

DCP 172 Working Group Minutes

Meeting Name	DCP 172 Working Group
Meeting Number	08
Date	22 September 2015
Time	10:00
Venue	Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Neil Magrath [NM] (Chair)	UK Power Networks
Angus Rae [AR]	SSE Power Distribution
Michael Catling [MC]	Northern Powergrid
Stephen Peacock [SP]	Scottish Power
Amy Freund [AF]	Ofgem
Claire Hynes [CH] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink

Apologies	Company
Tim Hughes	Western Power Distribution

1 ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 The minutes of the last meeting were approved without amendment.
- 1.2 The group reviewed the open actions. Updates on all actions are set out in Appendix A.
- 1.3 The Working Group agreed to act in accordance with the Competition Laws Do's and Don'ts for the duration of the meeting.

2 REVIEW OF THE RESPONSES TO THE RE-ISSUED DCP 172 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 2.1 The Working Group reviewed the re-issued DCP 172 consultation one responses. The Working Group's comments on these responses act as Attachment 1.
- 2.2 On review of the original DCP 172 consultation one responses, the Working Group noted that two respondents supported Option 1 and one respondent supported both Option 1 and 4. At a subsequent meeting two other DNO respondents advised that they also supported Option 1. AR noted that if Option 2 was not progressed then their second preference would be for Option 1 to be progressed. The Working Group agreed to add a table to the report displaying Parties support for the Options following discussion of the consultation responses.

ACTION 08/01: ELECTRALINK

- 2.3 It was noted during the course of the meeting that:
 - Option 1 takes account of the actual limiting factor for New Network capacity.
 - Option 1 avoids use of arbitrary thresholds.
 - some of the other Options may provide gaming opportunities if a solution was progressed that introduced definitions that were open to interpretation.

3 REVIEW OF THE DCP 172 DRAFT CHANGE REPORT

- 3.1 The Working Group reviewed the draft change report. The updated draft change report acts as Attachment 2.
- 3.2 The Working Group reviewed Angus Pontin's e-mail of the 19 February 2015 and debated whether the costs referred to in the bullet point below were costs or charges.
- "Generally is important that there is sufficient evidence and justification for us to make a decision, particularly the cost implications in this case. The current options have track changes where they change the examples of the charging statement. Having the cost implications made clear will assist us in considering the proposal that comes to the authority".
- 3.3 The Working Group interpreted the point as requesting the provision of information on changes to customer charges from the proposed DCP 172 solution in the change report. Members noted that a change in customer charges would depend on the current position of the DNO. UKPN currently takes a thermal methodology position which would provide a customer with a lower charge than a voltage rise connection. The Working Group agreed for the DCP 172 consultation one and the reissued consultation responses on question 15 to be collated in to a table. On review of these responses and the Working Groups internal enquiries, members will determine whether they can provide an overall estimate on the costs in the change report and useful supporting information.

ACTION 08/02: ALL

- 3.4 The Working Group agreed to retain the three Examples in Option 1 and for the draft legal text to be issued to Parties to provide comments on by the end of the day. If no material comments are received the secretariat will issue the draft legal text to the DCUSA legal advisor for review.

ACTION 08/03: ALL

- 3.5 AF requested that the Working Group provide an idea of the proportion of volumes of connections that fall in to the application of the Option 1 Examples where the DNOs carry out reinforcement to solve a voltage rise situation. The Working Group agreed to look at an estimate of the number of DG jobs which may fall in to each Example category. It was noted that these may need to be broken down by each voltage category.

ACTION 08/04: ALL

- 3.6 NM agreed to draft wording on gaming opportunities if either Solution 3 or Solution 4 was progressed for insertion in to the change report.

ACTION 08/05: NM

4 NEXT STEPS

- 4.1 The DCP 172 Working Group agreed that the next steps were as follows:
- Issue the Option 1 draft legal text to the Working Group for a final review before submitting it to the DCUSA legal advisor;
 - The secretariat and NM to update the draft DCP 172 change report and circulate to the Working Group for a final review;
 - Submit the change report to the DCUSA Panel on the 14 October 2015.

5 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

5.1 There were no items of any other business.

6 NEXT MEETING

6.1 The next DCP 172 Working Group meeting will be organised as required by the development of the change.

7 ATTACHMENT

- Attachment 1 –DCP 172 Draft Change Report

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

NEW AND OPEN ACTIONS

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
07/03	Draft a note on the rationale for the support of Option 1 as the solution to the DCP 172 change and circulate to the Working Group for agreement for a period of one week.	Neil Magrath	
07/05	<p>Include in the change report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of the cost of the option in the main body of the change report. The calculations behind the proposed solution taking in to consideration any differences on how the cost would be apportioned from current practice and where there is a difference which practice is used (voltage rise or voltage drop); Consider whether the solution could be interpreted inconsistently despite its insertion in to a common methodology; and Revisit the comments provided by AP in his e-mail of the 19 February 2015 when drafting the DCP 172 change report. 	All	
08/01	Add a table to the report displaying Parties support for the Options following discussion of the consultation responses	ElectraLink	
08/02	Provide an overall estimate of changes to the	All	

	customers costs to connect if the proposed voltage rise solution is used in the change report and useful supporting information.		
08/03	Working Group to review the Option 1 draft legal text by the end of the day. If no material comments are received the secretariat will issue the draft legal text to the DCUSA legal advisor for review.	All	
08/04	The proportion of volumes of connections that fall in to the application of the Option 1 Examples where the DNOs carry out reinforcement to solve a voltage rise situation.	All	
08/05	Draft wording on gaming opportunities if either Solution 3 or Solution 4 was progressed for insertion in to the change report.	NM	

ACTIONS AGREED CLOSED AT THE MEETING

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
07/01	Red-Line the DCP 172 proposed change against the updated DCUSA legal text since the implementation of the DCP 162 CP.	ElectraLink	Completed. The draft legal text was updated and included in the re-issued DCP 172 consultation.
07/02	Determine if the consultation had been issued to a sufficient number of DG industry parties before deciding whether to draft a second consultation.	ElectraLink	Completed.
07/04	Draft a change report if it is determined that a second consultation is required or not required.	ElectraLink & Neil Magrath	Completed. The Working Group reviewed a first draft of the change report at this meeting.