

# DCP 325 Working Group Meeting 17

13 January 2024 at 10:00am

Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Chris Ong [CO]	UKPN
Kara Burke [KB]	NPg
James Knight [JK]	Centrica
Rebecca Nock [RN]	National Grid
Blessing Ekpe [BE]	SSE
Victoria Burkett [VB]	SSE
Monique Pereira [MP]	Indigo Networks
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
<b>Apologies</b>	
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Simon Vicary [SV]	EDF
Ed Grimsey [EG]	BU-UK

## 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 and discuss the solution for the change proposal and agree on the approaches for the final outstanding topics for this CP.

## 3. Solution Discussion

---

- 3.1 The Chair went through the open actions from the last meeting and confirmed that all the actions had been completed barring action 16/03 which was for The Secretariat to draft a Change Report for the Working Group.
- 3.2 The Chair advised that as the solution was still unknown and as there were still outstanding topics that the Working Group needed to agree an approach on before a change report could be drafted.
- 3.3 The key outstanding items that the Working Group needed to agree an approach on were:
  - Who should facilitate the teleconference for the post publication review?
  - Should the above calls happen on a fixed date or have some flexibility?
  - How many times a year should the information be published?
  - What dates should the information be published?
  - Which of the two solutions should be taken forwards.

### **Who should facilitate the teleconference for the post publication review**

- 3.4 It was noted that within the consultation 4 respondents stated that the teleconference should be hosted by the DCUSA, 1 stated it should remain with the ENA, 2 had no preference and another offered no comment.
- 3.5 The Working Group agreed that the DCUSA had a structured process when it came to arranging calls with draft agenda being issued 10 working days before the call and final agenda being issued 5 working days before the call and these agendas would include all the documents/presentations so anyone joining would have plenty of up front visibility.
- 3.6 The Working Group agreed that the call should be hosted by the DCUSA secretariat and agreed to make the relevant changes to the legal text once it had also agreed on when these calls should be hosted.

### **Should the above calls happen on a fixed date or have some flexibility?**

- 3.7 The Working Group discussed the merits of whether the call should be fixed or not.
- 3.8 It was decided that whilst leaving the legal text as is, i.e. the call should take place 20 working days post publication would allow for people to manage instances where they couldn't make a fixed date, it would still be better to have the call hosted on a fixed date as people would then be able to manage their diaries in advance and set date meetings is consistent with other regular DUCSA meetings such as the Standing Issues Group (SIG), Open Panel Session and Distribution Charging Methodology Decision Making Group (DCMDG).
- 3.9 The date that the Working Group landed on was the first Thursday, at least 15 working days following publication the meeting should be convened. It was noted that this would be raised to the DCUSA legal advisors to ensure the language used in the legal text was appropriate.

### **How many times a year should the information be published?**

- 3.10 Based on the consultation responses the Working Group agreed that there should be 3 publications a year as this aligned with when the most valuable information would be available.

### **What dates should the information be published?**

- 3.11 It was agreed that the publications should be the last working days of May, September and the final day of the month of final publications of tariffs in each year.
- 3.12 May was chosen due to this allowing for time for more meaningful information being made available to DNOs which would make the publication more valuable.
- 3.13 It was also noted that the OBRs inflation figures would be able to be included in Mays publication.
- 3.14 It was advised that there is a PCFM submission made mid-August so using September made sense as this would allow for the PCFM submission to be included on the September publication.
- 3.15 The Working Group updated the legal text to state that the publications needed to be made by the final Day of May, September and the month of final publication of tariffs in each year.

### **Which of the two solutions should be taken forwards.**

- 3.16 It was noted that whilst there was a majority view for options A, there wasn't many suppliers or IDNOs who'd responded to the consultation on which solution would be better and as this change is likely to impact these two DUCSA parties most, it would be helpful if the Working Group could have further Supplier and IDNO responses to question 3A of consultation 2, "*which was a) Do you prefer Option A or Option B for the combination of requirements of Schedule 15 (the Cost Information Template) and Schedule 20 (ARP)? Please provide your rationale.*"
- 3.17 A supplier Working Group member did advise that the more information they can receive the better and noted that within the SME and I&C areas, solution A is very helpful when it comes to forecasting.
- 3.18 Due to the lack of Supplier and IDNO views the Working Group agreed to re issue to second consultation to Supplier and IDNO parties for a period of one week signposting that this change does have an impact on them and inviting them to answer question 3A as a minimum.

- 3.19 It was agreed to reissue the consultation on Friday 17 January with a closing date of 24 January to see if more Supplier and IDNO views could be sought.

## 4. Work Plan and Next Steps

---

- 4.1 The workplan will be updated after each meeting.
- 4.2 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
- The Secretariat to make the necessary updates to the draft legal text.
  - The Secretariat to reissue the second consultation to Suppliers.

## 5. Any Other Business

---

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

## 6. Date of Next Meeting – 27 January 2025

---

- 6.1 The next Working Group meeting will be held on 27 January 2025 at 10am.

## APPENDIX 1

### New and open actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
15/01	The Secretariat to speak internally around how a different timetable could be implemented for an alternate solution.	Secretariat	Ongoing.
17/01	The Secretariat to re issue the consultation to supplier and IDNO parties with a request to answer question 3A.	Secretariat	New Action.

### Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
15/02	The Secretariat to circulate the updated version of the draft Consultation 2 to the Working Group offline for a final review before issuing to wider industry on 08 November 2024.	Secretariat	Closed.
15/03	The Secretariat to seek further guidance from Gowlings in relation to Clause 35A legal text.	Secretariat	Closed.
15/04	The Secretariat to circulate the updated version of the draft legal text to the Working Group offline for a final review.	Secretariat	Closed.
15/01	The Secretariat to speak internally around how a different timetable could be implemented for an alternate solution.	Secretariat	Closed
16/01	The Secretariat to follow-up with SSEN in relation to extending the implementation date and gain a better understanding of the reasons.	Secretariat	Closed
16/02	The Secretariat to update the header of the legal text for Option A.	Secretariat	Closed