

DCP 403 Working Group - Meeting 04

15 August 2022 at 10:00

Location/ Web-Conference/Teleconference

Attendee	Company
David Wornell (DW)	Wester Power
Kyran Hanks(KH)	Waters Wye Associates
Chris Ong(CO)	UKPN
Andy Pace(AP)	Energy Potential
Edda Dirks(ED)	SSE Generation
Claire Campbell (CC)	SPEN
James Jones SSE (JJ)	SSE
Shannon Murray(SM)	Ofgem
Helen Tsang(HT)	EDF
Code administrator	
Andy Green [AG] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
John Lawton (JL) Chair	ElectraLink

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 Chair gave high level overview of terms of reference and confirmed everyone had read the ToR and CLG
- 1.3 Chair explained the roles of the chair and Tech sec and requested to use hand’s up function if someone wishes to speak or to use chat box in Microsoft teams.

2. Purpose of the Meeting / Timeline for Delivery

- 2.1 The Chair explained that the purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss the DCP 403 proposed legal text and request for information responses within the Working Group and, time permitting, review the draft consultation and agree next steps.

3. Review of Legal Text

- 3.1 The Working Group reviewed the draft legal text which can be found in **Attachment 1**.
- 3.2 It was raised that as the legal text referred to "certification", would the requirements for certification need to be noted within the legal text? AP advised that changing the legal text to ask for evidence rather than certification would work better. The Working Group agreed to this change and the legal text updated.
- 3.3 It was also queried what is meant specified single site and was that clear enough? The Working Group agreed to leave that definition as it was for now and let the lawyers to give steer as to whether specified single site was sufficient. That concluded the segment on the legal text

4. Review of Consultation.

- 4.1 The Chair invited the Working Group to then review and discuss the draft consultation document which can be found in attachment 2.
- 4.2 JL informed the Working Group the timeline had been updated. JL also explained that the consultation covered the background of the change, which is why some elements of the Working Group, which weren't taken forwards but debated were included as it was important to capture all options that the Working Group had reviewed and debated. AP as the proposer was happy to include the context to background.
- 4.3 The Working Agreed that first two questions should be the generic consultation questions which are below

Question 1: Do you understand the intent of DCP403?

Question 2: Do you support the principles of DCP403?

- 4.4 JL also noted that the How section had been updated as per ED's feedback. Working Group agreed they were also comfortable with the changes.
- 4.5 It was agreed to include the concern raised by Scottish Power with their RFI response to question 5 around where a site is on a different GSP, ie airports so the reader would be aware of this unique scenario. It was agreed that a question on this should be raised within the consultation document in section 4.
- 4.6 JL checked in with the Working Group after they'd reviewed the request for Information section to confirm they were all comfortable with the sections discussed and the Working Group agreed they were all happy with these sections.
- 4.7 SM advised that she had an update on her action from the last Working Group around if within the TCR were Ofgem referring to one customer to one site relationship or is it multiple customers to one single site. SM advised the TCR did consider sites with multiple connection agreements. A single site is a site with a DNO agreement. She also stated that that if a site is connected to a private network, then that would still be classed as a single site as the private network part of the market was not

regulated by Ofgem. This advice from SM was added to the section hosting the request for information response of the consultation document.

4.8 It was noted that numbering sequences were now out of sync within the paragraphs, so the secretariat took an action to update the paragraph numbering sequence.

4.9 The Working Group reviewed the questions for section four and agreed to ask 5 questions in this section which are below

Question 3: Do you consider that backup connections should be exempt from residual charges? Please provide your rationale.

Question 4: Should a single site be specific to one customer or multiple customers if within a private network? Please provide your rationale

Question 5: Do you consider that the proposed solution meets the TCR decision on redundant connection capacity? Please provide your rationale.

Question 6: Should the introduction of a subset to a Final Demand Site result in the allocation to a zero-charging band? Please provide your rationale

Question 7 If the Back Up Connection Site is connected to a different GSP to the main connection, should it be exempt from residual charges? Please provide your rationale.

4.10 The Working Group confirmed they were comfortable with the content in section four.

4.11 The Working Group review the text in section 5 and also confirmed they were comfortable with what it stated and agreed to ask the below question.

Question 8: Do you consider that the proposal better facilitates the DCUSA General Objectives? If so, please detail which of the General Objectives you believe are better facilitated and provide supporting reasons. If not, please provide supporting reasons.

4.12 Within section 6 the Working Group agreed to ask only the generic question below

Question 9: Are you aware of any wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP?

4.13 Within the implementation date section (section 7) the working group agreed to only ask the below question.

Question 10: what date do you believe this change proposal should be implemented? Please provide your rationale.

4.14 The Working Group reviewed the draft legal text within section 8 to make sure consensus was reached the legal text was fit for purpose. The Working Group agreed that the draft legal text was ready to be sent for consultation with the below question asked

Question 11: Do you have any comments on the proposed legal text amendments?

4.15 That concluded the section reviewing the draft consultation and the Working Group moved on to agreeing next steps.

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 The Working Group agreed to review the updated consultation document and provide feedback no later than 12pm on 19 August 2022
- 5.2 Next Working Group agreed to take place on 16 September 2022 10am to review the consultation responses.

6. Attachments

- Attachment 1_DCP403_Draft_Legal_Text
- Attachment 2 _DCP403_Consultation

7. Next Meeting – 16 September 2022

8.1 The next Working Group meeting will be held on 15 September 2022 at 10am

Appendix 1 – Actions Log

New and Open Actions – (Open/Closed Session) or (Board)

Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
03/01	Claire Campbell to check if the example given by SP's response to question 5 in the RFI document would have a single connection agreement or separate agreements	Claire Campbell	Open.
03/02	Secretariat to align the final two questions in the RFI response document with the RFI that was issued	Secretariat	Closed, Secretariat has updated the legal text and consultation document, so all aligned and share with the
03/03	Secretariat would update the draft consultation document with the draft legal text, how that text was landed on and to include the request for information responses.	Secretariat	Closed, legal text updated and share with Working Group
03/04	Shannon Murray to clarify if within the TCR, were Ofgem referring to one customer to one site relationship or is it multiple customers to one single site	Shannon Murray	Closed, Shannon has confirmed that within the TCR Ofgem were referring to one customer to one site.
04/01	Update the paragraph and consultation questions numbering sequences within consultation document and share updated version with the Working Group.	Secretariat	

Closed Actions – (Open/Closed Session) or (Board)

The logo features the text "DCUSA" in a white, bold, sans-serif font. The text is underlined with a white horizontal line. The logo is positioned in the upper right corner of a green banner that has a wavy, organic shape. The banner itself has a subtle pattern of overlapping green lines and shapes, giving it a textured appearance.

DCUSA