DCUSA SIG Meeting 129 Minutes

25 February 2022 at 10:00am: Web Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Kara Burke [KB]	Northern Powergrid
Donna Townsend [DT]	Energy Assets Networks
Donald Preston [DP}	SSEN
Karl Maryon [KM]	Haven Power
Richard Ellis	WPD
William McKay [WK]	SSEN
Tim Hammond [TH]	United Gas & Power
Code Administrator	
Angelo Fitzhenry (AF) (Chair)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC]	ElectraLink

1. Administration

1.1 The Chair welcomed the members to the meeting.

1.2 SIG members reviewed the "Competition Law Guidance". All members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.

1.3 The SIG members confirmed that the minutes from the last meeting were an accurate record.

2. Issues Log

2.1 The SIG reviewed the Issues Log. There was one open item, which was on the agenda for discussion (DIF 62). An updated issues log can be found in Attachment 1.

3. DIF 62 - Additional Clarification for correct application of the LV Sub Site Specific Tariff – Review of RFI Responses

3.1 The SIG members reviewed the RFI responses received. A collated version of the RFI responses, along with SIG members comments can be found in Attachment 2. A summary of the discussions can be found below:

With respect to this issue, have you experienced queries from customers/Suppliers relating to the application of the LV sub site specific tariff regarding physical arrangements (i.e., LV cable ownership and boundaries)?

3.2 Many companies have received queries regarding this issue ranging from definition of "Immediate Adjacent" and ownership of the LV cables. Note that the tariff differences can be significant, including where the supply is to the HV sub.

With respect to the wording "immediately adjacent", how does your organisation interpret and apply this (i.e., do you have a standard definition or is each site assessed individually and if so, how)?

3.3 There are a variety of different interpretations being applied in practice. Two responses indicated using 10 metres as a decision point for the LV cables and one response used 10 metres with respect to their metering cables. In terms of the physicality aspect two responses indicated in the same area (but not necessarily attached), whilst three responses confirmed the building needed to be attached.

Are there any other issues experienced when dealing with customers/Suppliers regarding the application of the LV sub tariff?

3.4 There were no other significant issues raised, however some responses indicated that responding to enquiries from TPIs (who may not fully understand tariff structures) can lead to unproductive effort by Distributors.

Do you believe that the legal text within the DCUSA requires amendment to remove any ambiguity and ensure consistency of application of the LV sub site specific tariff? If so, please can you provide suggestions for amendments?

3.5 There is a wide range of different opinions as to whether defining "immediately adjacent" or any other additional terms would be of benefit in clarifying the interpretation and application of this tariff. Overall, there would appear to be an opportunity to consider some form of additional or amended

legal text/ guidance/ drawings, however this would need further discussion via a Change Proposal Working Group.

With respect to the ownership of the LV cables, as a distributor, do you or the customer own the LV cables or is there mix? In either circumstance does this alter your application of the LV sub site specific tariff?

3.6 There are a variety of different interpretations, with some using the CT or metering point as a demarcation and others using the secondary terminals on the transformer (unless the CTs are further than 10 metres from the transformer terminals). Overall, there would appear to be an opportunity to consider some form of additional or amended legal text/ guidance/ drawings, however this would need further discussion via a Change Proposal Working Group.

Conclusions

3.7 As stated above SIG member agreed that there would appear to be an opportunity to consider some form of additional or amended legal text/ guidance/ drawings, however this would need further discussion via a Change Proposal Working Group.

3.8 It was agreed that a DIF 62 Sub-Group would be set up to consider this issue further and to determine whether a CP is needed.

ACTION 129/01: Secretariat to set up a DIF 62 Sub-Group and issue invites.

3.9 minor amendments were received and the RFI was issued to DCUSA Parties on 04 February 2022.

4. Any Other Business

4.1 There was one item of other business raised in relation to the User Smart Meter Installation Forecast Reporting. RE state that they have not been receiving the forecasts from Suppliers. It was noted that this is currently a BEIS document and they have recently changed their reporting requirements which may have led to some confusion. The Secretariat took an action to review the current process to ensure that these reports are received in the future.

ACTION 129/02: Secretariat to investigate current issues regarding the User Smart Meter Installation Forecast Reporting.

5. Date of Next Meeting:

5.1 The next SIG meeting will take place on 25 March 2022, via Microsoft Teams.

Appendix 1

New and open actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
129/01	Secretariat to set up a DIF 62 Sub-Group and issue invites.	ElectraLink	
129/02	Secretariat to investigate current issues regarding the User Smart Meter Installation Forecast Reporting.	ElectraLink	

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
128/01	Secretariat to draft an RFI document and circulate to SIG members for review.	ElectraLink	Completed
128/02	Issue RFI to DNO and IDNO DCUSA Parties for a period of two weeks.	ElectraLink	Completed