

DCP 160 Working Group Minutes

Meeting Name	DCP 160 Working Group
Meeting Number	07
Date	07 May 2015
Time	10:00
Venue	Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
George Moran [GM] (Chair)	British Gas
Chris Ong [CO]	UK Power Networks
Claire Campbell [CC]	Scottish Power
Bethany Hanna [BH]	Ofgem
Dave Wornell [DW]	Western Power Distribution
Lili Zou [LZ]	SSE Power Distribution
Pat Wormald [PW]	Northern Powergrid
Claire Hynes [CH] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink

1 ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 There were no apologies received for this meeting.
- 1.2 The minutes of the last meeting were approved without amendment.
- 1.3 The group reviewed the open actions. Updates on all actions are set out in Appendix A.
- 1.4 The Working Group agreed to be bound by the Competition Laws Do's and Don'ts for the duration of the meeting.

2 REVIEW OF THE DCP 160 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 2.1 The Working Group reviewed the DCP 160 consultation collated responses and responded to parties comments in Attachment 1.
- 2.2 The Working Group noted that the majority of respondents to question 1 considered that the capacity requested but not utilised by Half Hourly (HH) Customers was reserved capacity and not notional spare capacity. Members highlighted the ENWL response which referred to the Distributors Licence requirement for the DNOs' to make reasonable endeavours to ensure Maximum Import Capacity (MIC)/ Maximum Export Capacity (MEC) is available to customers at their connection points at all times.
- 2.3 The Working Group noted the Northern Powergrid response which pointed out that DCP 115 'NTC Amendments - Capacity Management (Under Utilisation)' Change Proposal (CP) is looking at instances where customers are consistently utilising less than their agreed MIC/MEC and how Customers can be influenced to ensure that their capacity meets their requirements. The Working Group considered this response and questioned whether the DCP 115 change would inadvertently address the issue of notional of spare capacity.
- 2.4 The Working Group agreed to request clarification from ENWL on their response to question 2. One member noted that diversity is applied to all customers not just the unit rates on an equally diversified basis. It is only when you reach the local level that a different approach is taken on the standing charge for Non Half Hourly (NHH) customers.

ACTION 07/01: GM

- 2.5 The Working Group noted that the Customer can reduce or increase their agreed MIC/MEC through application to the DNO. Since the introduction of the shallow connection charging arrangements in 2005, a customer who has just connected to the network who requests for the DNO to amend the MIC/MEC may have to wait up to a maximum of 1 year to change it as the cost of the connection could be in the process of being re-couperated through the capacity charge.
- 2.6 The Working Group noted that there will always be an element of spare capacity on the network for security of supply for all customers. Genuine spare capacity on the network provides benefits to all those connected and allows for lower reinforcement costs and lower connection charges to those seeking a connection.
- 2.7 The Working Group noted that the industry has moved on since this change was originally raised with the introduction of DCP 179 'Amending the CDCM tariff structure' and P272 'Mandatory Half Hourly Settlement For Profile Classes 5-8' changes. Furthermore, the Working Group asked whether this change would add increased complexity if it is introduced.
- 2.8 Members noted that once further analysis on a solution for this CP had been undertaken that the solution did not better meet any of the DCUSA Charging Objectives as originally stated in its CP form.
- 2.9 The Working Group noted that this consultation had been based on requesting Parties views on the principles of the change and no clear answer had been provided. The Working Group considered that the majority of respondents considered the capacity referred to, to be reserved capacity and questioned whether Parties would prefer a change that was related to the Standing Charge Factors and whether it would fit within the intent of this CP.

3 NEXT STEPS

- 3.1 The DCP 160 Working Group agreed that the next steps were as follows:

- The Chair agreed to refine the Working Group response to the DCP 160 consultation collated responses.

ACTION:07/02: GM

- The proposer agreed to take account of the consultation responses and consider what the next steps for this CP should be internally before providing guidance to the Working Group.

ACTION:07/03: CO**4 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- 4.1 There were no items of any other business.

5 NEXT MEETING

- 5.1 The next DCP 160 Working Group meeting will be scheduled as required.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1 – DCP 160 Consultation Collated Comments with Working Group Responses

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

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
07/01	Request clarification from ENWL on their response to question 2.	George Moran	
07/02	Refine the Working Group response to the DCP 160 consultation collated responses.	George Moran	
07/03	Take account of the consultation responses and consider what the next steps for this CP should be internally before providing guidance to the Working Group.	Chirs Ong	

ACTIONS AGREED CLOSED AT THE MEETING

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
05/04	Issue the consultation on the 25 March with a closing date of the 17 April 2015.	ElectraLink	Completed.
06/01	Correct the DCP 160 draft consultations formatting.	ElectraLink	Completed.
06/02	Circulate a clean version of the DCP 160 draft consultation to the Working Group for comment by the 24 March 2015.	All	Completed.