DCP 407 Working Group - Meeting 08

12 July 2022 at 14:00 - Web-Conference

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

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 The secretariate walked the Working Group through the actions and updated the action log accordingly in line with the responses that had been received.

1.3 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 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 were another outstanding area for focus for the Working Group. Finally, the Working Group agreed that there would need to be some context provided to Ofgem to explain why the suggested solution deviates from the Ofgem decision document.

3. Review Industry Standards for Electrical Load

3.1 The Working Group reviewed the BSRIA Electrical Loads table to understand if it would be helpful to include this as one of the criteria to decide if the site is speculative or non-speculative. It was noted that the table is only a ''rule of thumb'' and only applies to I&C sites.

3.2 The Working Group discussed if the table for electrical loads could be used as part of the evidence in line with the scoring matrix to inform if a development is speculative or not rather than something that would deliver an outcome. All Working Group members broadly agreed with this suggestion.

3.3 It was also noted that the BSRIA table states that its only a ''rule of thumb'' so would it be correct to use it as a hard and fast criterion. Because of these challenges it was agreed that a consultation question would be asked as to whether the use of the BSRIA table was appropriate or not and if it was used, would it only be an additional piece of information to help assess the site alongside all the other criteria or would it be a hard, yes/no as to whether the site would be speculative or non-speculative.

4. Review of Criteria for Speculative Development

4.1 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**.

4.2 It was noted that the middle ''maybe'' column was still in the table after the Working Group agreed to remove this in the last Working Group, so this column was removed.

4.3 It was agreed to change the wording for the green section of criteria 1 to ''where the load estimate requirements are within 20% of industry guidelines'' and the red section updated to state ''where the load requirement estimates are greater than 100% of industry guidelines''. It was noted that whilst these make sense, the Working Group still need to establish the industry guidelines.

4.4 The Working Group agreed that no changes were required to criteria 2

4.5 A small cosmetic change was made to criteria 3 to include bullet points so it was consistent with criteria 2.

4.6 The Working Group reviewed BH's ''Definition of ramped capacity'' draft wording along with criteria 4. Some wording was added into the green section of criteria 4which references where someone could find the relevant paragraph in the ''definitions of ramped capacity'' document. The relevant paragraph number will be updated once the definitions document is formalised.

4.7 It was noted that criteria 7 and 8 should be merged otherwise it would mean a customer could score 3 points for outlined planning and then 5 points for detailed planning approval. Point 8 was removed and point 7 changed to state 'Planning approval granted'' in the criteria box then then 2 bullet points in the non-speculative box to state ''project has achieved outlined planning approval'' with a score of medium, and the second bullet point to state ''Or has achieved detailed approval''

4.8 The weighting/scoring was reviewed and as there were no low criteria the medium weighting was removed so each criteria could only score low (3 points) or high (5 points).

4.9 The Working Group the moved on to test the weightings/scoring table against some of the examples the Working Group had submitted.

4.10 It was suggested that the Working Group work through the examples and score them in the remaining hour to make sure that each criterion is defined clearly, and the group reach the same conclusion.

4.11 The Working Group broadly came to the same conclusions when scoring each example but as time had run out for the Working Group before all the examples had been reviewed, it was agreed that the secretariate would convert the criteria table into an excel spread sheet and send this out to the group to review and score so the Working Group could revisit these items next week to confirm the criteria gives enough guidance to make scoring each development consistent.

4.12 The Working Group also agreed to provide additional examples to the next meeting if possible as this would prove beneficial to walk through and test using the current criteria.

ACTION 08/01: The Secretariat to convert the criteria table to an excel spreadsheet and circulate to the Working Group to complete.
ACTION 08/02: The Working Group to review the examples provided by JD/RM and test these scenarios against the current criteria for Speculative Development.
ACTION 08/03: The Working Group to provide any additional examples/criteria to the next meeting.

4.13 The current scoring of the criteria for 'high' or 'low' is 2/1 and the Working Group discussed whether this should be altered to high = 1 and low = 0. Members agreed to take an action to review the current scoring system and provide feedback at the next meeting.

ACTION 08/04: The Working Group to consider what the scoring should be (i.e., 0/1).

4.14 MB also agreed to take an action to draft additional wording to explain how the scoring mechanism works for inclusion within the draft legal text.

ACTION 08/05: MB to draft wording to explain the scoring system.

5. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

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

1. The Working Group to review the results of the Speculative Development testing.
2. The Working Group to review Consultation questions.

6. Date of Next Meeting

6.1 The next Working Group meeting will be held on 19 July 2022 at 2pm.

7. Attachments

- Attachment 1_DCP 407 Draft Criteria for Speculative Developments (Excel)
- Attachment 2_DCO 407 Draft Criteria for Speculative Developments (Word)

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
04/04	The Working Group to define Infrastructure.	Working Group	**Ongoing.** BH responded.
07/03	The Working Group to review LW example relating to a phased capacity connection.	Working Group	**Ongoing.**
08/02	The Working Group to review the examples provided by JD/RM and test these scenarios against the current criteria for Speculative Development.	Working Group	**Ongoing.**
08/03	The Working Group to provide any additional examples/criteria to the next meeting.	Working Group	**Ongoing.**
08/04	The Working Group to consider what the scoring should be (i.e., 0/1).	Working Group	**Ongoing.**
08/05	MB to draft wording to explain the scoring system.	Working Group	**Ongoing.**

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
05/02	The Working Group to review the Criteria within the Speculative Development document: • 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	**Closed.**
05/01	PT / DW to review the CIBSE guidelines in relation to electrical load.	PT / DW	**Closed.**
06/02	The Working Group to draft additional wording to be included to explain how the scoring system of the criteria for Speculative Development table works and for all members to provide suggestions at the next meeting.	Working Group	**Closed.**
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	**Closed.**
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	**Closed.**
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	**Closed.**
07/04	BH to draft additional wording to explain what a ramped profile is for the Working Group to review.	BH	**Closed.**

07/05	BH to review the ECCR for first connections.	BH	**Closed.**
08/01	The Secretariat to convert the criteria table to an excel spreadsheet and circulate to the Working Group to complete.	Secretariat	**Closed.**