

DCP 420 Working Group Meeting 06

26 March 2024 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Simon Vocary [SV]	EDF
Louise Robinson [LR]	ESP UG
David Fewings [DW]	Inenco
Brian Clark [BC]	SSE
Eleanor Suter [ES]	BU-UK
Andrew Nosworthy [AN]	Osprey Charging Network Ltd
Donna Jamieson [DJ]	IDCSL
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Generation
David Wornell [DW]	National Grid
Chris Ong [CO]	UKPN
James Jones [JJ]	SSEN
Joe Boyle [JB]	SPEN
Rustam Ellis-Majainah [REM]	OVO
John Harmer [JH]	WatersWye
Tony Collings [TC]	Ecotricity

Observers	
Thomas Holderness [TH]	Ofgem
Code Administrator	
Richard Colwill [RC]	Secretariat
Craig Booth [CB]	Chair

1. Administration

Recording

- 1.1 The Chair asked members if they were comfortable for this Working Group to be recorded. No members objected to this request. The purpose of this recording is purely to aid the Technical Secretariat in producing an accurate report of the meeting. The recording will be deleted after 15 Working Days.

Competition Law Guidance and Terms of Reference

- 1.2 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.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was to review and discuss the options put forward.

3. Actions Review

- 3.1 The Working Group reviewed the open actions and an update is provided in Appendix 1.

4. Review information from ChargeUK

- 4.1 It was noted that at the time of this meeting no information from ChargeUK had been shared. Members agreed that this information was essential to progress the conversations and were disappointed this had not been circulated before the meeting.

Post meeting note

- 4.2 On the same day of the meeting ChargeUK provided some case studies to the Secretariat, apologising for the delay. There may have been some crosswires on the deadlines and the Secretariat will ensure that appropriate attendance is at the next meeting.
- 4.3 Members agreed to reschedule the meeting via doodle poll post meeting.

5. Approach and Next Steps

- 5.1 The Chair will contact Charge UK to check their availability to attend a Working Group meeting and then issue a Doodle Poll.

6. Any Other Business

- 6.1 No other business was raised.

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/05	MM to reach out to DESNZ, providing an overview of the issue raised in DCP 420 and seeking initial views on how best to address.	Secretariat	Ongoing – See below update
	DESNZ facilitated the OZEV view on DCP420 summarised within the email below. DESNZ are open to targeted discussions with Code Admin.		
03/02	Ofgem to review whether this issue goes against the original intent TCR and whether it is now unintendedly setting price signals.	Ofgem	Ongoing – See below update
	<p>The residual charges are not supposed to send signals for how the networks should be used and as a result in the TCR we concluded that residual charges will apply to Final Demand consumers only, and that they would take the form of fixed charges, levied on a per-site basis for all households and businesses.</p> <p>In our TCR Decision and throughout the industry engagement activities we acknowledged that although the modelling used to support our TCR decision was conducted across the widest possible user archetypes, this list was finite and therefore Ofgem would be and are open to considering evidence where the TCR Decision is having unintended consequences and have invited industry to consider such cases and propose solutions to rectify them via the code modification process.</p> <p>DCP420 is one such mod which whilst identifying a potential unintended consequence of the TCR on a user archetype not captured within the TCR modelling, it goes on to propose a solution of ‘a change to the definition for certain EV charging sites from final demand site to non-final demand’, which raises concerns regarding fairness. We would recommend the WG consider (i) whether a code mod is the appropriate platform to resolve this issue or whether it would be better served by government</p>		

	support initiatives for this user archetype. (ii) If a code mod is the preferred solution for this issue, maybe explore the pros/cons of alternative solutions such as:- <ul style="list-style-type: none">• volumetric based reductions;• unmetered sites which do not pay standing or capacity charges and are only billed in volumetric terms.		
05/01	Reach out to GreenSync to understand how it validates EV chargers.	Harry Hailwood	Ongoing
05/02	Reach out to DESNZ to discuss the points raised by the Working Group.	Wesley Scott	Closed
05/03	Invite Charge UK to the next meeting and to check if they have, or can gather, views on the issues being faced by their members.	Chair	Closed

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update
02/01	Chair to share the links to the research papers with the Working Group.	Chair	Closed
02/03	Chair to follow-up the email sent by Pembrokeshire Council to see if other councils had been contacted.	Chair	Closed
02/04	Chair to draft the RFI question(s) and circulate to the WG for review.	Chair	Closed
02/05	GM to flag this CP to the TNUoS task force.	GM	Closed
04/01	The Chair to determine if a CUSC modification would be required based on the proposed solution above.	Chair	Closed
01/03	The proposer (DW) to contact the local council to see if they have other examples of EV charging sites where the fixed charges are currently making the sites unviable.	Proposer (DW)	Closed – lack of responses
04/02	The DNOs to check whether identifying and assessing the viability of these sites is something they could do.	DNOs	Closed
03/03	The Chair to update the DCP 420 Work Plan once more information has been gathered.	Chair	Closed
02/02	Chair to review the research papers.	Chair	Closed