

DCUSA SIG Meeting 154 Minutes

22 March 2024 at 10:00am: Web Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Kevin Woollard [KW]	British Gas
Edda Dirks (ED)	SSEG
Simon Vicary (SV)	EDF
Victoria Burkett(VB)	SSE
Charlotte Precious [CP]	Energy Assets
Emily Waters (EW)	BUUK
Kwaku Larbi (KL)	Valda Energy
Lade kanle (LK)	Scottish Power
Jacqui Fellows(JF)	Valda Energy
Sheereen Ahmed (SA)	Energy Assets
Code Administrator	
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Andy Green (AG) (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink

1. Administration

- 1.1 SIG members reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance”. All members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair advised the meeting would be recorded and asked the Working Group if there were any objections to this. It was explained that the recording would be deleted 15 working days after the Working Group meeting. There were no objections.
- 1.3 The Chair provided an update on the outstanding issues raised and these updates can be found within Attachment 1 SIG_Issues Log_240322_02.

2. DIF 74 ‘Proposal to increase the number of allowed alternatives’

- 2.1 SV provided an overview of the issue raised within Attachment 2 DCUSA-Issue-Form -Number of Alternatives.
- 2.2 SV explained that the rationale for the change was to provide the industry with an additional alternative solution for DCUSA changes as in the past some changes have come up against challenges

where a fourth solution had been identified but not allowed as the DCUSA only allowed for three solutions to be voted on for each Change Proposal (CP).

- 2.3 SV gave DCP 406 and 406A as an example of the issue explaining that the change required two variable elements to the solution which required voting against but as the DCUSA process only allowed for the original solution and two alternatives a work around had to be created which led to some confusion and additional meetings to explain the approach that had to be taken in order to allow for a fourth solution to be voted on.
- 2.4 It was noted that the two variable solutions for DCP 406 and 406A were agnostic to one another, but both required to be voted against.
- 2.5 The Chair raised that the Authority are looking at governance processes across the industry and all industry codes, including the change process so if it was agreed to raise a DCUSA change for DIF 74, the Authority may need to be informed of this.
- 2.6 SV noted that he was aware of this piece of work and that it was looking at the future governance for new energy codes and not the current processes so this change should be able to be progressed if the SIG agreed the issue warranted future investigation.
- 2.7 ED raised a challenge stating that DCUSA Consultations do not limit the number of solutions offered and that this stage is where the options within the change report are usually reduced to the proposer's solution and two alternatives.
- 2.8 It was explained that whilst this is usually the case, for DCP 4006 and DCP 406A, it was agreed that voting was required to be conducted on whether a new exception was required and also if an existing exception required amending within schedule 22. The second part of the solution addressed whether the definitions for Demand and Generation should follow the TRC or not.
- 2.9 It also noted that the Authority had directed that the above approach was taken and after seeking advice from legal professionals, it was agreed that two separate CPs needed to be raised and this DIF was seeking to amend the DCUSA so if this scenario happened again, it could be catered for in one CP and change report.
- 2.10 It was highlighted that if this issue is taken forwards to a formal CP, some analysis would be helpful to show how many changes over an agreed window had been taken to the voting stage with one or two alternative solutions.
- 2.11 It was agreed within the SIG that whilst the DCUSA have a history of chairing changes effectively, there have been instances in other codes where a number of different solutions have been raised to resolve an issue and this has sometimes led to a change in intent of the CP as the alternative solutions had led to some scope creep.
- 2.12 RC advised that some wording could be drafted to support DUCSA Chairs at the start of any Working Groups to highlight the intent of the CP and to keep Working Groups focus on the specific issues raised.
- 2.13 It was also raised that the SIG was being utilised regularly and that these issues have usually had a degree of discussion before a CP is raised which also mitigates the risk of Working Groups raising alternative solutions purely because the process allows this to happen.
- 2.14 It was queried if the views of the DCUSA panel could be sought before a CP is raised as to whether they believed a change was required and if the DCUSA panel had any insight on how any potential solution could look.

- 2.15 It was agreed that the DCUSA panel usually wouldn't direct Working Groups as to what approach they should take and that the consultation and voting stages would be where they would share their views.
- 2.16 SV advised the SIG that after discussing the issue he'd raised; his intention was to raise a formal CP to increase the number of alternatives from three to four and that any other changes to the process would be out of scope within the CP that he seeking to raise.

3. Any Other Business

- 3.1 No other business was raised.

4. Date of Next Meeting:

The next SIG meeting will take place on 26 April 2024 at 10:00am, via Microsoft Teams.