

DCP 444 Working Group Meeting 03

25 October 2024 at 13:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Thomas Alexander [TA]	SSEN
Colin Berry [CB]	Elexon
Donna Jamieson [DJ]	IDCSL
Philip Mark [PM]	SSEN
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark
Peter Waymont [PW]	UKPN
Code Administrator	
Richard Colwill [RC]	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.

Apologies

- 1.2 No apologies were received ahead of the meeting.

Competition Law Guidance and Terms of Reference

- 1.3 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.

Minutes of the previous Meeting & Action Log

- 1.4 No comments on the minutes. Updated action log can be found in appendix 1.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was to review the DCP 444 consultation responses and to consider the next steps.

3. Review Draft Consultation Document

- 3.1 The Working Group reviewed the consultation responses. The collated consultation responses along with Working Group feedback can be found in Attachment 1. A summary of the discussions can be found below:

Do you understand the intent of DCP 444?

- 3.2 All respondents understood the intent of DCP 444.

Are you supportive of the principles of DCP 444?

- 3.3 All respondents were supportive of the principles of DCP 444.

Which of the four options do you prefer? Please provide your rationale.

- 3.4 The Working Group reviewed the responses and noted that four respondents were in favour of option 1, one respondent was in favour of option 3 and two respondents were in favour of option 4.

Do you see value in receiving the II data in the REP-002/A/B for forecasting purposes?

If so, should it also be billed for consistency

- 3.5 The views on whether the data would be beneficial for forecasting purposes were mixed, with 3 believing it would be of benefit, three stating they did not see any benefits and one stating their current analysis is inconclusive on how beneficial it is for forecasting.

If a BSC Change Proposal or MHHS CR is raised to remove the II run, should the DR run also be removed?

- 3.6 Five respondents believe that if a BSC Change Proposal or MHHS CR is raised to remove the II run the DR run should also be removed. Two respondents believe that it should not be removed.

Do you consider that the proposal better facilitates the DCUSA General Objectives?

If so, please detail which of the General Objectives you believe are better facilitated and provide supporting reasons.

If not, please provide supporting reasons.

- 3.7 All respondents believe that this CP will better facilitate DCUSA General Objective 4, although one respondent stated only if option 1 was progressed. They believe the other options would have a negative impact on objective 4.

Are you aware of any wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP?

- 3.8 Most respondents stated they do not believe there are any wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP. Two mentioned the MHHS programme and that this change may impact, particularly if option 4 is progressed.

How are you impacted by the outcome of this CP?

- 3.9 All respondents stated that the solutions would impact them with varying degrees depending on the solution taken forward. With most stating that option 2 and 3 would have the most impact on IT systems.

Do you agree with the Working Group's proposed implementation date? If not, please provide your rational.

- 3.10 All respondents agree with the proposed implementation date, with the exception of one who state that if options 2, 3 or 4 are progressed then a six months lead time would be required for system changes.
- 3.11 Following review of the consultation responses, the Working Group agreed to progress with option 1 which aligned with the majority view of respondents. After further discussion, it was agreed that there was no need for DCUSA to describe how to handle these additional runs for billing purposes and subsequently the proposer, with support from the Working Group expressed they wished to withdraw the CP.

Post meeting note

- 3.12 A formal request from the proposer to withdraw DCP 444 was received on 25 October 2024 and in accordance with DCUSA Clause 11.29, an email was issued to DCUSA Contract Managers to inform them that we have received a notification requesting the withdrawal of a this CP from the DCUSA change process.
- 3.13 Standard DCUSA procedure under Clause 11.31 states that, any DCUSA Party may take ownership of a CP where the original Proposer intends on withdrawing it. Any Party who is prepared to support a CP which would otherwise be withdrawn then becomes the Proposer of the CP, thus taking ownership of the CP and its continued development. Any offers to take ownership of a CP need to be received within 10 Working Days of this notification, otherwise the CP noted above will be withdrawn in accordance with Clause 11.29.
- 3.14 Therefore, if no requests to take ownership are received by end of 11 November 2024 DCP 444 will be withdrawn

4. Any Other Business

- 4.1 No other business was raised.

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update