ElectraLink has sent a number of e-mails to this DNO respondent, but has not received a reply to date. The Working Group have taken the respondents silence on this subject as no further clarification being required on the change report.
10/03	The Working Group agreed to write back to WPD and ask if they could provide more clarification on what issues they perceive with the legal text as indicated within their response to Question 3 of the consultation; and to also offer a teleconference to address the issues to go forward.	ElectraLink	Completed. ElectraLink has sent a number of e-mails to this DNO respondent, but has not received a reply to date. The Working Group have taken the respondents silence on this subject as no further clarification being required on the change report.