

# DCP 325 Working Group Meeting 14

22 October 2024 at 10:00am

Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Blessing Ekpe [BE]	SSE
Chris Ong [CO]	UKPN
Ed Grimsey [EG]	BU-UK
Kara Burke [KB]	NPg
Karl Maryon [KM]	Drax
Rebecca Nock [RN]	National Grid
Simon Vicary [SV]	EDF
Victoria Burkett [VB]	SSE
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
<b>Apologies</b>	
Dave Wornell [DW]	National Grid

## 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 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 collated RFI responses within the Working Group and agree next steps.

## 3. Review of Draft RFI Document

---

- 3.1 The Chair presented the collated RFI responses on screen for the Working Group to review.
- 3.2 The key updates can be found below:
- 3.3 **Q1**
- 3.4 The Chair informed the group that there were 8 respondents to the RFI (4 DNOs, 2 IDNOs and 2 Suppliers).
- 3.5 The Chair informed the group that two DNO respondents stated that although they are obligated to produce the ARP, they do not use it. The remaining two DNOs stated they do use the ARP.
- 3.6 Both IDNO and Supplier respondents (four) confirmed they do use the ARP for information as it is really useful.
- 3.7 Following the responses, the Working Group agreed that the ARPs appear to be useful information for a variety of party categories.
- 3.8 **Q2**
- 3.9 In regard to what elements of the ARP are/are not useful, one DNO did not comment as they stated previously that they do not use the ARP (only publish).
- 3.10 Respondents that confirmed that they use the ARP stated that the forecast prices are useful and help with better understanding the tariffs. It was also mentioned that the amount of the residual revenue and the volumes and numbers of meters associated with customer type are also useful.
- 3.11 Respondents that confirmed that they use the ARP stated that there may not be any value in updating values within the ARP as there are already other means with this information available
- 3.12 The Working Group discussed the above responses and concluded that as long as the information that is currently within the ARP is available in some form (whether it be within the ARP, Schedule 15 or elsewhere), then party categories would be ok with this.
- 3.13 **Q3**

- 3.14 Respondents were asked whether they believed it would be beneficial to combine the ARP and the Cost Information Tables.
- 3.15 Out of the four DNOs, two respondents agreed that this would be beneficial to combine the two; one respondent stated they would not see a benefit in doing so, and another respondent stated that the ARP should be withdrawn, and the Cost Information Tables used moving forward. Further clarification was provided by the respondent within the meeting, who confirmed that there would be nothing to combine and believe only one should be used (the Cost Information Tables).
- 3.16 One DNO respondent did suggest that prior to any combination or merging, it must also include a proposal to amend the current publication timelines to maximise effectiveness. A member of the Working Group stated that another DNO (who did not respond to the RFI) agreed with this response in that combining the ARP and Cost Information Tables was a good approach, but only if the frequency was reduced.
- 3.17 One IDNO respondent stated that although they agree with combining the two, it was worth noting that with the potential implementation of DCP 437 '*To Shorten the DUoS Pricing Notice Periods*' may improve efficiency and usefulness of the information contained within the ARP. The Working Group discussed this but noted that the difference may not be that significant as the reduction in notice periods will only be going from 15 months to 14 months.
- 3.18 The other IDNO respondent agreed with combining both the ARP and the Cost Information Tables.
- 3.19 Both Supplier respondents confirmed that they agree with the combination of both documents so long as the information that is currently within the ARP remains available.
- 3.20 **Q4**
- 3.21 In regard to any other comments, one respondent stated that currently the ARP and Schedule 15 uses two different sets of charging years, which needs to be addressed. The Working Group agreed that this is something that does need to be considered.
- 3.22 Another respondent stated that the revenue breakdown currently in ARP/Cost Information Tables is the ED1 version and is out of date. It was noted that DCP 421 '*Update the Tables in schedule 15 of DCUSA*' is currently in progress to address this in line with ED2.
- 3.23 One respondent stated that the frequency and timing of when the data is published is important for them. Ideally, they would like to have the data being published at or around the same time as when the final rates are published.
- 3.24 Another respondent stated that they believe that the current ARP provision fulfils the aims of DCP086 and has succeeded in enabling the benefits described and its provision should be continued.
- 3.25 One member of the group stated they believe the two documents should be combined as it would make it as simple as possible for all party categories to use.
- 3.26 The Working Group discussed the above responses and agreed that it may be beneficial to outline alternative approaches within the Consultation for wider industry to respond to as ultimately it comes down to whether those who use the ARP will be able to get the information they need from a preferred approach.

## 4. Review of Draft Consultation

- 4.1 After reviewing and discussing the above RFI responses, the Working Group it would be beneficial to begin drafting the Consultation document.
- 4.2 The Working Group discussed the frequency of reporting and agreed that the dates themselves are probably more important as opposed to the frequency of the reporting itself.
- 4.3 Reporting three times a year seems to be the most popular frequency within the Working Group. One member suggested that April, September and November would be useful. It was queried within the group whether there would be much difference between the September and November reporting and suggested different reporting dates should be considered.
- 4.4 After further discussion, the Working Group agreed that reporting in April, September and December/January (at the same time as the charges, also dependant on DCP 437). It was also agreed to include a hyperlink to DCP 437 within the Consultation for ease of respondents.
- 4.5 One member queried whether its worth considering asking questions around the current ENA calls that run within the Consultation. It was confirmed that this was on the list of considerations within the original change proposal.
- 4.6 The Chair mentioned that DCP 421 did look into this, however it may not be in as much detail as may be required for this change. Following this, the Chair agreed to take an action to review what information was included around the ENA calls under DCP 421 and report back to the Working Group.

**ACTION 14/01: The Secretariat to review what information was included around the ENA calls under DCP 421 and report back to the Working Group.**

- 4.7 The Working Group agreed to include the below questions:
  - *Which of the two options referenced within this Consultation do you prefer? Option A – Combining the ARP and Cost Information Tables or Option B – Publication of Cost Information Tables and populated CDCM with no ARP.*
  - *For option A – If the tables are to be combined, what information would need to be added to the Cost Information Tables from the ARP to ensure all users have got the right access to the data required?*
  - *For Option B – What data items from the ARP would need to be retained within the Cost Information tables and/or populated CDCM to ensure all users have got the right access to the data required?*
  - *If you believe the templates should be combined and/or that the years should be aligned, should the years included be aligned to what is currently in Clause 35A, Clause 35B or some other years (please provide if other)? Please provide your rationale.*
  - *Would a change to the current publication timetable be beneficial? If so, publications on the last working days of April, September and the month of publication of final tariffs be appropriate? Is there another publication timetable that would be more appropriate? Please provide rationale.*

- *Do you find the meetings convened under Clause 35A (known as the 'DCP 066A teleconference) useful?*
- *Are there many improvements that should be made, such as submitting questions in advance or use of an online tool such as Slido?*
- *Who should be responsible for hosting them – the ENA, the DCUSA Secretariat or someone else?*
- *Should the meetings be held on a fixed day? Please provide your rationale.*

4.8 After further discussion, the Chair agreed to take an action to draft the Consultation and circulate to the Working Group for review prior to the next meeting.

**ACTION 14/02: The Secretariat to draft the DCP 325 Consultation 2 and circulate to the Working Group for review prior to the next meeting.**

## 5. Work Plan and Next Steps

---

5.1 The workplan will be updated after each meeting.

5.2 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:

- The Secretariat to issue the draft Consultation 2 document to the Working Group for review post-meeting.

## 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 – 05 November 2024

---

7.1 The next Working Group meeting will be held on 05 November 2024 at 10am.

## 8. Attachments

---

- Attachment 1\_DCP 325 Work Plan

## APPENDIX 1

---

### New and open actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
<b>14/01</b>	The Secretariat to review what information was included around the ENA calls under DCP 421 and report back to the Working Group.	Secretariat	<b>New Action.</b>
<b>14/02</b>	The Secretariat to draft the DCP 325 Consultation and circulate to the Working Group for review prior to the next meeting.	Secretariat	<b>New Action.</b>

### Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
<b>13/01</b>	The Secretariat to issue the final RFI document to wider industry on 23 September 2024 for further feedback.	Secretariat	<b>Closed.</b>

---