

DCP 458 Working Group Meeting 1

12 August 2025 at 13:00

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Kara Burke	NPg
Clair Richards	NGED
Donna Jamieson	IDCSL
Ed Grimsey	BUUK
Philip Mark	SSEN
Peter Waymont	UKPN
Laura Quinn	SPEN
Rachel Wallace	BUUK
Rebecca Flynn	NGED
Hazel Paterson	SPEN
Tim Porter	SSEN
Blessing Ekpe	SSEN
Code Administrator	
Andy Green	Chair
Craig Booth	Secretariat
Apologies	
Chris Ong	UKPN
Ephie Chalakateva	NGED

1. Administration

Recording

- 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 once these minutes have been approved.

Competition Law Guidance and Terms of Reference

- 1.2 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.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was to have an overview of DCP 458 and agree the next steps.

3. Overview of the CP

- 3.1 The Proposer explained that DCP 414 put in a process where distributors put together a contact for queries about capacity and that when suppliers move customers from non-half hourly to half hourly, the distributor would not apply capacity charges for the first 12 months.
- 3.2 There is an expectation that capacity should be charged for once this is known and agreed, but nearly 12 months on from the implementation of DCP 414, UKPN finds itself in a position where it hasn't received any information relating to the customer and their required capacity, from suppliers, and has placed customers onto a zero capacity charges tariff in good faith.
- 3.3 Several Working Group members supported the Proposer's observations that contact from Suppliers had been lacking, with one member specifically supporting the use of a default capacity. A member also noted that 71 KVA had been a default capacity under the P272 process.
- 3.4 The Working Group noted that this had been discussed at the DCMDG and that some Suppliers had clarified in the DCMDG that they hadn't yet started the migration process.
- 3.5 A Working Group member explained that they had reached out to Suppliers to remind them of the DCP 414 process, but that it had been tricky getting the information to the correct person.
- 3.6 A Working Group member stated that the process is within the DCUSA and Suppliers should be contacting their customers to make them aware that the distributor will be contacting them, but this does not appear to be followed correctly. It was questioned whether the onus could be put back onto the Suppliers as it is their part of the process that is currently failing.
- 3.7 A Working Group member noted they had started receiving some SDEP communications from Suppliers requesting voltage connection levels on MPANs changing from whole current to CT metering, though it was noted that this may be related to migration work and not to DCP 414.

- 3.8 The Proposer noted that even following the process, it is 18 months down the line that the distributor contacts the customer, during which the contact details or customer on site may have changed, or during which the customer has forgotten previous conversations about the need to agree and pay for their capacity. Several Working Group members agreed with this position and that it was too long a period to wait.

4. Legal Text Overview

- 4.1 A Working Group member stated that rather than apply a default capacity, the distributor would have information on maximum demand usage to set a more appropriate capacity.
- 4.2 The Proposer stated that if there was a desire to consult on a different approach, this could be presented as an Alternative in the consultation and change report. The Proposer explained that his proposal would keep the process simple and relatively automated, by applying a default capacity and limiting the amount of effort to check for data and calculate the capacity.
- 4.3 The Proposer noted that a capacity of 71 KVA as it is unusual and would be more likely to be identified as a default capacity, though noted that UKPN's billing systems allow default capacities to be flagged.
- 4.4 A Working Group member noted that 71 KVA had been used for P272 previously, so was not unheard of, however the Proposer was of the view that this meant there was a precedent for setting a default capacity and it would still be unusual for a customer to request a capacity of 71 KVA for a new connection.
- 4.5 A Working Group member noted that under DCP 414, one of the options considered was to put the customer on a default capacity and that the 12-month period would be used to gather the necessary data for this.
- 4.6 The Proposer explained that he had interpreted the 12-month period was for the purpose of easing customers who had never had to pay capacity charges before into the process.
- 4.7 A Working Group member asked that if a default capacity was used, whether this would remove the obligation for distributors to contact customers and instead wait for customers to contact distributors. The Proposer agreed that this was his intent.
- 4.8 A Working Group member queried whether in setting a default capacity, this would have a knock-on effect on the process for sending connection agreements, noting that customer details were not known. The Proposer agreed that it would, if the distributor was wanting to *agree* the capacity.

5. Consultation

- 5.1 The Chair captured the following (first draft) questions for inclusion in the consultation:
- 5.1.1 Is applying a default capacity appropriate, instead of trying to agree one with the customer?
- 5.1.2 Is the proposed default capacity of 71 KVA appropriate?

- 5.1.3 For Suppliers only – How do you intend to share with distributors which customers you are migrating as part of the DCP 414 obligation?
- 5.1.4 For Suppliers only – Are there any barriers/challenges to you in identifying which customers are to be migrated as part of the DCP 414 obligation? (e.g., no contact, access, etc.)
- 5.1.5 Have you used default capacities in other circumstances? If so, what were these circumstances?
- 5.1.6 Are you aware of any consequences of applying a default capacity? If so, what are these?
- 5.1.7 Is there an alternative process that has not been considered within this CP? If so, what is this alternative approach?
- 5.1.8 What proportion of customers that you are seeking to migrate as part of the DCP 414 obligation have you received contact details for?
- 5.2 The Working Group discussed whether the questions around the Supplier approach and potential barriers could be raised elsewhere, such as the DCMDG, however it was discussed that this is relevant to the CP and will therefore be kept within the consultation.
- 5.3 The Secretariat explained that the DCMDG distribution list contains contacts in Parties who have expertise in charging, as opposed to only contract managers, which could help ensure the consultation reaches as wide an audience as possible by forwarding the consultation to DCMDG members.

Action 01/01	Chair to draft a consultation and issue to the Working Group for review.
Action 02/01	Chair to issue the consultation to DCMDG and SIG members, in addition to the usual recipients.
Action 03/01	Secretariat to raise awareness of the DCP 458 consultation at the next DCMDG meeting.

- 5.4 The Working Group discussed whether the consultation should be issued for 10 working days or 15 working days. The Proposer noted that this has been raised as an urgent change and that the existing process should already be being used, so issuing for 10 working days would be preferred. There were no objections to issuing for this timescale.

6. Next Meeting

- 6.1 The next meeting will be held on 8th September at 10:00am to review the consultation responses.

7. Any Other Business

- 7.1 No other business was raised.

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/01	Chair to draft a consultation and issue to the Working Group for review.	Chair	New action
02/01	Chair to issue the consultation to DCMDG and SIG members, in addition to the usual recipients.	Chair	New action
03/01	Secretariat to raise awareness of the DCP 458 consultation at the next DCMDG meeting.	Secretariat	New action

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update