

# DCP 407 Working Group - Meeting 17

13 September 2022 at 14:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Dafydd Burton [DB]	Ofgem
Daniel Mellis [DM]	SSE
David Williams [DW]	SSE
Karin Cadwallader [KC]	BUUK
Martin Brace [MB]	UKPN
Peter Turner [PT]	NPg
Simon Vicary [SV]	
Tom Cadge [TC]	BU-UK
Tracey Taylor [TT]	ENWL
Vanessa Buxton [VB]	WPD
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
Andy Green [AG] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Craig Booth [CB]	ElectraLink
Furqan Aziz [FA] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
<b>Apologies</b>	
Brian Hoy [BH]	ENWL
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. Review of Consultation Responses

---

- 2.1 The Chair explained that the purpose of this meeting is to review the Consultation responses and feedback provided by Working Group members.
- 2.2 The Chair stated that to gain a high-level understanding of what areas need to be focused on, each of the responses will be questioned as to whether the issue/concern can be addressed, whether it can be completed within the given timescales, and if so, what are the next steps. A work plan can then be created, and solutions discussed at the following Working Group meetings.
- 2.3 **Question 1**
- 2.4 All responders confirmed they understood the intent of the CP.
- 2.5 **Question 2**
- 2.6 All responders confirmed that they are supportive of the principles of this CP.
- 2.7 **Question 3**
- 2.8 The Working Group agreed that there should be further clarity provided regarding how to treat mixed sites.
- 2.9 In regard to Criterion 1, there were a number of concerns raised stating that they could not get access to the ‘Industry Guidelines’. It was suggested that the Working Group avoid any specific mentions to the ‘Industry Guidelines’ and suggest that the DNO provide further clarity on their website.
- 2.10 In regard to Criterion 4, the Working Group needs to agree if Option 1 or 2 are applied and update the draft legal text accordingly. It was noted that SSEN provided a preference on this matter.
- 2.11 **Question 4**
- 2.12 The majority of responders did not have any additional ‘Industry Guidelines’ to suggest; however, it was noted that the CIBSE and BSRIA may not be sufficient. The Working Group agreed to further consider what ‘Industry Guidelines’ should be followed to determine whether a site is Speculative under Criterion 1.
- 2.13 **Question 5**

- 2.14 ENWL suggested a criterion based on the materiality of the applications, however, the Working Group believe it would be difficult to introduce a criterion based on the cost of the required works as this will only be identified later in the process.
- 2.15 UKPN suggested that a larger up-front payment for a staged payment job (but still less than the Connection Offer value) should be considered as a Financial commitment.
- 2.16 One member of the Working Group stated that they do not believe that this should be considered as a Financial commitment as the main concern for a speculative development relates to costs beyond the initial connection offer. And in all cases, the connection offer must be paid prior to initial connection.
- 2.17 **Question 6**
- 2.18 One responder suggested that Criterion 4 should be assessed as 'Low' if it is simply the provision of a ramped capacity profile to be consistent with the weighting assigned to Criterion 2. The Working Group agreed that this should be discussed further.
- 2.19 A number of responders suggested having a regular review, however it was noted that to have a regular review this would need to be raised a new CP in order to do this.
- 2.20 **Question 7**
- 2.21 Eight responders agreed that the quantitative values for measuring Criteria 1,2,3 and 6 are suitable; however, there was additional feedback provided by other responders, including the request for evidence for the values used.
- 2.22 Based on the feedback of the response, the Working Group agreed that the qualitative measures used for the Criterion will need to be reviewed.
- 2.23 **Question 8**
- 2.24 All bar one responder agreed with the Working Groups decision to not take forward the criteria identified in Section 4.60 of the Consultation. One responder suggested consideration of a materiality threshold.
- 2.25 **Question 9**
- 2.26 The Working Group agreed that BU-UK's feedback around having a separate change for amendments to Schedule 32, requires consideration. If this change has ramifications beyond speculative developments, then introducing the Schedule 32 changes as a standalone proposal makes sense.
- 2.27 **Question 10**
- 2.28 All responders did not have any further comments on the proposed legal text for Schedule 32, with the additional feedback of considering the inclusion of a Phased Capacity Site.
- 2.29 **Question 11**

2.30 All of the responders agreed that the draft legal text delivers the intent of the Ofgem Direction; however, NPg have proposed amendments for the Working Group to consider that they believe will not alter the intent.

2.31 **Question 12**

2.32 All responders agreed that the proposal better facilitates the DCUSA Charging Objectives.

2.33 **Question 13**

2.34 The majority of responders were not aware of any wider industry impacts of this CP. One responder stated that DCP 389 may be impacted due to amendments to Schedule 32. Another responder noted that Ofgem's proposed DUoS SCR will have material interactions with this CP.

2.35 The Working Group agreed that there needs to be a review of the wider industry impacts.

2.36 **Question 14**

2.37 All responders agreed with the Working Group's proposed implementation date.

2.38 It was noted that the change will require two charging methodologies to be in use for a period of time. This will need to be considered and the implementation details refined.

2.39 One Working Group member stated that their reading of SLC 13 is that this SLC clearly states that a singular CCCM should be in place at any given time. Whereas, from the 1st of April 2023, two separate CCCMs may need to be live and applicable based on the application date.

2.40 Ofgem agreed to take an action to consult internally around licences and feedback to the Working Group.

**ACTION 17/01: Ofgem to consult internally around licences and feedback to the Working Group.**

2.41 **Question 15**

2.42 One responder suggested that the number of scored criteria should be considered for the score to be deemed conclusive.

2.43 The Working Group agreed to review the current criteria for Speculative Assessment (i.e., reduce the current number of criteria down to 3 or 4 / review criteria 4).

2.44 The Chair agreed to take an action to group together all of the relevant questions following the Consultation responses and place them under relative criteria for the Working Group to review.

**ACTION 17/02: The Chair to group together all of the relevant questions following the review of the Consultation responses and place them under relative criteria for the Working Group to review.**

### 3. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

---

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

1. The Working Group to discuss and review criteria for determining a site as Speculative (Q3).
2. The Working Group to review what industry guidelines should be considered under Criterion 1 (Q4).
3. The Working Group to review other criteria for determining a site as Speculative (Q5).
4. The Working Group to review qualitative measures used for Criterion 1 (Q7).
5. The Working Group to review changes needed to Schedule 32 (Q9).
6. The Working Group to review wider industry impacts (Q13).
7. The Working Group to review current criteria for Speculative Assessment (i.e., reduce to 3 or 4 criterion & review criterion 4) (Q15).

### 4. Date of Next Meeting

---

4.1 The next Working Group meeting will be held on 20 September 2022 at 2pm.

## APPENDIX A

---

### New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
17/01	Ofgem to consult internally around licences and feedback to the Working Group.	Working Group	<b>Ongoing.</b>

### Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
17/02	The Chair to group together all of the relevant questions following the review of the Consultation responses and place them under relative criteria for the Working Group to review.	Working Group	<b>Closed.</b>