

# DCP 251 and DCP 252 Working Group Minutes

<b>Meeting Name</b>	DCP 251 and DCP 252 Working Group
<b>Meeting Number</b>	05
<b>Date</b>	22 March 2016
<b>Time</b>	10:30
<b>Venue</b>	Royal Institute of British Architects, 66 Portland Place, London, W1B 1AD.

Attendee	Company
Mike Harding [MH] (Chair)	Brookfield Utilities
Chris Allanson [CA]	Northern Powergrid
Chris Ong [CO]	UK Power Networks
Chris Barker [CB] (teleconference)	ENWL
Dave Wornell [DW] (teleconference)	Western Power Distribution
Keith Burwell [KB] (teleconference)	Ofgem
Pat Wormald [PW]	Northern Powergrid
Claire Hynes [CH] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink

Apologies	Company
Mo Sukumaran	SSEPD

## 1 ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 The minutes of the previous meeting held on 29 February 2016 were agreed to be an accurate record. Members updated the open and closed actions as set out in Appendix A.

**Action 04/01:** The Working Group agreed to split paragraph 2.4 in to three different paragraphs in the Working Paper. Members considered that where any type of distributor qualifies for these tariffs that this section of the Working Paper should examine to what extent the IDNO is undertaking the work that a DNO would otherwise complete rather than explain how the IDNOs methodology works.

- 1.2 All Working Group members agreed to adhere to the “Competition Law Dos and Don’ts” for the duration of the meeting.

## 2 REVIEW OF WORKING PAPER

- 2.1 The Group undertook a detailed review of the Working Paper, which provides a comprehensive background of the DNO methodology for charges to IDNOs and a comparison of the Use of System charges for different Network Operators. A number of amendments were made to the document, which can be found within Attachment 1.

- 2.2 During the review of the Working Paper, the Group agreed:

- To consider adding a new Section 2 to describe what is and out of scope in this change . For example, how MPAS services are recovered would be out of scope of this change;
- To redraft paragraph 1.2:

*“In order to determine to what extent either of the above two factors are relevant to the applicability of the LDNO tariffs to Licence Exempt Distributors.”*

**ACTION 05/01: MH**

- To consider whether a consultation question should be added on whether a licence exempt operator should be able to choose between the existing tariffs and the LDNO tariffs.

**ACTION 05/02: ALL**

### **3 REVIEW OF DCP 251 AND DCP 252 WORKING PAPER TABLES**

3.1 The Working Group updated the tables (proposed by Franck Latremoliere) which highlight the differences or similarities between licensed network operators and licence exempt network operators and provides examples of different network scenarios. The Working Group agreed to add the tables as Appendix A to the Working Paper. Please see Attachment 2.

3.2 The Working Group are asked to consider the following questions:

Table 1 ‘Supply from an IDNO’s licensed distribution system’

- Should this table be titled IDNO or MPRS?

Table 2 ‘Supply from a PNO’s distribution system with no BSC MPAN where there is no competition in supply under MRA and BSC arrangements.’

- Can competition in supply exist without MPANs?

**ACTION 05/03: ALL**

3.3 The major changes to the tables are highlighted below:

Table 3 ‘Supply from a PNO’s distribution system with a BSC MPAN (difference metering)’

- DCUSA as a use of system agreement is set out as a service in table 3. The Working Group considered that when a PNO was supplying a customer with a BSC MPAN then if a Supplier is appointed, the DCUSA which sets out the relationship between the Supplier and the distributor would apply. Members agreed to discuss this point with Franck Latremoliere.

**ACTION 05/04: ALL**

- Emergency call handling is set out as a service in table 3. Members considered that where a DNOs MPAN is supplied then a single emergency number will display at the end of the bill. MH agreed to draft further wording to capture this point in the consultation.

**ACTION 05/05: MH**

Table 4 ‘Private network with full-settlement BSC MPANs’

- The Working Group agreed to delete table 4 as the new wording above table 3 sufficiently captured this scenario. *“Table 1 covers scenarios where there are only a proportion of the MPANs on a licence exempt network subject to competition in supply (i.e. where difference metering is employed) or where each exit point is registered in industry systems such that it can receive competition in supply”.*

Table 5 ‘Private network without an active private network operator’

- The Working Group agreed to delete table 5 and instead capture the Private network without an active private network operator scenario in descriptive text by the end of the week.

**ACTION 05/06: CO**

- 3.4 The Working Group agreed to create a definition for a Qualified Network Operator (QNO) as the intent of the CP is to define what type of network operator qualifies for these tariffs.

#### **4 REVIEW OF CONSULTATION DOCUMENT**

---

- 4.1 Three Working Group members agreed to update the DCP 251 and 252 draft consultation with the agreed content set out in the Working Paper on the 04 April 2016. The updated consultation will be circulated to Working Group members' ex-committee for review.

**ACTION 05/07: ALL**

#### **5 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

---

- 5.1 There were no further items of business and the Chair closed the meeting.

#### **6 NEXT MEETING**

---

- 6.1 The next meeting will be scheduled as required following the Working Groups review of the DCP 251 and DCP 252 consultation ex-committee.

#### **7 ATTACHMENTS**

---

Attachment 1 - DCP 251 and DCP 252 Working Paper Redlined with Working Group Revisions

Attachment 2 - DCP 251 and DCP 252 Working Paper Tables Redlined with Working Group Revisions

Post Meeting Attachment: DCP 251 and DCP 252 Working Paper For Members Review By the 31 March 2016

**APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF ACTIONS****NEW AND OPEN ACTIONS**

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
03/01	To draft a timeline of events regarding the history of the IDNO methodology	PW & CA	In Progress
04/02	To: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the viability of MPAS services being part of the Use of System charged.</li> <li>Review where Section 3.2 should be placed within the Working Paper.</li> </ul>	All	On-going.
05/01	Redraft paragraph 1.2	Mike Harding	
05/02	Consider whether a consultation question should be added on whether a licence exempt operator should be able to choose between the existing tariffs and the LDNO tariffs.	All	
05/03	Consider the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should this table be titled IDNO or MPRS?</li> <li>Can competition in supply exist without MPANs?</li> </ul>	All	
05/04	Discuss with Franck Latremoliere the point that when a PNO was supplying a customer with a BSC MPAN then if a Supplier is appointed, the DCUSA which sets out the relationship between the Supplier and the distributor would apply.	All	

05/05	Draft further text on emergency call handling to capture that where a DNOs MPAN is supplied then a single emergency number will display at the end of the bill.	Mike Harding	
05/06	Capture the private network without an active private network operator scenario represented in table 5 in descriptive text by the end of the week.	Chris Ong	
05/07	Three Working Group members agreed to provide a first draft of the DCP 251/252 consultation after the 04 April 2016 for the Working Group to review ex-committee.	All	

**CLOSED ACTIONS AT THE MEETING**

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
04/01	To redraft Section 2.4 of the Working Paper by 14 March 2016	CA	Completed. Please see the administration section of these minutes.
04/03	To provide template case studies by 7 March 2016	FL	Complete: Agenda Item
04/04	To provide suggested consultation question by 14 March 2016	All	Complete: Agenda Item