

## DCUSA SIG Meeting 162 Minutes

29 November 2024 at 10:00am: Web Conference

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Kevin Woollard [KW]	British Gas
Peter Waymont (PW)	UKPN
Victoria Burkett (VB)	SSE
Ladie Adekanle (LA)	Scottish Power
Edda Dirks (ED)	SSEG
Paul Fitzgerald (PF)	SSE
Peter Douglas (PD)	Ethical Power
Rebecca Nock (RN)	NGED
Fraser Gascoigne (FG)	NPg
Ryan Tomlin (RT)	NPg
Giannis Katsaros (GK)	ENA
Donna Jamison (DT)	IDCSL
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
Andy Green (AG1) (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill (RC) (Chair)	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 provided an update on the outstanding issues raised and these updates can be found within Attachment 1 SIG\_Issues Log\_241129\_02.

### 2. LMAs

- 2.1 The SIG started the meeting by discussing the query that VB had raised with the guidance document for load managed areas (LMAs). This document can be found within **Attachment 1 Load Managed Areas Guidance Document.**

- 2.2 VB advised that the area of concern was specifically around LLFCs for primary and secondary MPANs in LMAs. It was their understanding that in a scenario where there are primary and secondary MPANs in an LMA, both MPANs should have LLFCs that reflect that they are in a Load Managed Area.
- 2.3 It was highlighted that they had come across scenarios where this wasn't the case so one MPAN had an LLFC that identified it was in an LMA and the other related MPAN, which is on the same site didn't have an LLFC that identified it was in an LMA.
- 2.4 VB advised that they would like to gain clarity on whether it is that accurate that one of the MPANs had an LLFC showing it was in an LMA and the other not or if they should both have LLFC IDs to reflect that they're in a load managed area, if they're in a relationship.
- 2.5 PF advised that it was his understanding that they should both have the same LLFCs showing the MPANs are in LMAs however, he offered to look at these examples if VB could share them with him.
- 2.6 It was confirmed that it is possible for IDNOs to have sites in LMAs however the DNO wouldn't place any restrictions on this MPAN so this would not be an issue for IDNOs.
- 2.7 It was also noted that it would be very unlikely for a DNO to put a new network into an LMA. Due to this it was agreed an RFI wouldn't be required as this would only be an issue within SSEN so a bilateral conversation would be more appropriate.
- 2.8 It was agreed that VB would reach out to PF directly to share the examples rather than issuing an RFI

### 3. Embedded Capacity Register Change Request

---

- 3.1 The SIG started to discuss a house keeping change that had been highlighted in the DCUSA off the back of the Embedded Capacity Register Change Request (ECR). It was highlighted that the legal text states that any person can raise an ECR within schedule 31, it was agreed that this was how the process was intended to work so generators could raise an ECR, but later on when it came to publishing details on the website the DCUSA legal text stated Party, which would stop any none DCUSA Party member raising an ECR.
- 3.2 It was noted that where party in mentioned, it should be in lower case as this would allow none DCUSA party members, such as generators, to raise an ECR.
- 3.3 It was agreed by the SIG that this housekeeping change was required.
- 3.4 The Chair then handed over to PD to explain his ECR change request. This document can be found within **Attachment 2 Embedded Capacity Register Data Item Change Request Notice**
- 3.5 PD explained that they use the ECR a lot to understand to where grid applications are happening to understand the size and number of them.
- 3.6 PD explained the issue with the ECR is that the data is not always usable and that also because the data governance isn't robust enough to ensure that there are no duplicate entries added to the ECR.
- 3.7 PD advised that the first item on the ECR change request was to add a unique identifier for each entry to stop this duplication.
- 3.8 PD noted that the data doesn't always tell the full picture of where applications are happening or where changes are taking place.

- 3.9 PD went on to then explain the second item was the site name was an issue and gave an example of instances where the site name is just a comma.
- 3.10 PDs final point that he raised was around the geo referencing of sites and noted that there are a lot of instances where the coordinates of sites are not representative of the actual site locations.
- 3.11 It was explained that when someone applies for a grid application, the applicant is supposed to put in the coordinates of the point of connections so improving this process would be useful.
- 3.12 It was highlighted that this would support a better planning landscape and lead to more thorough site searching and landowner engagement in the long term.
- 3.13 It was noted that points 2 and 3 were around quality control and point 1 was more an actual change to the data.
- 3.14 FG agreed a consistent approach across DNOs would be useful for a unique identifier.
- 3.15 RT noted that there is an LTN Sim project and that is looking at making sure each line of data in the ECR is given a unique ID.
- 3.16 RT suggested taking this to the LTN Sim group to gather their views on how a unique identifier could be added.
- 3.17 It was noted that the first change this project should have delivered was originally this month but that has been put back a year so trying to bring this potential change forwards would be useful.
- 3.18 RT advised that he take this away and speak to their technical lead on this project to get their thoughts on how they could progress this change.
- 3.19 RC noted that another ECR change request was received in August but that was put on hold because of the LTNS project so RC requests if RT could raise this with their internal technical expert to see if this could also be progressed outside the project if the project had been delayed a year.
- 3.20 RT noted he didn't believe the site name was an issue at his organisation, but he did not the coordinates issue that was raised sometimes the duplication issue can be usually because the site is based on the point of connection, and this can sometimes be a sub station so its possible a number of sites could have the same substation of their location.
- 3.21 RC agreed to keep speaking about the ECR change requests with RT after RT had spoken to their technical lead to get some ideas on how the issues could be tackled and then these updates can be passed through to the SIG at each monthly meeting.
- 3.22 PD noted that if the unique identifier can be added this would resolve the other data governance issues as well.
- 3.23 It was agreed that this ECR change and the one that was discussed in August will be taken offline to review with the intention of continuing with the discussion in a SIG meeting in the new year.

## 4. ENA Presentation

---

- 4.1 GK was invited to walk the SIG through a presentation on a project that the ENA had kicked off with around Fuse Upgrades.

- 4.2 It was explained that the project is designed to be a national wide programme with the aim to train Meter Equipment Managers (MEMs) and potentially safe isolation providers to perform a fuse upgrade in order to accommodate any additional load resulting from the installation of a low carbon technology or from a request for a property extension.
- 4.3 GK advise that what they were hoping to get feedback from the SIG on some the questions that they had.
- 4.4 The Chair invited the SIG to comment, and it was noted that suppliers would be predominantly impacted.
- 4.5 KW noted that the IWG might be a good forum to discuss this in as there weren't potentially the right people on the SIG to provide feedback.
- 4.6 PW asked if there would be a requirement that the DNO would have to be informed if fuses had been upgraded. GK advised that this is being considered and early indication is that there will be a new data flow to inform the DNO that work had been carried out.
- 4.7 PW noted that the slides do not cover that part of the process so it would be helpful if they were updated to include this requirement as it was likely that DNOs would have questions on how they'd be informed of fuse upgrades.
- 4.8 The Chair offered to work with GK to produce an RFI for industry that covered the DNO and supplier areas to get some feedback on the how the project progresses.
- 4.9 It was agreed that an area the RFI needed to focus on would be whether DNOs would want to have prior notice to a fuse upgrade or if the notice would be after.
- 4.10 It was also agreed that this would impact both suppliers and Distributors, so the RFI needed to be issued to both categories.
- 4.11 The Chair noted that this RFI would probably be best suited if it was sent by the DCUSA rather than the ENA as the project could potentially lead to DCUSA legal text changes.
- 4.12 The SIG agreed and RC took an action to speak to GK and create an RFI for industry that would be issued by the DCUSA.

## 5. Any Other Business

---

- 5.1 No other business was raised.

## 6. Date of Next Meeting:

---

- 6.1 The next SIG meeting will take place on 13 December 2024 at 10:00am, via Microsoft Teams.

## 7. Attachments

---

- Attachment 1 Load Managed Areas Guidance Document
- Attachment 2 Embedded Capacity Register Data Item Change Request Notice