

# Minutes

---

<b>Meeting Name</b>	167 Working Group
<b>Meeting Number</b>	05
<b>Date</b>	19 November 2013
<b>Time</b>	10:00am
<b>Location</b>	ElectraLink Ltd, Ground Floor, Grafton House, 2-3 Golden Square, London, W1F 9HR.

---

<b>Attendee</b>	<b>Representing / Company</b>
Neil Magrath (NM) Chair)	UK Power Networks
Angus Rae (AR) (teleconference)	SSE
Bob Weaver (BW) (teleconference)	PowerCon (UK) LTD
David Ball (DB)	ENWL
Deborah MacPherson	SP Manweb & SP Distribution
Peter Turner (PT)	Northern Powergrid
Mike Smith (MS) (part meeting)	Western Power Distribution
Tim Hughes (TH) (part meeting) (teleconference)	Western Power Distribution
Tim Russell (TR) (teleconference)	Renewable Energy Association
Giulia Buttini (GB) (part meeting)	Ofgem
Claire Hynes (CH) (Secretary)	ElectraLink Limited

## **1 ADMINISTRATION**

1.1 There were no apologies received for this meeting.

## **2 04 MEETING MINUTES**

2.1 The minutes of the last meeting were agreed without amendment.

## **3 OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

3.1 The Working Group reviewed the actions from the previous meeting.

3.2 A summary of new and outstanding actions is attached as Appendix A.

#### 4 WORKING GROUP REVIEW OF THE DCP 167 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 4.1 The Working Group reviewed the DCP 167 consultation responses. The consultation responses and the Working Group's comments are provided as attachment 1 to these minutes.
- 4.2 The Working Group discussed PowerCon (UK) Limited's response to question two and agreed to a difference in opinion. The majority of the Working Group considered that proposed Example 8D represented a reconfiguration of the network under which the costs would be fully chargeable to the customer. Other Working Group members considered that the load transfer from one network to another caused an increase in capacity at primary substation A. This capacity would provide for a new connection at the base of the diagram where the customer wished to connect and the cost of this work should be cost apportioned. As a result of this discussion the Customer members agreed to raise an alternate Change Proposal.

#### **ACTION 05/01: BW &TR**

- 4.3 The Working Group discussed Peel Port Limited's response to question three which made reference to point 2.5 of the consultation: *"Under associated DCP162<sup>1</sup> it is proposed to change the definition of Relevant Section of Network to remove the "used to supply you" condition"*. The respondent advised that DCP 167 should not be dependent on another change being progressed as the change may not be accepted by the Authority. The Working Group agreed that the DCP 167 change could be implemented without the DCP 162 change to the Relevant Section of Network definition. Although the Working Group would prefer that the DCP 162 change was implemented to ensure consistency across the Common Connection Charging Methodology (CCCM).
- 4.4 The Working Group discussed the Peel Port Limited's proposed text to replace the definition of Relevant Section of Network in the table after clause 1.24. The Working Group noted that following Peel Port Limited's response to the DCP 162 consultation, the definition of the Relevant Section of Network was modified by the Working Group to better accommodate remote reinforcement. The group agreed that the modified text fulfils its purpose and now does not need to be modified to the proposed text from the respondent.
- 4.5 The Working Group considered Peel Port Limited's response to question four which suggested some changes to the diagram in Example 8C to add further clarity. The Working Group agreed that these suggested changes to the diagram would be inconsistent with other diagrams in the Common Connection Charging Methodology. The group considered that the detail in the text below the diagram sufficiently described the Relevant Section of Network without the addition of further annotation.
- 4.6 The Working Group discussed the Renewable Energy Association's response to question four on the allocation of the cost of joints at A,B,C,D,E and F as reinforcement. Whilst the cost of the new circuit breaker at A and the cable A-F increases the capacity within primary substation B, the jointing in of the two substations being transferred from substation A does not add capacity. If Example 8C

---

<sup>1</sup> Non-Secure Connections in the Common Connections Charging Methodology

advises the cost of the jointing will be apportioned for their transfer from one network to another then the cost of the joints is being treated inconsistently in comparison with the load transfer in Example 8D.

- 4.7 The majority of the Working Group does not consider load transfer which adds capacity to one area of the network due to demand but takes capacity away from another area of the network as reinforcement as it has not holistically added capacity across the whole network. The Working Group agreed to disagree on the treatment of Example 8C and 8D and some members agreed to raise an alternate Change Proposal.
- 4.8 The Working Group discussed Peel Port Limited’s response to question eight. Peel Port Limited suggests that additional capacity to deliver power to the Point Of Connection (POC) has been created by constructing additional network assets. The Working Group point out that the capacity of a network at the POC is not changed by the removal of demand. One Working Group member considered that the methodology should recognise how capacity is effectively created by the transfer of an existing demand.
- 4.9 The Working Group thanked Mike Smith for his participation in the meeting as he had notified members that he is leaving his role at the end of this year and will not be participating in the DCUSA Working Groups going forward.
- 4.10 The Working Group agreed to draft the Change Report and circulate it to members for review.

**ACTION 05/02: ELECTRALINK & NM**

**5 NEXT STEPS**

ACTIVITY TIMELINE	
Draft Change Report review	Draft the Change Report and circulate to the Working Group for review. Present the DCP 167 Change Report to the December or January DCUSA Panel meeting.

**6 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- 6.1 There were no other business items at this meeting.

**7 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

- 7.1 The Working Group agreed to review the DCP 167 draft Change Report via e-mail and reconvene to discuss the DCP 167 draft Change Reports if required at a later date.

**8 ATTACHMENTS**

- Attachment 1: DCP 167 Consultation Collated Responses with Working Group Comments

**APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF ACTIONS****NEW AND OPEN ACTIONS**

<b>Action Ref.</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Update</b>
05/01	Raise an alternate Change Proposal	ElectraLink	Next meeting
05/02	Draft the Change Report and circulate it to the Working Group for review	ElectraLink & NM	Next meeting

**ACTIONS AGREED CLOSED AT THE MEETING**

<b>Action Ref.</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Update</b>
03/05	The secretariat agreed to issue the DCP 167 consultation to Parties.	ElectraLink	Closed
04/01	Ensure that the actions captured in the 03 meeting minutes were also captured in the revised DCP 167 meeting document.	ElectraLink & NM	Closed
04/02	Reference check be undertaken to check that the questions referenced the relevant paragraph in the consultation for the respondent to view.	ElectraLink	Closed
04/03	Update in the consultation document this' consultation rather than 'the' consultation and for DCUSA Schedule 22 to be placed in front of the clauses referenced in the consultation for clarity	ElectraLink	Closed
04/04	Circulate the updated consultation to the Working Group for 48hrs for approval before issuing the consultation to industry parties.	ElectraLink	Closed