

DCP 404/DCP 405 Q&A Session

25 August 2022 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Andy Barnes [AB]	Zog
Anne Claire Laydier [ACL]	UKPD
Carly Ashworth [CA]	SSE
Daniel Mellis [DM]	SSE
Darryll Spittal [DS]	SSE
Dave Wornell [DW]	WPD
David Williams [DW]	SSE
Donald Preston [DP]	SSE
Donna Townsend [DT]	ENA
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Generation
George Moran [GM]	Centrica
Gerard Boyd [GB]	SPEN
Grant Elder [GE]	SSE
Hunter Morven [HM]	Last-Mile UK
Ishan Lowe [IL]	Ofgem
Julia Phillips [JP]	Energy Networks
Karl Maryon [KM]	DRAX
Katie Stanyard [KS]	Energy Networks
Kester Jones [KJ]	WPD
Kris Devaney [KD]	SSE
Luigi Barsotti [LB]	Energetics

Maddie Brooks [MB]	Octopus
Marc Newby [MN]	Smartest Energy
Martin Brace [MB]	UKPN
Mike Kaveney [MK]	WPD
Paul Bedford [PB]	DRAX
Paul McGimpsey [PM]	Energy Networks
Peter Turner [PT]	NPg
Robert Matta [RM]	SPEN
Ross Thompson [RT]	UKPN
Sarah Owen [SO]	Eclipse Power
Tom Jenkins [TJ]	Espug
Tony McEntee [TM]	ENWL
Vicki Spiers [VS]	ESP
Code Administrator	
Furqan Aziz [FA]	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink

1. Purpose of the Meeting

- 1.1 The Chair informed the group that this session will be held to allow members to ask questions relating to the DCP 404/405 Change Proposals and Consultations that have currently been circulated to provide further clarity in order to enhance responses. Members were informed that the meeting 'chat box' can be used to ask questions, or alternatively Slido can be used to post anonymously.

2. DCP 404 Q&A Session

- 2.1 The Chair provided a brief overview of DCP 404 and opened the floor to questions.
- 2.2 **Question 1 - Why does the workgroup believe the Regulations that currently apply to Curtailment End Date for firm connections should be applied to flexible connections?**
- 2.3 TM stated that the Curtailment end date will be able to be moved in the same way that the energisation date would have been able to be moved if the customer had requested a . There are provisions within the regulations where it states the circumstances where the energisation date can be moved for a non-curtable connection – if it is outside of the DNOs control there will be no penalties or payments associated with it. The aim is to ensure there is consistency in Curtailment end date for a Curtable connection and the energisation date for a Non-Curtable connection as both will occur when the reinforcement works have been completed.
- 2.4 Under a non-Curtable connection, a generation connection would have zero revenue until the reinforcement work is complete. If the generator picks a Curtable connection, there will be some access and hence some revenue reinforcement whilst the reinforcement work is being completed. There will be less impact for Curtable offers as opposed to non-Curtable offers if the reinforcement works is delayed.
- 2.5 **Question 2 - Why was 20% picked to determine what is 'markedly higher'?**
- 2.6 TM stated that the Working Group did try to seek further clarity as to what 'markedly higher' actually means, however information around this was very limited. The view was that 'markedly higher' is subjective – the general view of the Working Group is that 20% was a reasonable figure. 20% is a significant uplift and follows the objective of the incentive and seek wider industry views around this figure and the Working Group are happy to consider alternatives along with reasons as to why a different figure should be chosen.
- 2.7 **Question 3 - If a customer has to be curtailed early how would that work in practice? E.g., would it disrupt that customer's business?**
- 2.8 TM stated that Customers can only be Curtailed from the date of energisation up to the end date and cannot be 'curtailed early'. It may impact a customer's business but it is for the customer to choose when to request early curtable access or waiting until for non-curtable access when the reinforcement works have been completed.
- 2.9 **Question 4 - It would be useful to understand what proportion of the inflight connections 2 typically represents? is it 2 out of 500 or is it 2 out of 10.**
- 2.10 TM stated that this would be difficult to quantify – it could potentially be 2/10 or 2/3 in some cases. There could be risk to Companies if they all go ahead; the bigger the number, the less likely it will be that all go ahead. There is a concern that there needs to be a factor to some degree of cost apportionment in there.
- 2.11 **Question 5 - How is curtailment instruction value going to be calculated? Not referenced in the legal text/model. Same for non-curtable capacity.**

- 2.12 TM stated this should be the amount that people can connect without reinforcement being needed. This may be a point that may need to be picked up and further consideration once the responses to the Consultation have been received. The Curtailment Instruction Value will be something that the DSOs will need to determine based on what the minimum they need to Curtail a Customer to resolve the issue. TM explained that it would not be expected for the Curtailment Instruction Value to be included within this due to DNOs needing to further refine this (this should be kept as low as needed).
- 2.13 **Question 6 - If a customer is to be curtailed how would it work in practice?**
- 2.14 TM stated that these discussions would be for DNOs specifically. Companies currently have different ANM schemes and would be done automatically with the systems that are currently in place. It would depend on the system that the DNO has currently got.
- 2.15 **Question 7 - Could you explain why the proposed curtailment threshold (the % of the network asset capacity which will determine the no. of curtailment) is 95% rather than 100%?**
- 2.16 TM stated that the Working Group had to come up and agree with a number that would incentive a DNO not to exceed the Curtailment limit. The Working Group tried to ensure that this is a prudent limit and not a forecast of what is likely to happen.
- 2.17 **Question 8 - How much notice might a customer receive if curtailment?**
- 2.18 TM stated that the notice could potentially be quite short depending on what it is that happens. If a Customer needs to be Curtailed due to a fault, emergency action may need to be taken and could be quite short – if there is a planned outage, the notice could be longer. TM expects there could be a range of notice lengths and would depend on the reason for the outage.
- 2.19 GB added that they currently have ANM active and it controls the outputs to alleviate constraints for Customers. This could be down to overload or transmission constraints for example. Once the constraint is removed, the Customer can then export again up to full available capacity.
- 2.20 **Question 9 - ANM is being mentioned a lot, but a lot of DNO's do not have a full ANM system yet, what happens in these cases?**
- 2.21 TM stated that Companies would need to put in a system that is appropriate to provide these Curtailment options – Companies that have not got ANM will need to be working towards it.
- 2.22 Question 10
- 2.23

3. DCP 405 Q&A Session

- 3.1 The Chair provided a brief overview of DCP 405 and opened the floor to questions.
- 3.2 **Question 1 - Where customers on an IDNO network get the notice for curtailment through the IDNO/DNO, does the IDNO have different actions/processes based on control equipment?**
- 3.3 TM stated that it would be expected that this is agreed between the IDNO and DNO, and the IDNO Customer would then respond to the instruction that the IDNO sends. If an IDNO can provide something equivalent to the DNO that can avoid Curtailing the Customer, the provisions would allow for this to be agreed. If something else can be done to avoid Curtailing the Customer that is equivalent to Curtailment, this could potentially be considered; otherwise, the aim is to ensure that the Customer has the same experience whether connected to an IDNO or DNO network.
- 3.4 **Question 2 - In the previous section, there was an expectation that DNOs will have ANM systems in place to manage this. Is there the same expectation therefore on IDNOs?**

- 3.5 TM stated that it may be a way forward for IDNOs to incorporate the Customer within the DNOs system as opposed to the IDNO putting in their own ANM system as this may be more feasible; however, it will be different in various situations.

4. Any Other Business

- 4.1 The Chair asked the group whether there were any other items of business to discuss.
- 4.2 One member queried whether a summary can provided of how all four of the Access SCR CPs (DCP 404/405/406/407) interlink with each other as this would be beneficial when reviewing – TM stated that this may be more suited to discuss at the Charging Futures Forum as opposed to DCUSA.
- 4.3 RC also suggested that an additional summary of how the CPs interlink could be added within the Change Reports to make it clearer how they interact and will be considered when moving forward.
- 4.4 There were no other items raised.

5. Date of Next Meeting

- 5.1 The next Working Group meeting will be held on 08 September 2022 at 10am.

