

Distribution Charging Methodologies Development Group (“DCMDG”) - Meeting 88

19 June 2025 at 10:00 via Microsoft Teams

Attendees	Company
Ahna Taylor [AT]	SSE
Amanda McFarlane [AM]	Aurora Utilities
Andrew Enzor [AE]	Field Energy
Andrew Malley [AM]	Ofgem
Chris Barker [CB]	ENWL
Chris Berry [CB ¹]	SEFirst
Chris Ong [CO]	UK Power Networks
Dave Wornell [DW]	National Grid Electricity Distribution
David Fewings [DF]	Inenco
Diandra Orodan [DO]	BU-UK
Donald Preston [DP]	SSEN
Donna Jamieson [DJ]	IDCSL
Ed Grimsey [EG]	BU UK
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Generation
Emma Clark [EC ¹]	SSE
Emma Robinson [ER]	E.ON
Ephie Chalakateva [EC]	NGED
Georgia Preece [GP]	NPg
Grant Elder [GE]	SSE
Itunu Akin-Olawale [IA]	ENWL
James Knight [JK]	Centrica
Jen St Claire-Hughes	ESPUG
Joe Boyle [JB]	SPEN
Kavya Kavya [KK]	BrookGreenSupply
Kyran Hanks [KH]	WatersWye
Lee Stone [LS]	E.ON
Mark Fletcher [MF]	Shell
Matthew Smith [MS]	UKPN
Meg Wong [MW]	Stark
Monique Pereira [MP]	SSE
Nadir Hafeez [NH]	Ofgem
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark Energy
Ryan Farrell [RF]	NPg
Tony Collings [TC]	Ecotricity
Victoria Burkett [VB]	SSE Energy Supply
Zviko Chigwedere [ZC]	St Clements
Secretariat	
Craig Booth [CB ²] (TechSec)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Dylan Townsend [DT]	ElectraLink
Apologies	
No apologies	

1. Administration

- 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. The recording will be deleted after the minutes are approved.
- 1.2 The Working Group reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance” and it was noted that all members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.
- 1.3 Attendees reviewed the draft minutes from the previous meeting. No comments were made on the accuracy of the minutes.
- 1.4 The Chair provided updates on the open actions contained in the actions log which was issued with the meeting papers.

2. DCMDG Forward Work Plan and Issues Log

- 2.1 The group reviewed the DCMDG Forward Work Plan and Issues Log, during which the following points were covered:
 - 2.1.1 Action 85/04 – The Chair explained no further response was received on this, so the issue would be archived. This action was closed.
 - 2.1.2 Action 86/03 – The Chair explained an update would be given during the meeting. This action was closed.
 - 2.1.3 Action 87/01 – The Chair explained this action would remain open to monitor where/when a CP/mod gets raised.
 - 2.1.4 Action 87/02 – The Chair confirmed he had had a call with BG. This action was closed.
 - 2.1.5 Action 87/03 – The Chair explained that comms has been issued, and the guidance uploaded to the DCUSA website. This action was closed.
 - 2.1.6 Action 87/04 – The Chair noted this was a duplicate action. This action was closed.
 - 2.1.7 Action 87/05 – The Chair noted this action had previously been completed and related to the validation of data. This action was closed.

DCMDG Issues

- 2.2 The Chair noted that the DCP 420 issue had now progressed to a CP, raised as DCP 454.

3. Ofgem Update

- 3.1 AM explained that Ofgem had hosted the Charging Futures Forum (“CFF”) for 2025 and that nothing new had been discussed that had not already been discussed at the DCMDG in some form.
- 3.2 AM stated that a decision on [DCP 446 ‘Emergency Disconnections’](#) was expected to be made by the end of the month.

- 3.3 AM explained that a decision on CUSC mod [CMP441 'Reducing the credit risk of supplying non-embedded hydrogen Electrolysers'](#) was expected to be made soon.
- 3.4 AM explained that [DCP 412 'Allocation of banding for TCR Charges for 'Peak' Final Demand Customers'](#) was not yet due a decision. AM recognised that the change declaration recommends rejection of the mod but noted that it has big links to other work, such as the DUoS SCR, cost recovery work, etc., and that Ofgem will explore these other programmes to see if elements of the Change Proposal can be included there. AM noted that he had been asked whether the same was for [DCP 420 'Provide targeted relief from residual charges for electric vehicle charging sites'](#), however AM clarified that this is a more discreet change, whereas peaky sites and industrial energy use is a larger issue.
- 3.5 AM noted that the DUoS SCR is on the horizon, and that while problems and defects can be resolved through CPs, Ofgem is not keen to see design changes raised, particularly “nice to haves”.
- 3.6 AM noted that the issue of the boundary between transmission and distribution had been raised at the CFF but that nothing new, or that had not already been discussed, had been raised there. AM noted that this had been discussed at the DCMDG previously and consideration was now being given to whether a cross-code workstream or task force was appropriate for this work.

4. Connection Boundary Between Distribution & Transmission

- 4.1 The Chair gave an update that he caught up with Ben Godfrey around the potential raising of a DCUSA Change Proposal but noted the update from AM re the Charging Futures Forum and that this may need to follow a different process.
- 4.2 ED asked whether this needed to be a broader and more joined-up approach.
- 4.3 The Chair handed over to CB² for an update from the CFF. CB² explained that a workshop had been held by Roadknight Taylor, a consultancy firm, and had identified potential ways forward, such as raising a CUSC mod and socialising this at the TNUoS level, raising a DCUSA change proposal and socialising this at the DUoS level, or raising a combination of mods and looking at both TNUoS and DUoS, with pros and cons to each approach.
- 4.4 CB² noted that the slides and webinar would be available soon, at the link provided here: <https://www.neso.energy/industry-information/charging/charging-futures/charging-futures-forum>
- 4.5 ED shared a link to the TCMF slides (<https://www.neso.energy/document/362256/download>) used to explore this issue, which were used in combination with the slides shared previously at the DCMDG, to form the basis of the slides used at the Charging Futures Forum.
- 4.6 LS asked whether this would be for the sandbox.
- 4.7 AM noted that a trial would be administratively a lot more complicated and could be progressed through a change proposal/modification, a task force, etc.
- 4.8 ED asked what the way forward would be. The Chair suggested that DCUSA could facilitate the next round of discussions including DCUSA and CUSC representatives.
- 4.9 AM explained that his team has done some work on this, and this could be shared for discussion in a subgroup, if that was the way to move this forward, and agree which issues could be handled within distribution and which would be more cross-code.

- 4.10 ED stated that Ofgem had previously recognised this was an issue that needed to be dealt with, but at the time it was decided to not take further action on this, and this may be a bigger issue that a mod/CP should not try to resolve.
- 4.11 AM acknowledged this and noted that he would take this away to think about this.
- 4.12 The Chair proposed that DCUSA reach out to CUSC regarding a joint working group, using Ofgem's initial thinking and the work done so far by NGED, Roadknight Taylor etc., to agree how to take the issue forward. AM stated that he would pull together a presentation on Ofgem's thinking so far.
- 4.13 NH asked whether the cross-code steering code group, run by the REC, would be an appropriate forum. The Chair explained that the group was good for identifying the need for potential mods was a useful function of that group, but that the charging knowledge on that group would be lacking, as the discussions are usually quite high level.
- 4.14 DW asked whether this could cause pauses in new connections, if connectees were aware that connections could be done cheaper in the future. DW noted this may need to be progressed quickly.
- 4.15 AM noted that this could present a deflationary pressure and that this might need to be considered, and short-term actions could be section off from longer-term actions and progressed sooner.

Action 88/01	Chair to reach out to CUSC to coordinate the creation of a group to discuss this issue.
Action 88/02	AM to draft slides to use as an overview for the potential joint group, to go over Ofgem's thinking so far.

5. [Other Potential/Enduring Solutions for Surplus Residuals \(related to \[DCP 450 'Managing the effects of surplus residual charge in the CDCM'\]\(#\)\)](#)

- 5.1 CO gave an overview of DCP 450 and that UKPN had raised this CP to deal with the issue of negative residual, which was so significant that it caused the model to produce errors. CO explained that the guidance document for the previous charging year, which forms the basis of the proposed solution, scales asset values until such a point that the model produces valid charges. CO noted that this resolves the errors but does not remove the issue of surplus/negative residual.
- 5.2 CO explained that negative residual is not unique to UKPN's London area and that, failing a solution being in place, any DNOs affected by the issue would be forced to request a derogation from Ofgem to deviate from the model again.
- 5.3 CO explained that CEPA provided a charge movement explainer paper during its engagement with the DCP 450 Working Group, which will be included with the consultation and is attached to these minutes as attachment 2, and that it was discussed in the Working Group that it would be beneficial for this to be raised at the DCMDG. CO noted that the proposed solution under DCP 450 will deliver a very simple solution, albeit one needed in a timely manner, and would provide clarity to all parties on what DNOs are doing to resolve the issue.
- 5.4 CO stated that many options could be put on the table to resolve this, but these other options are out of scope of DCP 450. CO explained that the purpose of bringing this back to the DCMDG was to see whether there were any thoughts on other potential solutions that could be taken forward, noting the potential overlap with the DUoS SCR.

- 5.5 DW noted that Ofgem has stated that if something is broken, then it can be fixed, even if there is an SCR on the horizon. CO acknowledged this and that it had been discussed within the Working Group, and that in conversation with CEPA it was noted that tweaking other model values may not be the best approach, and to correct the issue would likely require a more wholesale review and would not be something that a Working Group can progress in a matter of months.
- 5.6 CO reiterated that the intent of the CP is to resolve it quickly, this year, to enable DNOs to produce their charges and that he believed anything beyond the “sticking plaster” solution would require a broader review.
- 5.7 LS agreed there is a short-term issue and that progressing this quickly through DCP 450 was the correct approach, and agreed that a broader review would be beneficial, for anything beyond this, as this will resolve issues with derogations being required and there being delays in DNOs publishing their charges, which has knock-on effects on other processes.

6. DCP 414 Guidance Update

- 6.1 The Chair explained that the guidance is now on the website, but that discussions had been ongoing around the way the data is communicated. The Chair explained that he had reached out to REC regarding SDEP and that they had proposed the use of the following existing process types:
 - 6.1.1 PT0030 - Address Query;
 - 6.1.2 PT0031 - Contract Manager Query;
 - 6.1.3 PT0042 - Logical disconnections;
 - 6.1.4 PT0026 - Physical disconnection General Query;
 - 6.1.5 PT0029 - MPAD amendments general query / Retrospective MPAN amendments;
 - 6.1.6 PT0064 - Supplier Data Error Resolution; or
 - 6.1.7 PT0075 - Theft General Queries.
- 6.2 Members discussed that the information must be sent to the agreed emails, to ensure it is processed and not lost in the ether.
- 6.3 VB explained that the customer data could be sent as an attachment on SDEP and the contract manager would need to know who to transfer the data to, internally, preventing the transfer of customer data via external email.
- 6.4 The Chair noted that REC are open to using existing process types, so long as it is titled correctly, and that PT0031 (Contract Manager Query) may be appropriate.
- 6.5 VB explained that it would need to be sent to the contract manager who could be informed what to do with the data when they see an appropriately titled item come through. VB explained that the customer data would be sent to a DNO's REC contract manager, and that DNO's REC contract manager would need to have been briefed on what to do with the data (i.e., who, internally, to send it to.)

- 6.6 DW noted that for NGED, the DCUSA contract manager and the REC contract manager are not the same person. DW stated that it will be important for the REC contract manager to understand this data will be received via SDEP and to know what to do with the data once it is received.
- 6.7 VB reiterated the purpose of SDEP is to allow customer data to be transferred securely, not via email, hence the proposal to use SDEP for this purpose.
- 6.8 CO explained that UKPN has concerns about using SDEP and how the contract manager communications would work, or whether the DCP 414 data would be muddled in with the other messages the contract manager would see in it. CO stated that the data could be transferred via zip file and password protected. RF agreed that he believed a password protected file would be appropriate and secure.
- 6.9 VB explained that following the implementation of the GDPR, there was a concern around sending customer data over email, and that SDEP was developed to send customer data securely. VB explained that SSE is not comfortable sending customer data over email.
- 6.10 CO stated that UKPN has received SDEP messages from a supplier with one message per MPAN, which was onerous. VB stated that SSE would use a spreadsheet to submit a single message.
- 6.11 DO asked whether any suppliers has sent anything out, as nothing had been received so far. RF noted that NPg had also not received any notifications. VB stated she would check on this and update.
- 6.12 VB asked whether REC were open to the contract manager process type being used, as this data could otherwise get lost amongst other messages. The Chair confirmed that REC had provided “recommendations” on which process types to use, but he felt the REC would be open to using other process types, such as the contract manager.
- 6.13 DO asked how soon it would be agreed whether SDEP is the mechanism.
- 6.14 The Chair noted that SSE would not be comfortable sending the data via email, but that other organisations may have different views of the risks. The Chair stated that he believed the key was to record that SDEP can be used to securely transfer the data, and gain agreement on the process type that would be used, but that it would be down to Parties to mutually agree the mechanism for communicating the data, between their contract managers, based on their own internal policies.
- 6.15 DO asked what the expectation would be for how the data is to be delivered to the correct team. VB explained that the message would be sent to the REC contract manager with an instruction to transfer this internally to the appropriate person (noting that this could be as simple as providing the internal email to send it to).

Action 88/03	Chair to reach out to REC to discuss the use of the contract manager process type in SDEP.
Action 88/04	Secretariat to update guidance document following the update received from action 88/03.

7. Site-Specific Shared Network Asset Categories

- 7.1 CB provided an overview of the issue using the slides attached to these minutes as attachment 3.
- 7.2 CB explained that where there is a transformer with 132kV on the primary side and 33kV on the other, and two customers are sharing a circuit breaker, it was not clear in the DCUSA which category codes should be used for this scenario: 1100 or 1110. CB shared the definitions of both of the categories on screen, illustrating the perceived ambiguity.
- 7.3 CB requested feedback from colleagues on this scenario and how it should be classed. EC and JB stated they would need to pass this to their engineers for feedback.

Action 88/05	DNO colleagues to pass this onto their engineers for feedback, to be fed back in DCMDG 89.
--------------	--

- 7.4 CB stated he welcomed colleagues reaching out if any further clarity was required.

8. Any Other Business

- 8.1 No other business was raised.

9. Agenda Items for the Next Meeting

- 9.1 The Chair explained that in addition to the standing items and any other issues raised, the agenda for the next meeting would include:
- Connection Boundary Between Distribution & Transmission;
 - DCP 414 Guidance – SDEP/ Other Mechanisms; and
 - Site-Specific Shared Network Asset Categories feedback.

10. DNO (“Distribution Network Operator”) Operational Matters

- 10.1 The Chair asked if there were any DNO Matters to be raised. No matters were raised.

11. Date of Next Meeting

- 11.1 The next DCMDG meeting will be held on 17 July 2025 via Microsoft Teams.

12. Attachments

- 12.1 Attachment 1 – DCMDG Action Log & Forward Work Plan
- 12.2 Attachment 2 – CEPA Charge Movement Explainer
- 12.3 Attachment 3 – Site-Specific Shared Network Asset Categories