

DCP 371 Working Group Meeting 02

24 August 2020 at 10am
Teleconference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Alison Beard	Gemserv
Chris Allanson	Northern PowerGrid
Bob Hopkins	SSE
Bradley Baker	Gemserv
Terry Carr	EON Energy
David Sykes	
Derek Weaving	British Gas
Emslie Law	SSE
Francesca Barrick	Ofgem
Heather Ward	Energy Assets
Jon Prime	AMP Energy
James Nixon	Scottish Power
Joseph Cosier	Energy UK
Kit Fitton	Bulb Energy
Lisa Waters	Waters Wye Associates
Lorna Mallon	Scottish Power
Paul Bedford	DRAX Energy
Paul Farmer	Shell Energy
Paul Saker	EDF Energy
Peter Dennis	Ecotricity

Rajni Nair	Citizens Advice
Richard Brady	
Michael Iain	
Rustam Majainah	
Phil Whittaker	
Jas Rayatt	Match Energy
Symon Gray	Energy Assets
Code Administrator	
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
George Dawson [GD] (Technical Secretary)	ElectraLink

Apologies	Company
Alessandra De Zottis	Sembcorp
Claire Addison	Flexitricity
Richard Hartshorn	SSE

1. Administration

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the members to the meeting and noted the three apologies.
- 1.2 The Working Group reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance”. All Working Group members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was to continue with the scoping exercise initially started in the first Working Group meeting.

3. Review of SECMP0046 ‘Allow DNOs to control Electric Load connected to Smart Meter infrastructure’ Presentation

- 3.1 The SEC representatives, BB and AB, presented a presentation to the Working Group members detailing six solutions that were considered at the SEC meetings. This presentation can be found in Attachment 2.

- 3.2 A member queried whether Solution 3 was raised in the previous SEC meetings, as it was not in the Consultation published afterwards. It was noted that the alternate solutions were not in the Consultation document as they were rejected within the meeting. A few members were keen to have more information about the potential alternate avenues and would like further debate on this.
- 3.3 There was a debate regarding the 30 second reporting time needed for option 3. It was noted the DCC has two target response times, one which is 30 seconds and the other is 24 hours. 30 seconds was deemed the most appropriate.
- 3.4 Some members were keen to see the consultation documentation regarding the current SEC solution and details of this can be found in Attachment 3. This document contains the full non-confidential collated responses received to the SECMP0046 Refinement Consultation.
- 3.5 A member queried whether a joint Working Group could be held between the SEC and DCUSA to fully resolve the outstanding concerns some members have regarding what other solutions were considered in the SEC Working Group. AB took an action to establish a date for a joint Working Group.

Action 02/01: AB to schedule a date for a joint SEC and DCUSA Working Group.

4. Review of Working Group Considerations and Actions Log

GC147 (Last resort disconnection of Embedded Generation)

- 4.1 At the last meeting it was noted that the DCP 371 Working Group should consider the impact of [GC147 \(Last resort disconnection of Embedded Generation\)](#) and its decisions regarding any compensation scheme. This modification seeks to clarify the enduring arrangements for emergency instructions that the ESO can issue to Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) to disconnect embedded generators, as a last resort in an emergency situation and after having exhausted all other commercially available options. The first meeting of the GC147 Working Group is yet to take place.
- 4.2 It was noted that the current DCP 371 proposal does not propose to compensate customers. Some members on the Working Group believe that customers should be compensated. After discussions it was agreed that there should be a question posed in an industry consultation asking that if a party believes that compensation is appropriate, what are their reasons for this and why do they believe it is needed.
- 4.3 It was noted that the consultation should seek feedback on how parties believe compensation should be provided (i.e. should it be deducted from their DUoS, should it be a payment per event, should it be an annual payment).
- 4.4 It was noted that if the Working Group were unable to reach a unanimous decision on compensation, a DCUSA Party could submit an alternative CP (i.e. DCP 371a). Therefore, this could mean two sets of governance arrangements being proposed, one with compensation and one without.

Clean Energy Package

- 4.5 It was noted that the Clean Energy Package will mean some changes to Distributor Licence conditions, which may include last resort measures in emergency situations if flexibility fails. BH took an action to provide further details on any potential licence condition change as when further details can be shared.

Action 02/02: BH to provide ongoing updates on associated Clean Energy Package Distributor Licence condition changes when available.

Definition of last resort

- 4.6 BH mentioned that ENA Open Networks have produced a document called [“Flexibility Market Principles”](#). Within this document they define an Emergency Scenario as “denote conditions when normal operating arrangements are suspended. Emergency Conditions might arise where the condition of an energy system poses an immediate threat of injury or damage, or during a natural disaster or other emergency, or there is an actual or threatened emergency affecting energy supplies”.
- 4.7 Emergency Conditions is defined as “Emergency Conditions denote conditions when normal operating arrangements are suspended. Emergency Conditions might arise where the condition of an energy system poses an immediate threat of injury or damage, or during a natural disaster or other emergency, or there is an actual or threatened emergency affecting energy supplies”. This definition was found in the [Open Networks Project Terms and Definitions document](#).
- 4.8 After discussion, it was agreed that to be able to define “Last Resort” the Working Group needs to establish the timeline up to the point of a Distributor using the last resort solution. For example, appointing a flexibility provider should always be the first choice. Should this flexibility fail, the Distributor would immediately run another flexibility provider tender and only when this process fails would the last resort measure be used.
- 4.9 It was noted that the Distributor would only be contacting customers regarding use of this solution when there was an outage on the feeder caused by flexibility failure.
- 4.10 It was agreed that a roadmap of the process leading up to the use of this last resort solution is needed. This roadmap will identify each stage of the process starting from when a Distributor recognises an area of the network that may have constraints in the future. BH took an action to produce a first draft of the roadmap and this will be used to establish everything that should happen before this last resort measure should be used by a Distributor. The roadmap should also include what should happen post a last resort scenario, for example, appropriate reporting and actions to eliminate further use of the last resort solution in the future.
- 4.11 BH provided some initial thoughts on the governance arrangements which can be found in Attachment 4. Working Group members are encouraged to provide feedback on this so that it can be fed into the roadmap.

Action 02/03: BH to produce a roadmap detailing the timeline of events that should happen before this last resort measure would be used.

Assessment of Customer Impact

- 4.12 BH shared a document called “Assessment of Customer Impact of Last Resort Arrangements for Distributors to Manage Specific Consumer Connected Devices” and this can be found in Attachment 5. It was noted that these predictions are based on no actions being taking. Members were keen to see modelling based on preventative action such as time of use tariffs and flexibility providers.

- 4.13 A further document was shared with the Working Group detailing base cost for speed of uptake, based on 10% of overloaded networks. This document can be found in Attachment 6.
- 4.14 Also attached to these minutes for consideration is a document detailing base cost for market failure based on 7% failure rate. This document can be found in Attachment 7.
- 4.15 Members are encouraged to provide feedback regarding these shared documents.

Action 02/04: Members to provide feedback on the customer impact assessment and CBA documents.

Customer interaction, vulnerable customers and opt in/ opt out

- 4.16 It was acknowledged that consideration is needed as to the communications with customers. How will the Distributor establish vulnerable customers and how will these be dealt with? How will the customer be able to opt in/ opt out? These processes will need to be detailed in the roadmap.

5. Agenda Items for the Next Meeting

- 5.1 At the next meeting, the Working Group will review the draft roadmap and further expand on the timeline of events, as necessary. Consideration of consultation material and questions at each stage will be required.

6. Any Other Business

- 6.1 There were no further items of AOB, and the Chair closed the meeting.

7. Date of Next Meeting

- 7.1 A meeting invite will be sent out after the date of the joint SEC and DCUSA Working Group has been established.

New and Open Actions

Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
02/01	AB to schedule a date for a joint SEC and DCUSA Working Group.	ElectraLink	Date to be established and communicated by Monday, 8 th September.
02/02	BH to provide ongoing updates on associated Clean Energy Package Distributor Licence condition changes when available.	BH	
02/03	BH to produce a roadmap detailing the timeline of events that should happen before this last resort measure would be used.	BH	
02/04	Members to provide feedback on the customer impact assessment and CBA documents.	All	