

# DCP 422 Working Group - Meeting 01

01 June 2023 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Brian Hoy [BH]	ENWL
Clare Wagstaffe [CW]	SSE
Damian Clough [DC]	SSE Gen
David Williams [DW]	SSE
Kyle Smith [KS]	Western Power
Kyran Hanks [KH]	Waters Wye
Lee Wells [LW]	NPg
Martin Brace [MB]	UKPN
Robert Matta [RM]	SPEN
Simon Vicary [SV]	EDF
Tracey Taylor [TT]	ENWL
Victoria Burkett [VB]	SSE
William Topping [WT]	National Grid
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
George Kestner [GK]	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC] (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 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 and discuss the DCP 422 Change Proposal and draft legal text within the Working Group and agree next steps.

## 3. Overview of DCP 422

---

- 3.1 The Chair introduced the proposer [BH] to provide an overview of the CP to the Working Group.
- 3.2 BH explained that the purpose of this CP is to make clarifications and corrections to the legal text developed to implement Ofgem’s Access SCR direction.
- 3.3 The change are a mix of corrections (spellings, cross references etc) and clarifications. The clarifications are there to remove ambiguity or potential confusion but do not change the policy intent set out in Ofgem’s Access SCR Decision and Direction. The CP is also raised to remove Part A of the CCCM as this is no longer needed.

## 4. Review and Discussion of DCP 422 and Draft Legal Text

---

- 4.1 The Chair invited the Working Group to both review and further discuss the CP and draft legal text. Updates to the draft legal text were made live during the meeting and can be found as **Attachment 1**.
- 4.2 The key points can be found below:
  - KS raised a concern around exception 5, whereby the example shows to primary substations; however, it is suggested that this should include adding additional feeders. BH stated that the examples are there to illustrate the policy. The example may show that the connection is between two primary substations, however, this does not exclude others such as additional feeders.
  - KS further explained that in every instance where a Customer is given a new feeder linking back to an existing feeder, one leg is always going to be considered as reinforcement if any minor reinforcement is carried out on the existing feeder. BH confirmed that the intent was to prevent Customers from gaining free extension assets, and in the example provided, it looks like the Customer is not receiving a free connection.
  - Following this discussion, it was agreed that this concern may need further discussion to gain a better understanding; however, this may be more appropriate as a separate CP to DCP 422.
  - KS raised an additional concern around how Customers asking for both demand and generation are treated when the reinforcement is down to the generation only. KS suggested that an example is included to address this. BH agreed that this may be beneficial to clarify this, however this may also be more appropriate to be raised as a separate CP.

- The Chair confirmed that these discussions can be revisited once new CPs are received by DCUSA.
- The Chair shared the draft legal text with the Working Group for further review and amendments to the document were made live.
- In regard to paragraph 2.3, the Working Group agreed to amend the below:
  - (ii) half-hourly metered data from generation connected to or downstream of the asset to be reinforced.
  - (iv) half-hourly data from battery storage connected to or downstream of the asset to be reinforced.
- The Working Group agreed to all other housekeeping changes within Schedule 22 Part A.
- The Working Group reviewed Schedule 22 Part B of the draft legal text.
- In regard to paragraph 1.16, the Working Group reviewed the additional wording added by both BH and LW in relation to the High-Cost Project Threshold. The Working Group reviewed the examples to see if they would still align with the amendments made.
- It was noted that there are a number of updated diagrams that will need to be added to the examples – the Secretariat took an action to complete this post-meeting.
- The Working Group discussed example 10 and agreed to change ‘LV Extension Assets’ to ‘LV Mains Service’.
- In regard to example 14, the Working Group reviewed the calculations, and updated them to ensure the figures were below the High-Cost Project Threshold (as they originally exceeded it).
- One member noted that the definition of ‘Curtailed Connection’ differs between Schedule 2D and the CCCM. After further discussion, the Working Group agreed that the definition within Schedule 2D legal text will take precedent if others were to change and added the wording ‘in accordance with DCUSA Schedule 2D’ to the current definition of ‘Curtailed Connection’. It was also agreed to amend the word ‘reduced’ to ‘restricted’ within the same definition.
- The Working Group reviewed paragraph 1.17 and agreed that it would be more appropriate to move it to 1.21 within the draft legal text.
- In regard to Criterion 2 for Speculative Developments, LW raised a concern that although highly unlikely, it would be possible for a Customer could have over 5000 dwellings but less than 3 permanent substations – due to the current options being ‘or’ statements, a Customer could score significant points in both the ‘speculative’ and ‘non-speculative columns (which was not the intent).
- Due to the above concern, it was suggested that either a change needs to be made so this situation is avoided or accept that this can happen and when it does, the points would cancel each other out.
- After further discussion, the Working Group agreed due to the low percentage of the situation occurring, the wording should remain as is.
- LW also suggested that Criterion 3 should not include IDNOs as this could score them as Speculative without a phasing plan – this was further discussed and agreed that this has not caused any issues to date, and therefore the wording should remain the same. If the

methodology was to be changed, the Working Group agreed that a separate CP should be raised to discuss the potential solution.

4.3 The Chair agreed to finalise the draft legal text and circulate to the Working Group for a final review. Once this has been reviewed by the Working Group, the draft legal text will be sent for legal review. The Change Report will then be drafted, with the aim of presenting this at the DCUSA Panel being held on 21 June 2023 and out for voting on 23 June 2023. The proposed implementation date is set at 01 August 2023.

4.4 The Working Group noted that it may be more appropriate to have a two-week voting period as opposed to three-weeks. The Chair agreed to confirm this with the DCUSA Panel at the June meeting.

**ACTION 01/01: The Secretariat to make the necessary updates to the draft legal text post-meeting and circulate to the Working Group for review.**

**ACTION 01/02: The Secretariat to draft the Change Report to present at the June DCUSA Panel.**

4.5 The Working Group were happy with the above approach.

## 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 update the draft legal text and circulate to the Working Group for review.
2. The Secretariat to send the draft legal text for legal review.
3. The Secretariat to draft the Change Report.
4. The Secretariat to present the DCP 422 Change Report at the June DCUSA Panel.

## 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 Working Group agreed that an additional meeting will not be necessary.

## 8. Attachments

---

- Attachment 1\_DCP 422 Draft Legal Text
- Attachment 2\_DCP 422 Draft Change Report
- Attachment 3\_DCP 422 Workplan

## APPENDIX A

---

### New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update

### Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
<b>01/01</b>	The Secretariat to make the necessary updates to the draft legal text post-meeting and circulate to the Working Group for review.	Secretariat	<b>Closed.</b>
<b>01/02</b>	The Secretariat to draft the Change Report to present at the June DCUSA Panel.	Secretariat	<b>Closed.</b>