

DCP 183 Working Group Minutes

Meeting Name	DCP 183 Working Group Meeting
Meeting Number	15
Date	21 April 2015
Time	14:00
Venue	Web-conference

Attendee	Company
Wendy Mantle [WM] (Chair)	SP Distribution
Chris Ong [CO]	UKPN
Keith Burwell [KB]	Ofgem
Richard Ellis [RE]	Western Power Distribution
Dave Wornell [DW]	Western Power Distribution
Donald Preston [DP]	SSEPD
Rosalind Timperley [RT] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink

Apologies	Company
Pat Wormald [PW]	Northern Powergrid

1 ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 The minutes of the last meeting were approved without amendment.
- 1.2 The Working Group reviewed the “Competition Law Dos and Don’ts”. All Working Group members agreed to the terms set out in the document.
- 1.3 The group reviewed the open actions. Updates on all actions are set out in Appendix A.

2 DISCUSSION ON REASONING BEHIND CURRENT EDCM APPROACH

- 2.1 It was noted that prior to the meeting, emails had been received from the developer of the EDCM model and a DCP 183 Working Group member regarding the reasoning behind the current EDCM approach (i.e. the use of KVA and KWh in the calculations). These emails are provided as Attachment 1. The group noted that the emails support the suggestion that there is logic to the approach originally developed in the EDCM.
- 2.2 It was observed that to proceed with DCP 183 may have an unintended consequence on those customers that are trying to help the network by load managing. Under the DCP 183 solution these customers may receive reactive power charges, which could reduce the incentives on them to load manage.
- 2.3 An attendee suggested that the group needs to consider whether the benefits gained from consistently using KVA in the EDCM calculations is greater or less than the dis-benefit that would come from penalising those that are load managing.
- 2.4 It was highlighted that DCP 183 had been raised because Ofgem had observed that the approach within the EDCM model was inconsistent and had asked that DNOs to look into this. KB explained that the Working Group has looked in to this area and could choose to feed back to Ofgem that the approach is inconsistent by deliberate intent, should they feel that this is the right way forward.

- 2.5 Attendees ask KB whether, as an Ofgem representative, he had any concerns regarding the level analysis that the group had carried out on the CP. In response, KB noted that the issue was been raised by Ofgem as a perceived anomaly. It is for the group to decide whether they wish to take the issue forward based on their assessment of it.
- 2.6 The group noted that they had met a number of times, consulted with industry and determined that the EDCM is doing what it is intended to be doing. Any change from the current approach may improve certain areas but would create issues in other areas.
- 2.7 All Working Group members agreed that they were happy for the CP to be withdrawn as the benefit of aligning the calculations is not great enough for the unintended consequences that may result from the change.
- 2.8 DW, as proposer of the CP, agreed to withdraw the CP. It was observed that once the CP has been withdrawn, DCUSA Parties will have two weeks to adopt the proposal should they wish for it to continue.

3 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 3.1 There were no items of any other business.

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

NEW AND OPEN ACTIONS

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
n/a			

ACTIONS AGREED CLOSED AT THE MEETING

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
14/01	Capture in the DCP 183 Change Report the reasoning for the Working Group's decision that the reactive power associated with an import MPAN should be excluded when a site is generation dominated.	ElectraLink	Closed
14/02	Contact the developer of the EDCM model to ask what the logic behind the current approach is	ElectraLink	Closed