DCP 392 Working Group Meeting 07

02 February 2022 at 14:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Charles Deacon [CD]	Renewable Connections
Dafydd Burton [DB]	Ofgem
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Generation
Joanna Knight [JK]	SSEN
Gwen MacIntyre [GM]	SSEN
Patrick Cassels [PC] Part meeting	Ofgem
Thomas Cadge [TC]	BU-UK
Peter Turner [PT]	NPg
Vanessa Buxton [VB]	WPD
Simon Vicary [SV]	EDF
Code Administrator	
John Lawton [JL] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Hannah Proffitt [HP] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink

1. Administration

1.1 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.

1.2 The Working Group reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting and accepted these as final. These are provided as **Attachment 1.**

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

1.4 PC joined the meeting to provide further information on action 06/01 - The Chair to refer to Ofgem as to whether it is appropriate for Distribution Use of System (DUoS) funding to be used. CD highlighted that this is a fundamental consideration for the Working Group and will determine whether the CP will progress.

1.5 PC noted that it is important to establish whether DCUSA is an appropriate place to address the proposed change and suggested that a clear rationale is needed as to why the matter is in scope of DCUSA rather than another code.

1.6 The Chair confirmed that the Working Group had considered this and that the DCUSA Panel had sought legal advice prior to progressing the change. The DCUSA lawyers provided a response supporting the progression of the change within DCUSA but recognised that it is not a connection charging issue.

1.7 GM raised concerns from a Distribution Network Operator (DNO) perspective, that DCUSA may not be the correct place for the change. SV suggested that if DCUSA is not the correct route for progressing the issue, the correct route needs to be identified to address the outstanding issues.

1.8 PC agreed to take this away and gather more information on what guidance Ofgem can offer.

1.9 The Chair confirmed that progress will continue until the consultation document is complete but will await an Ofgem stance prior to submission to parties for their consideration. Once this position is reached Ofgem will be notified.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

2.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was to review the draft legal text and draft consultation document, with particular focus on the definitions.

3. Review of Draft Legal Text and Definitions

3.1 The Working Group reviewed the current legal text focussing on the definitions under section 4.6. The Working Group reviewed amendments suggested by CD.

3.2 The Working Group discussed and agreed the following definitions.

- Required Capacity - Where the Systems Connection Point requires an increase in capacity then it is the increase above the Existing Capacity.
- Existing Capacity – means the Maximum Capacity at the Systems Connection Point.
- New Network Capacity - is the non-secure capacity of the Relevant Section of Network following Reinforcement.
- Fault Level Contribution - is the incremental increase in Fault Level at the appropriate point on the Distribution System taken from the impact assessment.
- New Fault Level Capacity - is the Fault Level rating, following Reinforcement, of the equipment installed after taking account of any restrictions imposed by the local network Fault Level capacity. For the avoidance of doubt this rule will be used for all equipment types and voltages.

3.3 The Chair agreed to update the legal text with the above. An updated version can be found as **Attachment 2**.

3.4 An action was placed on the Working Group particularly the distributors members to consider whether the proposed new definitions will work in practice.

Action 07/01: Working Group, particularly the distributors members, to consider whether the proposed new definitions will work in practice.

4. Review of Draft Consultation Document

4.1 The Working Group reviewed the draft Consultation document – an updated version can be found as **Attachment 3**.

Key Points of Discussion:

- The Working Group agreed that the consultation should be issued for four weeks rather than three due to the matter being complex.
- The Working Group accepted the suggested wording amendments to Q2.
- Regarding 4.21, the Working Group discussed whether this was the correct location within the consultation for the Recovery of costs process section. The group noted that the question is important, however that they do not want the question to influence the following responses. The Working Group agreed to leave this section under 4.21. GM and PT agreed to submit their proposed wording as outlined in action 05/05.
- Regarding 4.26, Cost Apportionment Factors, the Chair agreed to include the definitions agreed under agenda item 3.
- Regarding 7.4, the Working Group agreed for this to be amended as this is a new process although similar to some existing ones. The Chair agreed to do this.
- Regarding 7.6, the Chair agreed to amend the wording to add clarity.
- The Working Group agreed for sections 7.7 and 7.8 to be updated with Ofgem's current position, as they have now published a second minded-to consultation.
- The Chair agreed to check the document to ensure all standard consultation questions are included, particularly under section 7 – Impacts & Other Considerations.

5. Next Steps

5.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:

- The Secretariat to update the legal text and consultation document in line with the above discussions and circulate to members with the meeting minutes.
- The Secretariat to issue a doodle poll with dates for the next meeting.

6. Any Other Business

6.1 The Chair asked the group whether there was any other business to discuss, to which nothing was raised.

7. Date of Next Meeting

7.1 To be confirmed via doodle poll.

8. Attachments

- Attachment 1 - DCP 392 Working Group Meeting 06_Final Minutes v1.0
- Attachment 2 - DCP 392 Legal Text_02022022_Updated
- Attachment 3 - DCP 392 Draft Consultation_02022022_Updated

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
05/04	CD to seek legal perspective internally regarding the DUoS money questions.	CD	**Action ongoing.**
05/05	GM/PT to re-word Q7 of the Consultation document relating to how the remaining DNO costs should be recovered from Transmission connected customers and bring back to the Working Group for further review.	GM / PT	**Action ongoing.**
07/01	Working Group, particularly the distributors members, to consider whether the proposed new definitions will work in practice.	Working Group	**New action.**

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
03/04	The Working Group to redefine the definitions within the definitions table of the legal text that is currently used within the application of the CAFs.	Working Group	**Action closed.** *The Working Group agreed the amended definitions. The updated legal text will be issued following the meeting.*
04/01	The Working Group to seek information internally around potential examples that can be provided within the legal text of this CP (or can they be adapted from the current examples within the CCCM)?	Working Group	**Action closed** *Definitions defined.*

05/01	CD to seek further information from the DNO system planners around what figure they use in DNO impact assessments (in relation to fault level/thermal).	CD	**Action closed.** *Information circulated to Working Group members on 01 Feb.*
06/01	Chair to refer to Ofgem as to whether it is appropriate for DUoS funding to be used.	Chair	**Action closed.** *Ofgem response circulated to members ahead of the meeting. Discussion held under agenda item 1.*
06/02	Working Group members to consider what the definitions should be in paragraph 4.6 based on current process.	Working Group	**Action closed.** *Duplication of 03/04*