

# DCP 325 Working Group Meeting 20

01 August 2025 at 13:00

Web-Conference

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

## 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 discuss and review the updated test model, draft legal text and draft Change Report within the Working Group and agree next steps.

## 3. Review Updated Test Model

- 3.1 The Chair informed the group that both KB and BE provided feedback after testing the updated model.
- 3.2 KB’s suggestions can be found below:
  - *‘Table 1 – Delta from previous’ – the ‘variance commentary’ column (Y) needs to be formatted as an input (i.e. yellow cells), as currently it is not obvious that it is there or that it should be populated.*
  - *‘CIRP\_Instructions’ – update to add the following row (or similar)*

CIRP_General inputs/ CIRP_Inputs by customer type/ CIRP_Inputs by network level	Columns L:Q	DNO	For regulatory years for which tariffs are already published, populate all inputs, including those for allowed revenue, with those used in the CDCM at the time that the tariffs were set. This will mean there is a difference between the allowed revenue in 'Table 1 - Detailed', which is the latest available information from the PCFM or equivalent forecast, and the allowed revenue in 'CIRP_General inputs', which was the value when tariffs were set.
---	-------------	-----	---

- 3.3 Members were happy to incorporate the above changes to the test model.
- 3.4 BE’s suggestions can be found below:
  - *Table 1 – Detailed Worksheet: for consistency, BE suggested it is best to either leave cells K127 to P129 in the correction term section as DNO inputs (yellow cells) and thus remove the formula from cells R127 and R129; or, leave as calculated cells per the formula and change to plain cells to accurately match the ‘Key’ indicated in the Cover Worksheet.*
- 3.5 KB provided feedback on the above and suggested that the current formula in R129 is incorrect and should say  $K_1 = D_{t-1} \times (1 + TVM_{t-1})$ .
- 3.6 KB also suggested an option where the equation is put into brackets for the two rows to make it clearer that it is a DNO input, but there is a calculation behind it elsewhere.
- 3.7 KB also provided feedback in response to feedback given by CEPA/TNEI. Row 59 has a formula that follows on to column M, however, column M has a different formula in it (multiplying by the percentage change as opposed to the TVM). Members are unsure why this was done this way initially. KB reiterated that this does not impact the model in any way.

- 3.8 Following the above discussions, the Secretariat agreed to take an action to follow up with NGED to see if there is any insight as to why the calculations may be different.

**ACTION 20/01: The Secretariat to follow up with NGED to see if there is any insight as to why the calculations in the model (row 59/column M) may be different.**

**ACTION 20/02: KB to make the agreed changes to the test model and send to the Secretariat.**

## 4. Review Draft Legal Text

- 4.1 The Chair presented the draft legal text with KB's feedback to the Working Group live on screen.

- 4.2 The agreed changes can be found below:

- *Removal of 'in accordance with Paragraph 2' as it was stated within Paragraph 2.*
- *Removal of Paragraph 2 h).*
- *Changed Cost Information Template to Cost Information Review Pack.*
- Update Table 1 with the correct table.
- *All members agreed that this should be added to Schedule 20 (as opposed to Schedule 15).*
- *Members agreed to seek view from Gowlings as to how the numbering should sit (i.e. 35B/C?)*

**ACTION 20/03: The Secretariat to seek legal advice around how the numbering of the legal text should sit (i.e., 35B/C?) and a final review of the legal text.**

- 4.3 All Working Group members agreed with the above changes.

## 5. Review Draft Change Report

- 5.1 The Chair presented the draft change report with KB's feedback to the Working Group live on screen.

- 5.2 KB informed the group that the current wording under the 'how' section within the Change Report has been updated to reflect the final solution that has been agreed (as it now differs from the intended original solution). All members were happy with the updated wording.

- 5.3 Additional wording has also been included as Paragraph 4.3 to state that 'the Working Group restarted in 2024, with a new call for participants ensuring the group consisted of DNO, IDNO and Supplier representatives'.

- 5.4 The majority of additional wording has been added to provide further clarity within the draft Change Report.

- 5.5 Members agreed to add two tables for the DCUSA Objectives under the Question 12 ('which of the DCUSA General Objectives do you believe would be better facilitated by the intent of the DCP?') in order to show which objectives that were better facilitated within this change.

- 5.6 It was noted that this change was initially measured against DCUSA General Objectives 3 and 4, and the Working Group agreed that this is still supported and has not changed (Consultation responses also agree with this).

- 5.7 The Chair noted that if this change is accepted, the old template will still be used for the November release, and the new template will be used after. The Secretariat confirmed that once the status of this

change is known, wider industry will be fully informed of the process and when to use which template ahead of time.

5.8 Members agreed it would be beneficial to have a high-level overview of the draft legal text in the relevant section (as opposed to the entirety of the draft legal text).

5.9

5.10 The Secretariat agreed to circulate the draft Change Report to the Working Group for a final review post-meeting once all the final updates have been made.

**ACTION 20/04: The Secretariat to circulate the draft Change Report to the Working Group for a final review post-meeting.**

## 6. Work Plan and Next Steps

---

6.1 The workplan will be updated after each meeting.

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

- KB and the Secretariat to make the final updates to the test model.
- The Secretariat to make the final updates to the draft legal text and send to Gowling for final review.
- The Secretariat to make the final updates to the draft Change Report and circulate to the Working Group for final review.
- The Secretariat to present the DCP 325 Change Report to the August DCUSA Panel.

## 7. Any Other Business

---

7.1 The Chair asked the group whether there were any other items of business to discuss.

7.2 There were no other items raised.

## 8. Date of Next Meeting – TBC

---

8.1 The next Working Group meeting is TBC. The Working Group have agreed to complete a final review of the Change Report offline, with the aim to present this to the August DCUSA Panel.

## APPENDIX 1

### New and open actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
<b>20/01</b>	The Secretariat to follow up with NGED to see if there is any insight as to why the calculations in the model (row 59/column M) may be different.	Secretariat	<b>New Action.</b>
<b>20/02</b>	KB to make the agreed changes to the test model and send to the Secretariat.	KB	<b>New Action.</b>
<b>20/03</b>	The Secretariat to seek legal advice around how the numbering of the legal text should sit (i.e., 35B/C?) and a final review of the legal text.	Secretariat	<b>New Action.</b>
<b>20/04</b>	The Secretariat to circulate the draft Change Report to the Working Group for a final review post-meeting.	Secretariat	<b>New Action.</b>

### Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
<b>19/01</b>	RN to speak internally for more information around what caveats are used within NGEDs reports that state that the figures used (from the tariffs output) are indicative only.	RN	<b>Closed.</b>
<b>19/02</b>	JK to send KB a drop-down caveat box example to see if this can be incorporated within the Cost Information Template.	JK	<b>Closed.</b>
<b>19/03</b>	KB to make the necessary updates to the Cost Information Template offline and circulate to the Working Group for review.	KB	<b>Closed.</b>
<b>19/04</b>	The Chair to make the necessary updates to the solution section and send to the Working Group to review offline.	Secretariat / Working Group	<b>Closed.</b>