

DCP 417 Working Group - Meeting 05

25 April 2023 at 14:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Ann Burston [AB]	NPg
Christine Austin [CA]	ENWL
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Gen
Kevin Woollard [KW]	Centrica
Simon Vicary [SV]	EDF
Simon Yeo [SY]	National Grid
Observer	
Nadir Hafeez [NH]	Ofgem
Code Administrator	
Alysson Peña [AP]	ElectraLink
George Kestner [GK]	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Donna Jamieson [DJ]	Energy Assets

1. Administration

- 1.1 The Working Group reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance”. All Working Group members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.
- 1.2 It was agreed that the minutes of the last meeting were an accurate reflection of the discussions held.
- 1.3 An action log has been created and all updates are provided in **Appendix A**.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair explained that the purpose of this meeting is to review the draft Consultation and associated documents within the Working Group and agree next steps.

3. Review Draft Consultation

- 3.1 The Chair presented the draft Consultation to the Working Group for further review. An updated version can be found as **Attachment 1**. Updates to the draft Consultation were made live during the meeting.
- 3.2 The key updates can be found below:
 - The Working Group reviewed both the existing and proposed governance arrangements and were happy with the information provided within these sections.
 - The Chair presented a review of risks against solutions and mitigations table to the Working Group for further discussion.
 - Following this, the Chair suggested creating a risk matrix for respondents to indicate the likelihood of each risk and the level each risk may be. ED suggested adding a comment box for respondents to provide a rationale for each perceived risk – other Working Group members agreed to this approach; however, it was noted that the complexity of the task should be considered.
 - The Working Group agreed it would be beneficial to include all of the steps in which a Change Proposal can be challenged (i.e., Initial Assessment stage, Definition, Consultation, Change Report, Voting and Change Declaration) to provide that additional clarity for respondents.
 - It was also agreed that it would be appropriate to state that five members are needed to join a Working Group, and that the Definition phase cannot progress without this.
 - ED queried whether the formatting of the table and the information itself could be presented clearer for the respondent – the Secretariat agreed to take an action to review and improve the formatting of the Analysis table post-meeting.

ACTION 05/01: The Secretariat to review and improve the formatting of the Analysis table within the Consultation.

- The costs of Secretariat raised Change Proposals were included within the analysis table, stating that ElectraLink have confirmed that there will be no associated costs to the drafting

of CPs; however, once a CP has been approved by the Panel, the costs will be identical to that of a CP raised by a DCUSA Party (within the existing DCUSA contract) moving forward.

- In regard to the concern from one Working Group member around the current prioritisation of CPs – it was stated that the timing of Working Groups is within the hands of the industry (i.e., Working Group members) and not the proposer of the CP. With this, if the Secretariat is the proposer of a CP, they would not dictate the priority of each change and the number of meetings that are held.
- ED suggested that additional clarity is provided under 4.18, to state that prioritisation abilities of the DCUSA Panel could follow a process similar to that of the prioritisation powers the CUSC Panel has (CUSC 8.19E).
- In relation to the risk of the number of CPs raised by the Secretariat, additional wording was added to the mitigation to state that the pace of the development of a solution, whether a proposal is urgent or otherwise, is determined by the members of the Working Group. The only exception to the normal Working Group timescales is at the direction of the Authority.
- Concerns were raised around the clarity of question 9 within the draft Consultation – after further discussion the Working Group agreed to update the question to ask ‘Do you agree that the Panel should have the ability to defer or reject the progression of a Change Proposal raised by the Secretariat if it is expected to cause costs over and above the annual allocation for all DCUSA Change Proposals, unless the benefits outweigh these additional costs?’
- The Working Group discussed adding a risk matrix as an attachment to the draft Consultation as an optional task for respondents to complete. Although it may provide additional insight, members showed concerns around how beneficial the information would be at this stage. It was also mentioned that the questions that are currently within the draft Consultation, will likely provide the same information.
- It was agreed to add the question ‘do you agree with the list of potential benefits’ as respondents may have a different view on the ones provided.
- ED mentioned that preferences for the various options (for the solution) were discussed at the previous meeting, and it was agreed that these discussions should be noted within the Consultation. Following this, the Secretariat agreed to include wording to state that the Working Group discussed the potential for various deviations of this solution (i.e., the three alternate solutions).
- The Working Group agreed to include additional wording to state that ‘The Working Group also discussed variations of the Proposers solution such as only being able to raise CPs in limited situations (such as consequential and housekeeping changes or to better facilitate specific DCUSA objectives only) and/ or the Panel having additional powers to reject a Secretariat raised CP, above what currently exists in DCUSA’.
- The Secretariat agreed to take an action to update the DCP 417 timetable/Work Plan once the Consultation has been issued.

ACTION 05/02: The Secretariat to update the DCP 417 timetable/Work Plan once the Consultation has been issued.

- 3.3 After further discussion, the Secretariat agreed to take an action to produce a final draft of the Consultation to the Working Group for review, with a response deadline of 02 May 2023, with the aim of issuing the final Consultation to wider industry on 03 May 2023.

ACTION 05/03: The Secretariat to produce a final draft of the Consultation for the Working Group to review with a response deadline of 02 May 2023.

ACTION 05/04: The Secretariat to issue the final DCP 417 Consultation to wider industry on 04 May 2023.

- 3.4 The Working Group will review the Consultation responses at the next meeting being held on 13 June 2023.

4. DCP 417 Workplan

- 4.1 The Working Group reviewed the workplan for DCP 417 and agreed with the proposed dates. The updated workplan can be found as **Attachment 2**.
- 4.2 The workplan will be updated after each meeting.

5. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

- 5.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
1. The Secretariat to produce a final draft of the Consultation for the Working Group to review.
 2. The Secretariat to issue the final DCP 417 Consultation to wider industry on 04 May 2023.

6. Any Other Business

- 6.1 The Chair asked the group whether there were any other items of business to discuss.
- 6.2 There were no other items raised.

7. Date of Next Meeting

- 7.1 The next Working Group meeting will be held on 13 June 2023 at 10am.

8. Attachments

- Attachment 1_DCP 417 Draft Consultation
- Attachment 2_DCP 417 Workplan

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
05/01	The Secretariat to review and improve the formatting of the Analysis table within the Consultation.	Secretariat	Ongoing.
05/02	The Secretariat to update the DCP 417 timetable/Work Plan once the Consultation has been issued.	Secretariat	Ongoing.
05/03	The Secretariat to produce a final draft of the Consultation for the Working Group to review with a response deadline of 02 May 2023.	Secretariat	Ongoing.
05/04	The Secretariat to issue the final DCP 417 Consultation to wider industry on 04 May 2023.	Secretariat	Ongoing.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update
04/01	The Secretariat to include additional wording within the Consultation regarding the interactions with the Code Manager review, along with Consultation questions to seek wider views.	Secretariat	Closed.
04/02	The Secretariat to carry out a cross-referencing exercise with the current governance risk mitigations.	Secretariat	Closed.
04/03	The Secretariat to make the necessary updates to the draft Consultation and circulate to the Working Group for review.	Secretariat	Closed.