

DCP 172 Working Group Minutes

Meeting Name	DCP 172 Working Group
Meeting Number	09
Date	09 February 2016
Time	2pm
Venue	Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Neil Magrath [NM] (Chair)	UK Power Networks
Amy Freund [AF]	Ofgem
Angus Rae [AR]	SSE Power Distribution
Michael Catling [MC]	Northern Powergrid
Tim Hughes [TH]	Western Power Distribution
Wendy Mantle [WM]	Scottish Power
Claire Hynes [CH] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink

Apologies	Company
Stephen Peacock	Scottish Power

1 ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 The minutes of the last meeting were approved with a minor amendment. The group reviewed the open actions. Updates on all actions are set out in Appendix A.
- 1.2 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 DCP 172 REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

- 2.1 The Working Group reviewed the DNO responses to the DCP 172 Request for Information (RfI) as set out in Attachment 1. The RfI asked DNO Working Group members to provide an estimate of the number of DG quotations issued within a recent 12 month period which provide for reinforcement being required to keep voltage rise within acceptable limits, and by voltage level if this is available.
- 2.2 The Chair advised that in order to provide a gauge of the number of the connections that would be impacted by this change on an annual basis he had totalled the EHV, LV and HV figures received and used this figure to work out by pro rata an estimate for all DNO areas. This provided an estimate of approximately 600 connections a year out of 300,000 connections that would be impacted by DCP 172 or in other words 0.2% of connections.
- 2.3 AF asked the Working Group if it would be possible to provide the 600 connections a year in the context of the proportion of the number of annual DG connections. The Working Group considered that gathering this information would again delay the submission of the change report which had been developed over almost 3 years. Members advised that the number of annual DG connections could be found in eachs DNOs Ofgem returns if Ofgem wished to reference it in their Authority decision.

3 REVIEW OF THE DCP 172 CHANGE REPORT

- 3.1 The Working Group reviewed the draft change report. The updated draft change report acts as Attachment 2.
- 3.2 AF highlighted that the request for the DCP 172 proposed solution to be compared with existing treatment of demand connections in the report had not been undertaken. NM agreed to draft wording to reflect that Option 1 provides equal treatment of voltage rise connections with the existing treatment of demand connections and circulate the updated change report to members.

ACTION 09/01: NM

- 3.3 The Working Group checked that the following points had been addressed in the change report:
- Clarity around cost implications.
 - context to the cost impacts of the proposal.
 - supporting interpretation of the data
 - draft a section in the report to consider the relevant issues raised in the earlier determination and how the options compare with existing treatment of demand connections.
- 3.4 The Working Group agreed to review the draft change report ex-committee following the completion of action 09/01.

ACTION 09/02: ALL

- 3.5 Members thanked the Chair for his hard work over the last three years on this change.

4 NEXT STEPS

- 4.1 The DCP 172 Working Group agreed that the next steps were as follows:
- Update the DCP 172 draft change report with wording to reflect that Option 1 provides equal treatment of voltage rise connections with the existing treatment of demand connections;
 - Review the draft change report ex-committee;
 - Submit the change report to the DCUSA Panel on the 10 February 2016.

5 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 5.1 There were no items of any other business.

6 NEXT MEETING

- 6.1 There are no further meetings scheduled for this change.

7 ATTACHMENT

- Attachment 1 - DCP 172 Request for Information (RfI) Responses
- Attachment 2 - DCP 172 Draft Change Report

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

NEW AND OPEN ACTIONS

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
09/01	Draft wording to reflect that Option 1 provides equal treatment of voltage rise connections with the existing treatment of demand connections	NM	
09/02	Review the draft change report ex-committee	All	

ACTIONS AGREED CLOSED AT THE MEETING

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	Completed.
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 	All	Completed.

	<p>to a common methodology; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revisit the comments provided by AP in his e-mail of the 19 February 2015 when drafting the DCP 172 change report. 		
08/01	Add a table to the report displaying Parties support for the Options following discussion of the consultation responses	ElectraLink	Completed.
08/02	Provide an overall estimate of changes to the customers costs to connect if the proposed voltage rise solution is used in the change report and useful supporting information.	All	Completed.
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	Completed.
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	Completed. NM updated the change report and the wording was approved by the Working Group at this meeting.
08/05	Draft wording on gaming opportunities if either Solution 3 or Solution 4 was progressed for insertion in to the change report.	NM	Completed.