

## Distribution Charging Methodologies Development Group (DCMDG) - Meeting 43

02 September 2021 at 10:00

Teleconference via Microsoft Teams

Attendees	Company
Chris Ong [CO]	UK Power Networks
David Fewings [DF]	Inenco
Donald Preston [DP]	SSEN
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Generation
Finn Davies-Clark	SSE Energy Solutions
George Moran [GM]	British Gas
Helen Tsang [HT]	EDF Energy
John Parson [JP]	BEAMA
Kara Burke [KB]	NPg
Karl Maryon [KM]	Haven Power
Kyran Hanks [KH]	Waters Wye Associates
Lee Stone [LS]	E.ON Energy
Megan Coventry [MC]	SSE Energy Solutions
Rowan Hazell [RH]	
Rustam Majainah [RMj]	OVO
Ryan Roberts [RR]	Energy Potential
Thomas Cadge [ThC]	BU-UK
Tom Chevalier [TC]	Power Data Associates
Andrew Neves	Engage Consulting
Secretariat	
Angelo Fitzhenry [AF] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Dylan Townsend (DT)	ElectraLink
Amina Uddin [AU] (Technical Secretary)	Electralink
Apologies	
Peter Tubey	Scottish Power
Lee Wells	NPg

## 1. Administration

---

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the DCMDG attendees to the meeting.
- 1.2 The Group reviewed the DCUSA “Competition Law Guidance” and agreed to be bound by this for the duration of the meeting.
- 1.3 Attendees reviewed the draft minutes from the last meeting, held on 05 August 2021 and agreed that they were an accurate representation of the discussions held.
- 1.4 Attendees were informed of the Actions Log progress and that all actions were completed and up to date and is included as Attachment 1.

## 2. DCMDG Forward Work Plan and Issues Log

---

- 2.1 The group reviewed the DCMDG Forward Work Plan and Issues Log and agreed that no updates were needed at this time. The current version can be found as Attachment 2.
- 2.2 The Chair confirmed that there were no new issues.
- 2.3 The Chair gave a brief overview on the DCUSA Charging Methodology Change Proposals and External Activities within the Forward Work Plan.
- 2.4 The Chair questioned the group if they were happy for the Forward Work Plan to be edited to remove some historic information as some sections were becoming unwieldy to update. The group agreed to this.
- 2.5 One member questioned if there was a follow up action regarding Ofgem’s lack of attendance at the DCMDG. The Chair noted that there was no immediate commitment to attend the DCMDG due to resourcing issues and prioritisation decisions at Ofgem. However, Ofgem have committed to receive and respond to any questions raised by members of the DCMDG outside of the formal meetings.

## 3. Ofgem Update

---

- 3.1 The Chair noted that there was no Ofgem update.
- 3.2 One member noted that they would have preferred an update on the consultation on the DUoS notice period. The Chair advised that that a request for an update can be made if required post discussing agenda item 6 - Consultation on DNOs request for directions to temporarily disapply the current DUoS charges notification periods – Update.

## 4. TCR Implementation Update

---

- 4.1 The Chair asked the DCMDG if they had any questions, comments or issues with the TCR implementation.
- 4.2 One member noted that Suppliers were receiving notifications from DNOs regarding non-final demand certification; DNOs were receiving certifications from customers directly where they should have received it from the Supplier (or at least cc’d with the Supplier).

4.3 One member noted that as a DNO they were happy to receive certification if the Supplier was aware. The member noted that the confusion may have been due to DCUSA stating that the certification should be sent from a “DCUSA Party”.

4.34.4 Members discussed whether a Change Proposal was required to clarify the submission process for the declarations. The UKPN representative indicated that they are considering this and aim to have a draft Change Proposal circulated prior to the November DCMDG meeting (meeting 45).

4.44.5 Another member noted a concern that back-up connections/redundant capacity may have been inadvertently overlooked as part of the TCR implementation Change Proposals.

4.54.6 A member clarified that the definition was that if the input was solely for the purpose of generation that it was non-final demand.

4.64.7 However, it was agreed that the member would provide the question to be addressed for the Chair to take to the TCR Implementation Steering Group for confirmation.

Action  
DCMDG\_043/01:

Member to provide details of the question to seek clarity from the TCR Implementation Steering Group with respect to redundant capacity connections and the application of the TCR.

~~4.7 — **Post meeting note:** In providing the question to the Chair, DT (who was the technical secretariat to the DCUSA TCR related Change Proposals, was able to confirm the following from the DCP 358 Change Report:~~

~~1.13 — The reference within paragraph 3.57(9) of the TCR Decision relating to redundant connection capacity is catered for within the definition of Single Site defined under DCP359, i.e. there will only be one fixed charge because all the MPANs including those providing such a provision will be classed as an associated MPAN.~~

## 5. Consultation on DNOs request for directions to temporarily disapply the current DUoS charges notification periods - Update

5.1 The Chair questioned if DNOs had any updates on the Consultation on DNOs request for directions to temporarily disapply the current DUoS charges notification periods.

5.2 One member noted that there would be a post consultation update at the end of September 2021.

5.3 The Chair noted that a request would be sent to Ofgem for an update.

## 6. Agenda Items for the next meeting

6.1 There were no new agenda items requested for the next meeting.

## 7. Any Other Business (AOB)

7.1 The Chair noted that a draft change proposal - Implementation of Banding Allocation on an Annual Basis, was circulated to members shortly before this meeting.

- 7.2 The Proposer of the change proposal summarised the draft change proposal to the group.
- 7.3 In summary, the general view (including from other Suppliers), is that the Change Proposal is probably not needed as other sourcing of data is used to understand the relevant banding that applies for new sites. However, as different Suppliers have different internal policies, the Proposer will consider the feedback and revert back to the next meeting. This also gives members more time to review the draft Change Proposal given it was issued shortly before the meeting.

Action  
DCMDG\_043/02:

All to provide any further comments on the draft Change Proposal - Implementation of Banding Allocation on an Annual Basis & Proposer to review internally whether to proceed with the Change Proposal given the initial feedback received.

- 7.4 The Chair noted that a query was raised from a member regarding TCMF hosting their meetings on that same day as DCMDG. The Chair contacted the secretariat of the TCMF to find out why this was as some members wished to attend both meetings but was awaiting response.
- 7.5 However, another member indicated that the clash has always been there and is not a new issue.
- 7.6 The Chair advised members that DCMDG would still go ahead on the planned dates for now but questioned if it was an option to change the DCMDG meeting dates and time as there is a preference for TCMF and DCMDG meetings not to clash
- 7.7 The Chair agreed to issue a questionnaire to find out the preferences of members for future meeting dates/timings.

DCMDG\_043/03:

The Secretariat to issue a survey to the DCMDG on options to change dates/times of the meeting.

- 7.8 **Post meeting note:** Survey issued to DCMDG members 09 September 2021.

## 8. Date of Next Meeting

- 8.1 The next DCMDG meeting will be held on 07 October 2021 via Microsoft Teams/Teleconference at 10am.

## 9. DNO Operational Matters

- 9.1 There were no DNO Operational Matters raised at this meeting.

## 10. Attachments

- Attachment 1 - DCMDG Actions Log
- Attachment 2 - DCMDG Forward Work Plan and Issues Log

