DCUSA

DCP 328 Working Group Meeting 27

14 July 2021 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE plc
David Fewings [DF]	Inenco
Dave Wornell [DW]	WPD
Thomas Cadge [TC]	BUUK
Kara Burke [KB]	NPg
Donald Preston [DP]	SSEN
Shannon Murray [SM]	Ofgem
Julia Haughey [JH]	EDF Energy
Chris Ong [CO]	UKPN
Derek McGlashan [DM]	Forth Ports
Code Administrator	
Angelo Fitzhenry [AF] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Dylan Townsend [DT] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Tom Chevalier [TC]	Power Data Associates

1. Administration

1.1 The Secretariat noted the welcome and apologies for this meeting.

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.

1.3 The Working Group reviewed the minutes from the last meeting and agreed that the minutes were an accurate reflection of the discussions held.

1.4 The Working Group noted the items on the actions list from the last meeting. Updates on all actions are provided in Appendix A.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

2.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was to review the responses to the consultation that the Working Group had issued on 04 June 2021.

3. Review of collated consultation responses

3.1 It was noted that the Working Group developed and issued a consultation on 04 June 2021 seeking industry views on the solutions which they had developed for DCP 328. There were twelve respondents to the consultation, of which:

- six were from DNOs;
- two were from IDNOs;
- one from a Supplier;
- one from a generator;
- one from an innovator; and
- one from an energy consultancy firm.

3.2 It was noted that the document containing the collated consultation responses was provided to the Working Group prior to the meeting.

3.3 The Working Group discussed the probable scenario that they would need more than one meeting to complete a full review of all responses received. Members agreed that in light of some absences, it would be best come back to the responses to the first question and to start with responses to the second question. It was noted that the Working Group were able to review the responses to question 2 through to question 8 during the meeting. The collated consultation responses document including the Working Groups comments acts as Attachment 1 to the minutes.

3.4 During the review of the consultation responses the following key points were noted:

Question 2:

3.5 This question was seeking views on options presented in the consultation on metering data. Members noted that the majority (6) of respondents had preference for Option 1 and a minority (1) had preference for Option 2 and the remaining respondents either had no preference or did not

provide a response. The Working Group noted some themes across the responses, which indicated that respondents seemed to believe that Option 2 will require system changes for which the additional cost would be shared between the DNOs and that Option 1 would require work to be carried out by an entity whose role may not exist following Market Wide HH Settlement implementation.

3.6 The Working Group noted a concern with respect to Option 2, which had been raised by one respondent, who stated:

> *"As we have indicated in our response to question 1, there is no licence obligation on IDNOs to offer MPAS in respect of metering points not connected to their distribution system. Therefore, it would for IDNOs to choose if they wanted to offer such service. Offering such service would be dependent on IDNOs being able to recover their costs"*

Question 3:

3.7 This question was seeking to draw out any general comments related to the EDCM solution with respect to fully settled arrangements. The Working Group noted that views as to a preference for a particular solution would be picked up by a later question and that respondents comments could be drawn upon for the purposes of the Change Report.

Question 4:

3.8 This question was seeking to draw out any general comments related to the CDCM rebate solution with respect to fully settled arrangements. The Working Group noted that there were numerous comments which could be drawn upon for the purposes of the Change Report and that generally speaking, it seemed that there were a more concerns related to this option than there were supportive comments, although some supportive comments were also noted. As with responses to question 3, the Working Group noted that views as to a preference for a particular solution would be picked up by a later question.

Question 5:

3.9 This question was seeking to draw out any general comments related to the customers that export within a PNO Network and if there should be a negative rebate. The Working Group noted that generally speaking, it seemed that the majority of respondents were supported the approach of the Working Group as set out in the consultation, which was that negative rebates should not be applied.

Question 6:

3.10 This question was seeking to draw out views as to whether a rebate process should be added to Schedule 16 as well as any potential way in which the process could be improved. The Working Group noted the there was a mix of responses to this question and that a number of alternative suggestions had been provided. Therefore, the Working Group agreed to consider these suggestions further, if the rebate solution was to be progressed.

Question 7:

3.11 This question was seeking to draw out views as to whether the rebate should be billed annually. The Working Group noted the there seemed to be a general agreement amongst respondents that the rebate should be billed annually, if the rebate solution is taken forward.

Question 8:

3.12 This question was seeking to draw out any general comments related to the CDCM tariff solution with respect to fully settled arrangements. The Working Group noted that there were numerous comments which could be drawn upon for the purposes of the Change Report.

4. Next Steps and DCP 328 Work Plan

4.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps and reviewed the Work Plan and the following items were captured:

- The Working Group will need to meet again to continue reviewing the responses to the consultation;
- The Secretariat is to issue a doodle poll to members to confirm date which has best availability on which to hold the next meeting.

ACTION 27/01: Secretariat to issue a doodle poll to members to confirm date which has best availability on which to hold the next meeting.

5. Any Other Business

5.1 There were no other items raised.

6. Date of Next Meeting

6.1 The date of the next meeting will be confirmed via doodle poll.

7. Attachments

- Attachment 1: DCP 328 Collated Consultation Responses

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/01	ElectraLink to consider approaches to ensure appropriate engagement with private network operators.	ElectraLink	Ongoing and considered at each meeting or consultation circulation
25/02	SM to review whether there are any approved charging methodologies for Private Networks with fully settled metering.	SM	Ongoing
27/01	Secretariat to issue a doodle poll to members to confirm date which has best availability on which to hold the next meeting.	ElectraLink	

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
26/01	Working Group to review the consultation document, updated legal text and the updated energy park example and provide comments by midday 03 June 2021.	All	Closed