

# DCP 442 Working Group - Meeting 02

12 September 2024 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Gen
Gavin Stewart [GS]	SSE
Karl Maryon [KM]	Drax
Lee Wells [LW]	NPg
Mark Bellman [MB]	ENWL
Sven Hoffman [SH]	National Grid
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
Craig Booth [CB] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
<b>Apologies</b>	
Tracey Taylor [TT]	ENWL

## 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 completed actions from the previous meeting (pro’s and con’s table and alternate solution matrix) within the Working Group and agree next steps.

## 3. Review of Pro’s and Con’s Table

---

- 3.1 The Chair presented the pros and cons table (action completed prior to the meeting by LW) to the Working Group for further discussion. This can be found as **Attachment 1 (page 1)**.
- 3.2 The Key updates can be found below:
- 3.3 LW stated that the original plan was to split the table between Demand Connection and Generation Connection, however, the Working Group agreed with LW’s suggestion that ‘Connection Type’ be removed and the pros and cons generalised to avoid repetition.
- 3.4 ED queried whether the risk of ‘free-riding’ is also a risk under a flexible connection as well as an enduring curtailment connection – LW stated that yes this is correct and is mentioned within the Change Proposal (CP), however, it was noted that although this is a risk for both types of connection, it is more likely to occur for curtailable connections as they are within more condensed parts of the network as opposed to flexible connections.
- 3.5 In regard to a bespoke forecast of curtailment, GS stated that both flexible and curtailable connection Customers will both receive a curtailable assessment if they wanted to. LW further explained that by removing the curtailment limit protection, a bespoke forecast will provide a more accurate indication of their curtailment limit. It was agreed for this point to be made clearer within the table.
- 3.6 GS stated that it may not be possible to put forward an economical argument for this change if both demand and generation connections are treated separately within this table – following this, GS agreed to add extra wording to the table that better outlines this.
- 3.7 GS also mentioned that they believe the current arrangement supports the acceleration of net zero by enabling Customers to connect earlier. GS stated that these points are reasons as to why the current arrangements should be retained as opposed to a ‘con’ of the proposed change.
- 3.8 In regard to the ‘pro’ point that suggests a flexible connection can largely be ‘fit and forget’, SH suggested that this is more of a con than a pro of this change, as with a fit and forget situation, curtailment is not being actively tracked. There is then a risk that background load changes that

increase curtailment could be missed by increased curtailment, and therefore signals that indicate a need for reinforcement may potentially be missed. Following this, SH stated that it needs to be recognised that there is a reduction of the administrative load from a network point of view, however, this is at a cost of a reduction in transparency for the Customer. Both the proposer and the Working Group noted this, and LW added additional wording to the table to provide further clarity on this point.

- 3.9 SH suggested it may be worth noting that where there are discrepancies between the limit calculation and the curtailment forecast, this reflects deficiencies in the limit calculating methodology as opposed to the concept of the limit being calculated. LW agreed to add some additional words around this point.

**ACTION 02/01: GS to send LW additional wording to be added to the Pro's and Con's table.**

**ACTION 02/02: LW to make the necessary updated to the Pro's and Con's table to reflect the discussions held and circulate to the Working Group post-meeting for review.**

- 3.10 After further discussion, the Working Group agreed that it may be beneficial to issue an RFI to all DNO/IDNO parties to gain further feedback prior to sending out a Consultation.

## 4. Review of Draft RFI

- 4.1 Both the Chair and Proposer drafted an RFI during the meeting for the Working Group to further discuss and agree. This was shared on screen and edited live.
- 4.2 The key points can be found below:
- 4.3 It was suggested that it may be worth adding a note to the RFI stating that the Secretariat will aggregate and anonymise all data received within the responses to the RFI prior to sharing with the Working Group. In regard to the Consultation and Change Report, the Secretariat will articulate how many DNO and IDNO Parties responded to the RFI to make clear to voting Parties the response rates to the RFI.
- 4.4 The agreed RFI questions can be found below:
- *For connections applications received since 1 April 2023 (implementation of the Access SCR), in absolute terms, how many of the following types of offers have you made to customers:*
    - *Curtable Connection (with a Curtailment End Date)*
    - *Enduring Curtable Connection (without a Curtailment End Date, or since removed)*
    - *Flexible Connection*
    - *Non-Curtable Connection*
  - Split by:*
    - *Distribution and transmission system constraints (driver of the constraint)*
    - *Generation Connection and Demand Connection*
  - *How many of Curtable Connections have been converted to Non-Curtable Connections?*
  - *For what reasons do you offer an enduring Curtable Connection?*
  - *What is the range and average cost of Reinforcement for (i) a Curtable Connection, (ii) an enduring Curtable Connection, and (iii) a Flexible Connection?*

- *What trends do you foresee for future connections?*

4.5 After further discussion, the Secretariat agreed to finalise the RFI and issue to all DNO/IDNO Contract Managers post-meeting for further feedback.

**ACTION 02/03: The Secretariat agreed to finalise the RFI and issue to all DNO/IDNO Contract Managers post-meeting for further feedback.**

4.6 **Post-meeting note:** An attachment containing two tables was provided for respondents to complete for both questions 1 and 4.

## 5. Review of Alternate Solutions Matrix

5.1 The Proposer (LW) presented the alternate solutions matrix to the Working Group for further discussion. This can be found as **Attachment 1 (page 2)**.

5.2 The different solutions can be found below:

- *Option 1 - Enduring Flexible Connection Only (as proposed)*
- *Option 2 - Enduring Curtailable Connection at DNO/IDNO Party Discretion*
- *Option 3 - Time Limited Enduring Curtailable Connection*
- *Option 4 - Enduring Curtailable Connection with no Exceeded Curtailment Payment*
- *Option 5 - Curtailment Limit(s) Refreshed Periodically by DNO/IDNO Party*

5.3 LW walked through each of the suggested pros and cons for each solution with the Working Group.

5.4 In regard to option 1, GS suggested that a con would be resulting in treating Customers differently, however, a pro might be that it would alleviate some of the concerns that the change is trying to achieve.

5.5 SH queried whether a DNO is mandated to offer a curtailable connection if the application qualifies for one – the proposer confirmed this is the case, however, the current wording within Schedule 2D does not make this clear enough.

5.6 In regard to option 3, ED suggested it may be beneficial to Consult on this alternative solution as it still allows the current arrangement to be retained whilst incorporating the benefits of the proposed solution.

5.7 Members discussed option 4 and agreed that there would be little to no benefit in taking this option forward. As the Proposer had noted this alternative solution in the previous minutes, it had been added to the matrix for the Working Group to review. After further discussion, the Working Group ultimately agreed to remove this option as a potential alternative due to there being no merit in this being progressed.

5.8 As the Working Group collectively cannot remember discussion option 4 as a proposed alternate solution, the Secretariat took an action to look back at the previous meeting minutes to see if there was an accuracy issue and, if so, to feedback to the group.

- 5.9 In regard to option 5, ED suggested that the review should take place 'periodically'. LW suggested consulting on how often a refresh should occur to be considered appropriate.
- 5.10 LW agreed to tidy up the document and circulate to the Working Group post-meeting for any further feedback. It was agreed for any additional comments on the document to be provided no later than 20 September 2024.

**ACTION 02/04: LW to tidy up the pros and cons table and alternate solutions matrix and circulate to the Working Group for review post-meeting.**

**ACTION 02/05: Working Group members to review the pros and cons table and alternate solutions matrix and provide any additional comments no later than 20 September 2024.**

## 6. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

---

- 6.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
1. The Working Group to review the finalised pros and cons table and alternative solutions matrix and provide additional feedback.
  2. The Secretariat to circulate an RFI to all DNO/IDNO Contract Managers.

## 7. Any Other Business

---

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

## 8. Date of Next Meeting

---

- 8.1 The next Working Group meeting will be held on 04 October 2024 at 10:00am.

## 9. Attachments

---

- Attachment 1\_DCP 442 Updated Actions Document
- Attachment 2\_DCP 442 Work Plan

## APPENDIX A

### New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
02/01	GS to send LW additional wording to be added to the Pro's and Con's table.	GS	Completed.
02/02	LW to make the necessary updated to the Pro's and Con's table to reflect the discussions held and circulate to the Working Group post-meeting for review.	LW	Completed.
02/03	The Secretariat agreed to finalise the RFI and issue to all DNO/IDNO Contract Managers post-meeting for further feedback.	Secretariat	Completed.
02/04	LW to tidy up the pros and cons table and alternate solutions matrix and circulate to the Working Group for review post-meeting.	LW	Completed.
02/05	Working Group members to review the pros and cons table and alternate solutions matrix and provide any additional comments no later than 20 September 2024.	Working Group	New Action.

### Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update
01/01	The Chair [LW] to create a table of pros and cons (split between demand curtailable connection and generation curtailable connection) of this change for Customers to be included within the Consultation document.	LW	Closed.

01/02	The Chair [LW] to create a matrix of the potential alternate solutions for the Working Group to review at the next meeting.	Secretariat	Closed.
01/03	The Secretariat to make the necessary updates to the work plan timetable.	Secretariat	Closed.