

# DCP 442 Working Group - Meeting 07

25 March 2025 at 13:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Gen
Lee Wells [LW]	NPg
Michael Allison [MA]	SSE
Monique Pereira [MP]	Indigo Networks
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark
Sven Hoffmann [SH]	National Grid
Tracey Taylor [TT]	ENWL
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
Craig Booth [Chair] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink

## 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 The Working Group reviewed the previous meeting minutes and agreed them to be an accurate reflection of the discussions held.
- 1.3 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 both the draft Consultation and the draft legal text within the Working Group and agree next steps.

### 3. Review Draft Consultation

- 3.1 The Chair presented the draft Consultation on screen for the Working Group to further discuss. This can be found as **Attachment 1**.
- 3.2 The key points can be found below:
- 3.3 LW presented the updated version of the draft Consultation with his recent changes to the Working Group for further review.
- 3.4 LW walked through the updates under paragraphs 1.9 with the Working Group. In relation to paragraph 1.9.2, ED suggested they do not quite agree with the description provided. LW explained that if the DNO has to pay the Customer to curtail, why would someone accept less than what that Customer is going to be paid.
- 3.5 In relation to paragraph 1.9.6, ED suggested that this should not sit within a list of impracticalities of providing an enduring curtailable connection. LW confirmed that he is happy to separate this particular paragraph from the list, however, is ultimately trying to state that there is the potential for a Customer to have to breach its contract to get an enduring curtailable connection. Following this discussion, it was agreed to add wording to state (*i.e., requests an enduring Curtailable Connection at a later date*).
- 3.6 In relation to paragraph 1.9.1, SH stated that the only changes that would impact on the validity of the curtailment limit are all future changes. Those future changes may be subsequent connection applications further down the LIFO (Last-In, First-Out) queue, and should not impact the Customer that the curtailment connection has been offered to. Another future change would be background load changes. Standard connected Customers are protected against background load changes. With that being said, it was queried why a curtailable connected Customer would be treated any different – LW stated that they do not believe DUoS Customers should pay the remaining amount (when a Customer is knowingly not contributing) when the charging rules state that they should.
- 3.7 LW explained that the list of impracticalities has been written in a way as to not provide a 'likeliness' to happen, but more to add that these are situations that are allowed to happen due to the way the provisions are written. SH confirmed that the provisions are exposing risks that were not intended or anticipated to, but queries whether this change is the right route to take to address these risks.
- 3.8 In relation to paragraph 1.9.2, TT queried whether the wording needs to be enhanced if this is not the most likely approach that would be taken to procure flexible services – LW stated that this was written this way intentionally, however, is happy to include an alternative option of completing reinforcements if desired. Following this, LW agreed to take an action to add additional wording to paragraph 1.9.2 to explain the alternative approach of progressing reinforcement.

**ACTION 07/01: LW to add additional wording to paragraph 1.9.2 to explain the alternative approach of progressing reinforcement.**

- 3.9 LW has mentioned previously that there is a change he is planning to progress in relation to Curtailment Limits in the near future – ED queried whether it would make more sense to progress that change first and put the current change on hold to see what the outcome of that change would be first before progressing any further. LW reiterated his previous view in that he was conscious in

his decision-making and believes this current change has an immediate solution, whereas the other change around Curtailment Limits is a more open-ended solution-based change which could take far longer to progress. LW confirmed that his decision remains the same to progress this current change first.

3.10 LW presented a number of minor changes under section 4 of the draft Consultation for the Working Group to review. The Working Group were happy with these minor changes with no further feedback.

3.11 The Working Group were happy with the deletion of both paragraphs 4.7 and 4.13.

3.12 Following the above discussions, LW agreed to make the necessary changes to the draft Consultation to reflect discussions held and circulate to the Working Group for review prior to the next meeting.

**ACTION 07/02: LW to make the necessary changes to the draft Consultation to reflect discussions held and circulate to the Working Group for review.**

## 4. Review Draft Legal Text

4.1 The Working Group discussed and agreed that it would be more beneficial to review and finalise the draft legal text during the next meeting once the updated draft Consultation has been circulated.

## 5. Work Plan and Agree Next Steps

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

- LW to make the necessary updates to the draft Consultation and circulate to the Working Group for review.
- The Secretariat to make any necessary updates to the Work Plan offline.

**ACTION 07/03: The Secretariat to make any necessary updates to the Work Plan offline.**

## 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 – 13 March 2025

7.1 The next Working Group meeting will be held on 13 March 2025 at 10am.

## 8. Attachments

- Attachment 1\_DCP 442 Draft Consultation
- Attachment 2\_DCP 442 Draft Legal Text
- Attachment 3\_DCP 442 Work Plan

## APPENDIX A

### New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
<b>06/02</b>	LW to provide additional wording for paragraph 4.23 of the draft Consultation for the Working Group to review.	LW	<b>Ongoing.</b>
<b>07/01</b>	LW to add additional wording to paragraph 1.9.2 to explain the alternative approach of progressing reinforcement.	LW	<b>New Action.</b>
<b>07/02</b>	LW to make the necessary changes to the draft Consultation to reflect discussions held and circulate to the Working Group for review.	LW	<b>New Action.</b>
<b>07/03</b>	The Secretariat to make any necessary updates to the Work Plan offline.	Secretariat	<b>New Action.</b>

### Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update
<b>05/01</b>	The Secretariat to cross check TT's notes alongside the recording of the previous meeting and update paragraph 3.14 as necessary.	Secretariat	<b>Closed.</b>
<b>05/02</b>	The Secretariat to cross check the recording of the previous meeting and update paragraphs 3.24/3.25 as necessary.	Secretariat	<b>Closed.</b>
<b>05/03</b>	The Secretariat to check the recording of the previous meeting to clarify whether the sentence in paragraph 5.1 was added in error.	Secretariat	<b>Closed.</b>
<b>06/01</b>	ED to update and finalise option 4 of the 'out of scope' table of options offline for the Working Group to review.	ED	<b>Closed.</b>

06/03

LW to reword the introductory wording for paragraph 1.9 of the draft Consultation for the Working Group to review.

LW

Closed.