

# DCP 406 Working Group - Meeting 09

19 July 2022 at 10:00 –13:00 Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Brian Hoy [BH]	ENWL
Damian Clough [DC]	SSE Generation
David Williams [DW]	SSE
George Moran [GM]	SSE
Karin Cadwallader [KC]	BUUK
Martin Brace [MB]	UKPN
Kyle Smith [KS]	WPD
Kyran Hanks [KH]	Waters Wye Associates
Lee Wells [LW]	NPg
Peter Turner [PT]	NPg
Simon Vicary [SV]	EDF
Wendy Mantle [WM]	SPEN
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
Andy Green [AG] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Furqan Aziz [FA] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
<b>Apologies</b>	
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 Secretariat walked the Working Group through the actions and updated the action log accordingly in line with the responses that had been received. Agreed to close 07/07, 08/02, 08/03/08/05, 08/06, 08/07, 08/08 and 08/10. DB advised he will give an in-depth update on action 07/07 as that in part of the agenda.
- 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 Chair walked the Working Group through the timeline for delivery and stressed that the consultation needs to be issued by the end of July.
- 2.3 The Working Group agreed that the work progress document has captured all the outstanding aims.

## 3. Review CCCM Examples

---

- 3.1 The Working Group started to review the CCCM examples that the various Working Group members had shared since the last Working Group session.
- 3.2 BH called out that due to DW comments on example 3, this example may need some slightly new text. DW agreed, as he raised the comment, that he would take the action to make some changes to example 2.
- 3.3 DB advised that Ofgem have agreed that if there are any exceptions where its deemed moving away from the decision and direction is the only way for a fair customer outcome, then if there can be some documentation/evidence as to why the scenario must deviate from the decision/direction and why deviating from the direction is the only way for a fair customer outcome, then this would be fine.
- 3.4 BH noted as there’s a complication with the demand and generation definition, could further steer for the consultation be given otherwise there may be a risk that some within the industry could reject the proposal on the basis of the proposed solutions not complying with the decision/direction.
- 3.5 DB stated he wouldn’t be able to give steer on what Ofgem would approve however as industry experts if the market can demonstrate why they’ve deviated from the direction/decision they would be more than happy to review and approve if the case to deviate was valid.

## 4. Exceptions Drafting

---

- 4.1 The Working Group decided given the Ofgem steer given by DB it would make sense to move onto reviewing the Exceptions Definitions:
- 4.2 MB advised he believed that they would be able explain the rationale behind why there’d be deviation from the Ofgem decision/direction and allow Ofgem to make a ruling on whether the treatment was appropriate or not.

- 4.3 The Working Group reviewed some of the CCCM examples in line with the steer from Ofgem and the Exceptions drafting. CCCM example 18 was called out as an example that would need to be amended on the back of the Ofgem steer. MB agreed to take away example 18 and redraft it and well as the exceptions drafting that accompanies it.
- 4.4 It was also noted that the consultation would need to give context into the new exception and how it links to the broader policy intent PT agreed to take away the action to add some wording into the consultation to provide the explanation. The Working Group agreed no further Exceptions drafting was required so the discussion moved on to reviewing the CCCM Examples.

## 5. Continuation of the Review of the CCM Examples

---

- 5.1 The Working Group Started with reviewing example 3. BH had drafted an index of all the examples. He gave the Working Group a walkthrough of what the table entails and asked the Working Group if they thought it was valuable. The Working Group agreed it is a helpful addition to the examples document. BH advised the Working Group that the index is not fully completed yet and requires some work before it is completed and finalised.
- 5.2 The Working Group also reviewed the wider examples document that Brian had put together and discussed it they wanted to walk through the track changes now or later. It was agreed as there were several cosmetic changes that it would be better for the Working Group to review the changes outside the Working Group and reconvene later next week with feedback.
- 5.3 The Working Group moved on to discussing the individual examples starting with example 3. DW talked the Working Group through the changes he'd made to example 3 and why he'd made them. The Working Group were comfortable with DW's redrafting of example 3.
- 5.4 The next Example for review was example 16 which PT had taken away to review on the last Working Group call. PT shared the rationale for his redrafting with the Working Group. PT advised that he'd tried to make the wording in the example customer friendly as end users wouldn't know the technical terminology. PT did note that there were elements of the diagram he wasn't sure about, so he was going to take an action to find out who provided the diagram and ask them to explain it.
- 5.5 PT also took an example to speak to WM about the storage example she was going to review and feedback to the Working Group once he'd found out more information.
- 5.6 The Working Group moved on to the new example that LW had drafted. It was agreed to remove the text in the bracket that state "eg, the maximum capacity for the demand connection is greater than 3MVA". It was agreed that the title needed to be checked with LW as there may be a typo in it. LW had also left a note on the diagram asking if it needed changing with the new text. The Working Group agreed it would need to change but as LW was not on the call that could be do outside the Working Group and feed back before next week's session.
- 5.7 MK queried where this new example would fit into the document. It was noted there's an action for the Working Group to agree on the numbering for the examples so they could pick that up when the consultation document gets drafted. BH suggested it may become the new example 16 and then the storage examples follow.

- 5.8 The Group moved on to the other new example that LW had drafted for new storage connections. It was noted that if this example is changed then changes to the existing example 16 would be required. BH suggested that the diagram is difficult to understand so noted that PT had taken an action earlier to speak to WM to explain the diagram and report back to the Working Group.
- 5.9 The Working Group moved on to the newly drafted 21a and 21b by MB. The Working Group have agreed to not have a's and b's within the diagram or legal text so these will become 21 and 22. MB talked the Working through the 2 examples it was agreed to removed the diagram in 21a as it offered no value.
- 5.10 Example 22 was reviewed next. RM advised he'd spoken to the design team and their steer was that it didn't offer much value as there were already some examples that covered all the elements of this scenario. RM advised he'd come back to the Working Group with a definitive yes or no as to whether its required but initially it was believed that example 22 isn't required.
- 5.11 DW walked the Working Group through his review of example 24. DW advised after review he didn't believe that the example added anything of value so the example may not be needed. The Working Group ultimately agreed that it would add some value to keep the example and made some changes to the cost's tables, so it was decided to keep example 24.
- 5.12 RM walked the Working Group through his changes to example 30. He queried if it was ok to refer to High-cost project threshold. MB advised would it be useful to have a sentence that explains what high-cost project threshold means as this would be helpful to customers. The Working Group couldn't reach a consensus on this so RM suggested removing all references in this example to high-cost cap but this would mean the whole example document would need to have this removed as well for consistency. It was agreed those who'd had actions to redraft examples would revisit three's and remove any reference to high-cost cap.
- 5.13 The Chair noted to the Working Group that was the last of the redrafted examples that required reviewing unless there were other questions. RM asked if the Working Group were all going to change where EHV is mentioned for MV in the examples they each drafted? The Working Group took two actions on this. 1, if there's a change in voltage, whatever the scale and size needed the treatment is to move to the next voltage above. The second action is does any if the drafting need changing.
- 5.14 DB also suggested he take that question away to Ofgem to get some clarity. The Working Group advised that this would be very helpful.

## 6. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

---

- 6.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
1. The Working Group to review all the examples and provide feedback at next week's Working Group.

## 7. Any Other Business

---

- 7.1 The Chair asked the group whether there were any other items of business to discuss.

7.2 There were no other items raised.

## 8. Date of Next Meeting

---

8.1 The next Working Group meeting will be held on 21 July 2022 at 10am.

**ACTION 08/01: The Working Group to review the drafted analysis circulated by LW.**

**ACTION 08/02: The Secretariat to chase Ofgem (DB) regarding the open action around providing clarity/guidance around the drafting of the new exception.**

**ACTION 08/03: DW to review and redraft Example 3 of the CCCM examples.**

**ACTION 08/04: BH to update the 'Index of Examples' table within the CCCM examples to cross-reference changes from the previous examples (as an input to the Consultation).**

**ACTION 08/05: BH to check with the ENA if they can still make the necessary updates to the diagrams within the CCCM examples document.**

**ACTION 08/06: PT to draft a new diagram for example 16 of the CCCM examples.**

**ACTION 08/07: LW to draft two new examples for example 17 of the CCCM examples (one for Generation and one for Storage behind the meter).**

**ACTION 08/08: MB to enhance the existing scenario relating to the minimum scheme for example 21 of the CCCM examples.**

**ACTION 08/09: WM to check whether example 22 should remain or be deleted if not beneficial.**

**ACTION 08/10: DW to review example 24 to see if the narrative is still suitable and also review the costs within the table and update as necessary.**

**ACTION 08/11: The Working Group to cross-check the example numbers within the CCCM examples document (once finalised).**

**ACTION 08/12: RM to review the diagram within example 30 of the CCCM examples and wording to explain the mechanism.**

**ACTION 08/13: RM to review example 31 of the CCCM examples.**

## APPENDIX A

### New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
07/07	Ofgem (DB) to provide clarity/guidance in regard to the drafting of the new exception.	Ofgem	Ongoing.
08/01	The Working Group to review the drafted analysis circulated by LW.	Working Group	Ongoing.
08/02	The Secretariat to chase Ofgem (DB) regarding the open action around providing clarity/guidance around the drafting of the new exception.	Secretariat	Ongoing.
08/03	DW to review and redraft Example 3 of the CCCM examples.	DW	Ongoing.
08/04	BH to update the 'Index of Examples' table within the CCCM examples to cross-reference changes from the previous examples (as an input to the Consultation).	BH	Ongoing.
08/05	BH to check with the ENA if they can still make the necessary updates to the diagrams within the CCCM examples document.	BH	Ongoing.
08/06	PT to draft a new diagram for example 16 of the CCCM examples.	PT	Ongoing.
08/07	LW to draft two new examples for example 17 of the CCCM examples (one for Generation and one for Storage behind the meter).	LW	Ongoing.
08/08	MB to enhance the existing scenario relating to the minimum scheme for example 21 of the CCCM examples.	MB	Ongoing.
08/09	WM to check whether example 22 should remain or be deleted if not beneficial.	WM	Ongoing.

08/10	DW to review example 24 to see if the narrative is still suitable and also review the costs within the table and update as necessary.	DW	Ongoing.
08/11	The Working Group to cross-check the example numbers within the CCCM examples document (once finalised).	Working Group	Ongoing.
08/12	RM to review the diagram within example 30 of the CCCM examples and wording to explain the mechanism.	RM	Ongoing.
08/13	RM to review example 31 of the CCCM examples.	RM	Ongoing.

## Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
06/01	All DNO representatives within the Working Group to test and review the load factor spreadsheet and feedback as to whether 5%/10%/20% load factors are a sensible modelling range.	DNOs / Working Group	Closed.
07/01	The Working Group to review the pros and cons list circulated by LW.	Working Group	Closed.
07/02	The Working Group to review the analysis and provide context to include within the Consultation.	Working Group	Closed.
07/03	LW to draft wording around the analysis to include within the Consultation.	LW	Closed.
07/05	The Working Group to review the CCCM examples circulated by KS.	Working Group	Closed.
07/08	The Working Group to review the Draft Consultation.	Working Group	Closed.