

# DCP 172 Working Group Minutes

<b>Meeting Name</b>	DCP 172 Working Group
<b>Meeting Number</b>	07
<b>Date</b>	20 February 2015
<b>Time</b>	10:00
<b>Venue</b>	Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Neil Magrath [NM] (Chair)	UK Power Networks
Andrew Scott [AS] (teleconference)	Scottish Power
Arun Pontin [AP] (teleconference)	Ofgem
Claire Hynes [CH] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink

Apologies	Company
Angus Rae	SSE
Michael Catling	Northern Powergrid

## 1 ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 The minutes of the last meeting were approved with minor amendments.
- 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 DCP 172 SOLUTION OPTIONS AND DRAFT LEGAL TEXT

- 2.1 The Working Group reviewed the DCP 172 solution options and the support provided by industry Parties for each of the solutions and concluded that Option 1 received the support of the majority of Parties.
- 2.2 The Working Group were concerned that the industry had been divided on their support for the solutions to DCP 172 and considered the strength of the modification to provide a new methodology (where all DNOs use the voltage rise method) with new defined terms without considerable support from industry parties.
- 2.3 Members noted that since the DCP 172 legal text was drafted that the New Network Capacity Definition had been changed by DCP 162 "*Non-Secure Connections in the Common Connections Charging Methodology*" Change Proposal (CP) when it was implemented in to the DCUSA on the 06 November 2014. The Working Group agreed for the DCP 172 legal text change to be updated against the current DCUSA legal text.

### ACTION 07/01: ELECTRALINK

- 2.4 AP raised a concern that there had not been a sufficient response to the consultation from the Distributed Generation (DG) community on a change that would have a direct impact on them. The Working Group noted that the DCP 172 consultation was issued to the National Terms of Connection, DCMF and DCUSA Parties distribution lists. This consultation was also shared with the Connection Charging Methodology Forum (CCMF) and all respondents were

provided with a four week period to respond. AP advised that without the engagement of the DG community it would be difficult for Ofgem to make a decision.

- 2.5 The Working Group agreed to determine if the consultation had been issued to a sufficient number of DG industry parties before deciding whether to draft a second consultation.

**ACTION 07/02: ELECTRALINK**

- 2.6 NM agreed to 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.

**ACTION 07/03: NM**

- 2.7 The Working Group agreed to draft a change report if it was determined that a second consultation was not required.

**ACTION 07/04: ELECTRALINK & NM**

- 2.8 AP requested that once the Working Group had agreed their preferred solution that the change report should include:

- 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.

**ACTION 07/05: ALL**

- 2.9 The Working Group considered that Option 1 as a solution is simple, supports existing practice, is consistent with the rest of the methodology, can be precisely calculated and consistently applied and can be site specifically applied.

- 2.10 The Working Group considered that due to the simplicity of the application of Option 1 that instead of four Examples only one Example would need to be added to the Common Connection Charging Methodology (CCCM).

### **3 NEXT STEPS**

---

- 3.1 The DCP 172 Working Group agreed that the next steps were as follows:

- determine if the consultation had been issued to a sufficient number of DG industry parties before deciding whether to draft a second consultation;
- 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;
- draft consultation two if there has been determined to be insufficient engagement with the DG community under consultation one; or
- draft the change report if there has been determined to be sufficient engagement with the DG community under consultation one.

### **4 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

---

4.1 There were no items of any other business.

**5 NEXT MEETING**

---

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

**APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF ACTIONS**

**NEW AND OPEN ACTIONS**

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	
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	
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	
07/04	Draft a change report if it is determined that a second consultation is required or not required.	ElectraLink & Neil Magrath	
07/05	<p>Include in the change report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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);</li> <li>Consider whether the solution could be interpreted inconsistently despite its insertion in to a common methodology; and</li> </ul>	All	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revisit the comments provided by AP in his e-mail of the 19 February 2015 when drafting the DCP 172 change report.</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--

**ACTIONS AGREED CLOSED AT THE MEETING**

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
06/01	GP agreed to consider raising a further solution to this CP and provide his decision to the Working Group by 25 November 2014.	Graham Pannell	Closed. Members noted that GP made a decision to not raise an alternate CP to the DCP 172 CP.