

DCP 344 Working Group Meeting 08

13 December 2022 at 13:00pm
Teleconference

Attendees	Company
Working Group Members	
Donna Townsend [DT]	Energy Asset Pipelines
Peter Waymont [PW]	UKPN
George Barnes [GB]	Utilita
Natalie Hay [NH]	BUUK
Mark Jones [MJ]	SSE
Tim Porter [TP]	NPg
Code Administrator	
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
George Dawson [GD] (Technical Secretary)	ElectraLink

1. Administration

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the members to the 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 An update on actions can be found in Appendix 1.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair noted that the purpose of this meeting was to review the responses to the RFI.

3. Review of RFI Responses

- 3.1 The Working Group reviewed an RFI document which was circulated prior to the meeting. The aim being to issue review the consultation responses and agree which solution is to be progressed.
- 3.2 Question 1: The Chair noted that 7 of the respondents preferred Option B, whilst 2 preferred Option A. 2 were not supportive and 1 needed additional contact due to a perceived lack of all necessary information around costings.
- 3.3 Question 2: There were mixed responses regarding the costs of each option. Some respondents stated that option A would result in no cost, whilst others noted costs ranging from £1K to £35K. In relation to option B, some indicated no costs, one indicated significant costs, and some indicated minor costs.
- 3.4 Question 3: Most who responded believed that the spreadsheet captured everything needed. The Working Group noted that there could be an additional note added to the Excel spreadsheet to explain why each element is present in response to the EAN query in their RFI responses.
- 3.5 Question 4: A lot of Parties agreed on a 6-month lead time, whilst one respondent wanted a lead time of 12 months. The Working Group agreed to add in wording for ‘Next DCUSA release within 6 months of Authority Decision.’
- 3.6 The Working Group noted that the visible conclusion from the responses is toward Option B and a 6-month lead time. This would meet the original intent from the proposer of the Change as it will create numerous efficiencies. In terms of the DCUSA General Objectives, by creating a standardised approach, this Change will create a promotion in efficiency and administration of DCUSA and so Objective 4 seems very supported.
- 3.7 The Chair noted that the Secretariat would begin to draft a Change Report for the January Panel meeting.

ACTION 09/01: Secretariat to draft DCP 344 Change Report for January DCUSA Panel meeting.

4. Any Other Business

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

5. Date of Next Meeting

- 5.1 The next meeting has been scheduled for 10 January 2022, where the Working Group will review RFI responses and determine next steps.

New and open actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
09/01	Secretariat to draft DCP 344 Change Report for January DCUSA Panel meeting.	ElectraLink	

6. Closed actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
07/01	PW investigate with ElectraLink the potential costs associated with DCUSA Ltd procuring the DUoS e-billing service.	Peter Waymont	Closed
07/02	Secretariat to research into what fields would be necessary in the manual invoice template for Option A.	ElectraLink	Closed
