

DCP 407 Working Group - Meeting 07

05 July 2022 at 14:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Brian Hoy [BH]	ENWL
Dafydd Burton [DB]	Ofgem
David Williams [DW]	SSE
James Devriendt [JD]	UKPN
Karin Cadwallader [KC]	BUUK
Kyle Smith [KS]	WPD
Kyran Hanks [KH]	Waters Wye Associates
Lee Wells [LW]	NPg
Robert Matta [RM]	SPEN
Simon Vicary [SV]	EDF
Code Administrator	
Andy Green [AG] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Furqan Aziz [FA] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Martin Brace [MB]	UKPN
Peter Turner [PT]	NPg
Vanessa Buxton	WPD

1. Administration

- 1.1 The Working Group reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance” and “Terms of Reference”. All Working Group members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting and agreed to the Terms of Reference.
- 1.2 An action log has been created and all updates are provided in **Appendix A**.

2. Working Group Progress Document

- 2.1 The Chair provided the Working Group with a progress document for the group to update with outstanding actions in order to progress with this change.
- 2.2 The Chair reviewed the open actions – there is currently an open action to review the CIBSE guidelines (in relation to electrical load) to see if it is relevant to this change. DW agreed to be the new owner of this action (currently within the action list).
- 2.3 The Working Group also agreed that providing real life examples to use and test the new criteria of whether a site is considered as Speculative/Non-Speculative would be necessary prior to finalising the criteria (to ensure the correct outcomes are received).

ACTION 07/01: The Working Group to identify real life examples of Speculative/Non-Speculative to be tested with the new criteria and also be included within the Consultation.

- 2.4 LW mentioned that if a Customer has been deemed Non-Speculative after a phasing application for example, then DNOs would need to ensure that that levied charges (i.e., DUoS) reflect the phases. Due to this, LW agreed to take an action to set out an example of a phased capacity connection and what DUoS methodology changes are needed, and why, to ensure that the Customer is not unduly discriminated against (in favour or against). The Working Group agreed to take an action to review this example once received.

ACTION 07/02: LW to set out an example of a phased capacity connection and what DUoS methodology changes are needed, and why, to ensure that the Customer is not unduly discriminated against (in favour or against).

ACTION 07/02: The Working Group to review LW example relating to a phased capacity connection.

- 2.5 The Working Group started by agreeing what is outstanding to progress how Speculative Development is defined. Defining the criteria and scoring for speculative developments was an area the Working Group agreed would require focus. It was also agreed that consultation questions is another outstanding area for focus for the Working Group.
- 2.6 The group also agreed on the outstanding items for the Speculative examples/scenarios and then moved onto the Ofgem Decision document giving specific focus to section 16 of the Ofgem decision document.
- 2.7 It was noted that as there were some contradictions in the Ofgem document the Working Group would work towards a solution in keeping with the principles of the change and provide evidence/documentation as to why the Working Group has looked for an alternative solution.

3. Review of Criteria for Speculative Development

- 3.1 The Chair introduced BH to provide an overview of the Criteria for Speculative Development document drafted for the Working Group to further discuss. The updated document can be found as **Attachment 1**.
- 3.2 The Working Group began to review the feedback on the draft criteria and scoring that was drafted at the previous Working Group session.
- 3.3 BH stated that it might be better to remove the middle 'Maybe Speculative' column from the criteria and only highlight the clearer speculative and definitely not speculative ends of the table. The Working Group agreed that removing the middle section would help to make the process more transparent and definitive.
- 3.4 JD noted that the first criteria would need changing as it currently mentions only I&C developments, cited an example of a development for domestic dwellings where the developer doesn't know the sort of heating the dwellings will have, if they'd have solar etc. It was also noted that most commercial developments usually won't know what sort of businesses will move into the units so they would usually be providing estimates for their load requirement so that opens the question of whether these should be classed as speculative. It was agreed that the industry guidelines would need to be clarified first before deciding how to define criteria 1 so the Working Group agreed to move on to criteria 2.
- 3.5 BH suggested making the green element of criteria 2 simpler for shorter timings as these developments are usually clear cut and he believed that the criteria for longer developments would need more consideration as confidence levels for longer developments can often be low.
- 3.6 KS noted that most long term developments will have a clear phasing plan and that it would be difficult to class a development as speculative without evidence to counter those phasing plans. BH suggested changing the red element of criteria 2 to state 'and where no phasing plan is provided and adding into the green section "or a clear phasing plan is provided". It was also agreed by the Working Group to uprate the scoring of criteria 2 from low to medium.
- 3.7 The Working Group agreed to amend the wording for criteria 3 around the number of substations but agreed to revisit this once the Working Group had given it more consideration.
- 3.8 It was noted that the definition of 'a ramp profile' within criteria 4 would be needed as it could be confused with a phasing plan. It was captured that additional wording/definition for ramp profile would be drafted by BH for the Working Group to review.

ACTION 07/04: BH to draft additional wording to explain what a ramped profile is for the Working Group to review.

- 3.9 Criteria 5 was agreed to be left as originally drafted.
- 3.10 The Working Group added in "and not within local authority development plans" to the speculative element for criteria 6.
- 3.11 Criteria 5, 10 and 11 were agreed to be left as originally drafted.
- 3.12 It was agreed to delete criteria 21 by all Working Group members.
- 3.13 BH agreed to take an action to review the ECCR for first connections.

ACTION 07/05: BH to review the ECCR for first connections.

4. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

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

1. The Working Group to review the Industry Standards for Electrical Load.
2. The Working Group to review the criteria table for Speculative Development.
3. The Working Group to review the Draft Consultation.

5. Date of Next Meeting

5.1 The next Working Group meeting will be held on 12 July 2022 at 2pm.

6. Attachments

- Attachment 1_DCP 407 Draft Criteria for Speculative Developments
- Attachment 2_DCO 407 Draft Consultation

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
04/04	The Working Group to define Infrastructure.	Working Group	Ongoing. Review when looking at the restoration of the document.
05/01	PT / DW to review the CIBSE guidelines in relation to electrical load.	PT / DW	Ongoing. Has noted some observations. Will come back to this when discussing electrical load.
05/02	The Working Group to review the Criteria within the Speculative Development document: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are options 2/3/4 individual criteria or should they be combined?• Identify which of the 'Green' column would make a site be deemed as non-Speculative.• Identify which of the 'Red' column would make a site be deemed as non-Speculative.• Identify how many of the 'Amber' column would make a site be deemed as Speculative?• Provide suggestions for any additional criteria that could be added to the table.	Working Group	Ongoing.
06/02	The Working Group to draft additional wording to be included to explain how the scoring system of the criteria for Speculative	Working Group	Ongoing.

	Development table works and for all members to provide suggestions at the next meeting.		MB responded.
06/03	The Working Group review the criteria table (including the current figures within the table) for Speculative Development and provide feedback at the next meeting.	Working Group	Ongoing. BH responded. LW responded.
07/01	The Working Group to identify real life examples of Speculative/Non-Speculative to be tested with the new criteria and also be included within the Consultation.	Working Group	Ongoing.
07/02	LW to set out an example of a phased capacity connection and what DUoS methodology changes are needed, and why, to ensure that the Customer is not unduly discriminated against (in favour or against).	LW	Ongoing.
07/03	The Working Group to review LW example relating to a phased capacity connection.	Working Group	Ongoing.
07/04	BH to draft additional wording to explain what a ramped profile is for the Working Group to review.	BH	Ongoing.
07/05	BH to review the ECCR for first connections.	BH	Ongoing.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
03/05	The Working Group to provide real-life examples to include within the draft proforma to highlight the discrepancies for the Working Group to review during the next meeting.	Working Group	Closed.

			Will review once criteria is finalised.
04/01	The Working Group to see what criteria they can apply to access the appropriateness of the electrical load being applied for.	Working Group	Closed. May need to revisit.
04/02	The Working Group to identify ways to specify a materiality threshold.	Working Group	Closed.
06/01	LW to look at internal processes relating to assessing risks (i.e., a scoring system).	LW	Closed. LW responded.