

## Distribution Charging Methodologies Development Group (“DCMDG”) - Meeting 89

17 July 2025 at 10:00 via Microsoft Teams

Attendees	Company
Adam McNae [AM]	Brook Green
Ahna Taylor [AT]	SSE
Andrew Malley [AM]	Ofgem
Chris Berry [CB <sup>1</sup> ]	SEFirst
Chris Ong [CO]	UK Power Networks
Daniel Minifie [DM]	EDF
Dave Wornell [DW]	National Grid Electricity Distribution
David Fewings [DF]	SEFirst
Diandra Orodan [DO]	BU-UK
Dimuthu Wijetunga [DW]	Shell
Donald Preston [DP]	SSEN
Donna Jamieson [DJ]	IDCSL
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Generation
Emma Clark [EC <sup>1</sup> ]	SSE
Itunu Akin-Olawale [IA]	ENWL
James Knight [JK]	Centrica
Jen St Claire-Hughes	ESPUG
Joe Boyle [JB]	SPEN
Kara Burke [KB]	NPg
Kyran Hanks [KH]	WatersWye
Lee Stone [LS]	E.ON
Mariana Mesaros [MM]	St-Clements
Matthew Smith [MS]	UKPN
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark Energy
Ryan Farrell [RF]	NPg
Simon Vicary [SV]	EDF
Tony Collings [TC]	Ecotricity
Zviko Chigwedere [ZC]	St Clements
<b>Secretariat</b>	
Dylan Townsend [DT]	ElectraLink
Furqan Aziz [FA]	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
<b>Apologies</b>	
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:
- 2.2 **Action 87/01** – The Chair informed the group that this was raised at the CCSG and identified interaction with the CUSC. Chair will raise this again and will feedback any updates to the group at the next meeting.
- 2.3 **Action 88/01** – The Chair informed the group that the CUSC are aware of the potential mod but will inform the group of any further updates at the next meeting.
- 2.4 **Action 88/02** – AM confirmed an overview will be provided in due course with the inclusion of any potential interactions with REMA.
- 2.5 **Action 88/03** - The Chair confirmed a DCUSA CP is not needed. The Secretariat will issue an email to industry to remind them of the DCP 414 Guidance document and highlighting the use of SDEP. Action Closed.

Action 89/01	The Secretariat to issue an email to industry to remind them of the DCP 414 Guidance document and highlighting the use of SDEP.
--------------	---

- 2.6 **Action 88/04** – The Chair noted that this is an ongoing action in relation to action 88/03.
- 2.7 **Action 88/05** – The Chair noted that this will be discussed during the meeting.

### DCMDG Issues

- 2.8 The Chair noted that there are no new issues to be raised.

## 3. Ofgem Update

- 3.1 Following the previous update within the Actions section, AM informed the group that the [DCP 446 'Emergency Disconnections'](#) decision can be expected shortly.
- 3.2 AM also stated that they have also started to review [DCP 439 'Backdating Tariff Changes'](#).

- 3.3 Ofgem have also been working on EV charging issues and BAU. Discussions have also been held between Ofgem and ElectraLink in relation to the Data Transfer Service (DTS).
- 3.4 JK had a query in regard to the standing charge review; the draft determinations have come out for TNUoS with significant increases year on year – the query is whether industry is expected to do something in this space prior to April 2026. AM explained that the only expectation is for industry to follow the current TNUoS model. AM suggested that any feedback in relation to changes to the standing charges should be discussed with Ofgem who can then seek how this can be raised moving forward if urgent changes are needed.

## 4. Connection Boundary Between Distribution & Transmission

- 4.1 AM noted that work has been ongoing and have completed a triage of what should/should not be included. With the REMA update recently published, AM noted that they did not want to provide an overview of potentially out of date information, so are taking the time to investigate any potential interactions. AM confirmed an overview will be provided in due course with the inclusion of any potential interactions with REMA.
- 4.2 ED queried what the next steps are now that the [REMA update](#) has been received – AM explained that a number of users have stated they are glad this is being looked at and Ofgem want industry to continue having these discussions (with Ofgem potentially facilitating this).
- 4.3 AM also stated that the aim is to ensure that any upcoming solutions (e.g. from ongoing connection reforms) do not inadvertently create new barriers to generation connections.
- 4.4 The group were informed that the team will continue reviewing new data and checking for material changes, along with acknowledgement that the current understanding of impacts differs significantly from earlier stages due to new information.
- 4.5 The Secretariat agreed to take an action to inform the CUSC of the aim to set-up a joint group and begin this process.

Action 89/02	The Secretariat to inform the CUSC of the aim to set-up a joint group and begin this process.
--------------	---

## 5. DCP 414 Guidance Update – SDEP and Other Mechanisms

- 5.1 Re-iterating the update from the actions section, the Chair informed the group that they will issue an email to industry (REC Contract Managers) to remind them of the DCP 414 Guidance document and highlighting the use of SDEP. Action Closed.
- 5.2 LS stated that they have not yet received any feedback from other IDNOs as to where to send these to. Following this, the Secretariat agreed to send communications to IDNOs to ask them to provide their contact details to Suppliers.
- 5.3 DJ also agreed to send an email to the Independent Networks Association (INA) distribution list reminding them to provide Suppliers with their contact details.

Action 89/03	The Secretariat to send communications to IDNOs to ask them to provide their contact details to Suppliers.
Action 89/04	DJ to send an email to the Independent Networks Association (INA) distribution list reminding them to provide Suppliers with their contact details.

## 6. Site-Specific Shared Network Asset Categories

- 6.1 The Chair shared a presentation with the group on site-specific shared network asset categories – clarification sought on current practice. This can be found as **Attachment 2**.
- 6.2 Members of the group confirmed that they are yet to receive feedback from their engineers at this time, however, it was agreed that comments can be provided during the next meeting and these can be summarised.

## 7. MHHS Update

- 7.1 The Chair informed the group that [DCP 456 'MHHS Incremental Changes for Go Live'](#) is going out to vote today (17 July 2025).
- 7.2 The Chair also stated that all Code related changes are incorporated into the program. There will be a transition going back to BAU, with ongoing work as to how this transition will work.
- 7.3 LS stated that MDD has frozen until October 2026.

## 8. Any Other Business

- 8.1 No other business was raised.
- 8.2 DDDG, DNO Charges
- 8.3 FA shared a presentation with the group in relation to centralised access to network charging information. This can be found as **Attachment 3**.
- 8.4 As a bit of background, FA informed the group that the DDDG (DCUSA Digitalisation Development Group) was formed to allow industry to provide any feedback and/or improvements to the DCUSA website. Recently, feedback was received by Ofgem which appears to be technical. This was presented to the DCUSA Board to which they suggested further discussing this feedback with the DCMDG.
- 8.5 *Ticket #001 – Ofgem*
- 8.6 Ofgem have stated that the Network Charging information (i.e. the CDCM) is hard to find and use. They follow templates but each DNO stores and labels documents slightly different, confusing for user to understand and compare charges across DNOs.
- 8.7 Following the above feedback, Ofgem suggested a centralised dashboard that displays the Tariff Summary outputs from all 14 DNO CDCM charging models. This will make it easier to view, understand, compare and interpret tariff data across all DNOs. It was also suggested that this should be API driven.
- 8.8 The June DCUSA Panel meeting produced an action for FA to present a simple mock design of the dashboard to the DCMDG for review and feedback. This was presented to the group live on screen.

- 8.9 SV suggested including a date as to when the data was last added or updated/released.
- 8.10 LS confirmed that this will be really useful and re-iterated the need for a date that the data was added/released.
- 8.11 DW also agreed that as a Supplier, they fully support this idea. DW queried whether EHV tariffs will be included within this dashboard – FA confirmed that if this information is available, there should be no issues including this (along with any other additional information that may be useful on the dashboard).
- 8.12 DM confirmed they are fully supportive of this centralised dashboard. DM also re-iterated that of DW, stating that it would be useful to include all the information within the Schedule of Charges table.
- 8.13 CB stated this dashboard has their full support, but suggested adding line loss factors/tariff IDs, losses percentages by period and by tariff ID. It would also be helpful to add EHV specific charges (by MPAN and import/export).
- 8.14 DW stated that the CDCM does not include EHV charges or losses and therefore these cannot be added to the dashboard. DW also noted that checks need to be in place to ensure of all the information published on the dashboard is correct as provided by each DNO.
- 8.15 DW informed the group that there are some instances where charges have to be changed outside of the CDCM and queried how this would work with this dashboard.
- 8.16 DT stated that the intent is to pull the necessary information from each DNOs system in order to automatically collate all of the needed data within the dashboard. The main focus is pulling CDCM data for the dashboard, but there can be additional phases to this development if desired to include additional information. FA also stated that it will be a manual process to begin with (it is manual currently), but eventually, once the API is being used, the data will be as correct as the data is published.
- 8.17 RF queried whether there is a plan to update the dashboard when tariffs change throughout the year – AF stated that this is currently unknown, but is definitely something to consider in the future. AF noted this and will consider.
- 8.18 Content in Charging Statements regarding Private Networks
- 8.19 DT invited members of the group to feedback any implications there may be following the implementation of the BSC Modification [P455 'On-Site Aggregation as a method to facilitate Third Party Access'](#) which was raised by Emergent Energy as it was a solution they designed and developed and which was being trialled via the BSC Sandbox.
- 8.20 DS suggested they believe that the DCUSA does not specifically deal with DUoS charging for Private Networks and that currently, how DNOs treat them is mostly detailed in their respective charging statements. Therefore, the question is whether there have been any considerations about what the implementation of P455 has on DUoS charges for such sites and/or if it would fall within one of the existing set ups for now. The reason for this being discussed is because we've recently had an enquiry from someone wanting to utilise the P455 arrangements but that they have concerns around how this will work for DUoS charges. I've shared relevant information with them, and they have said the following:

- “The evidence provided does provide a confidence in both the allocation of correct supply volumes and the ability to ensure DUoS recovery needs no adjustment (as licenced UoS charges appear to be 100% recovered). However there does appear to be a gap when it comes to the recovery of Private Network UoS charges, resultant from the potential over-allocation of DUoS to registered MPANs, either from the distribution of units through the private network (as the ‘last mile’) or from energy generated within microgrid systems.”

- 8.21 There was also a DCUSA related Sandbox Derogation (although actually a Licence Derogation for the partner DNO to undertake an additional process that is not currently set out in the DCUSA, but a change has yet to be raised to formalise it and have been made aware there are concerns from one or more DNOs about the approach that was being trialled).
- 8.22 DT suggested that it would be good if members are able to discuss this and if needed, it could be brought back for further discussion in the future. DT noted that there have not been any formal discussions held yet in relation to this.
- 8.23 KB believes that once the Sandbox is over, there would be a need for a DCUSA change to make any changes official and noted that there is nothing currently in DCUSA that would sort out the charges.
- 8.24 LS suggested that there might be a need to look at the condition 14 statement as it does not make reference to these statements. LS also stated that a lot of this comes back to [DCP 328 ‘Use of System Charging for Private Networks with Competition in Supply’](#) where it calls out the gap on cost recovery for private network use of system.
- 8.25 DT suggested that members revisit [P455 ‘On-Site Aggregation as a method to facilitate Third Party Access’](#) and provide any feedback on the above during the next DCMDG meeting.

Action 89/05	DCMDG members to revisit <a href="#">P455 ‘On-Site Aggregation as a method to facilitate Third Party Access’</a> and provide any feedback on the above during the next DCMDG meeting.
--------------	---

## 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;
- Content in Charging Statements regarding Private Networks; 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 21 August 2025 via Microsoft Teams.

## 12. Attachments

---

12.1 Attachment 1 - DCMDG Action Log & Forward Work Plan

12.2 Attachment 2 - Site-Specific Shared Network Asset

12.3 Attachment 3 - Mockup-CDCM Tariff Summary Data