

DCP 424 Working Group Meeting 08

08 August 2025 at 10:00

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Kara Burke	NPg
John Lucas [JL]	Elexon
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSEG
Benny Talbot [BT]	Co-Op
Chouhon Leong [CL]	Ofgem
Simon Vicary [SV]	EDF
Monique Pereira [MP]	Indigo Networks
Mary Gille [MG]	
Hazel Patterson [HP]	SPEN
LILI Zuo [LZ]	SSE
Diandra Ordan [DA]	BUUK
Code Administrator	
Andy Green	Chair
Apologies	
Lee Stone [LS]	Eon
Lorna Mallon [LM]	REC

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 424 draft consultation and legal text to see what needs to be updated since the Working Group was put on pause back in August 2023.

3. Overview of the intent of the change and if it was still fit for purpose

- 3.1 The Working Group initially reviewed if the intent of DCP 424 was still fit for purpose as there were some questions at the last Working Group if the approach now needed to consider MHHS changes and if so, would the intent of the CP need to be updated which would require panel approval.
- 3.2 It was queried as the MHHS changes were going to change the process for complex sites in October 2026, was this CP still needed if the process was to be future looking?
- 3.3 It was confirmed that these complex sites do need to be catered for in the here and now, so this CP is still needed to tackle the process issues that the CP is seeking to remedy.
- 3.4 It was agreed that as this was an area that needed to be tackled now, and as changing approach and the intent of the change would lead to a delay in delivering changes in the current world, the CP should continue as originally written and deal with the here and now and then a new CP would be raised to amend the process for MHHS implementation in the new year.
- 3.5 The Chair noted that there was an Ofgem representative in the meeting and asked if this was an approach they'd support. CL confirmed that this approach made sense considering bringing in changes for the MHHS changes in October 2026 would create a future delay.
- 3.6 BT highlighted that within the consultation document, there was a reference to a Distribution Code change item (D-068) and he queried if the DCUSA changes for the MHHS M18 milestone could be bought into the Distribution Code change.
- 3.7 It was confirmed that D-68 was only a work off item as part of P441 and that it didn't have any interactions with DCP 424. It was also noted that any DCUSA changes would have to be made through the DSCUSA process.

- 3.8 The Chair noted that there was already a question in the draft consultation document asking what potential impacts MHHS implementation would introduce but that the consultation could be amended further to ask questions on MHHS to support the future DCUSA change.

4. Consultation document review

- 4.1 The Working Group moved on to discuss the consultation document and the Chair noted that ED had suggested some changes and invited ED to walk the Working Group through the suggested amendments.
- 4.2 The first set of amendments were in relation to the intent of the CP. It was noted that these amendments only clarified the intent and didn't alter it. SV was invited as a panel member for his thoughts on the changes to the intent of the CP and stated that he felt the amendments were ok and didn't require further panel approval but couldn't speak for all panel members.
- 4.3 It was agreed that if it was believed this does change the intent, then leaving the intent as it was originally written would be the approach to take to mitigate further delays.
- 4.4 An amendment was made to highlight that P441 was the lead MOD for these changes, that P441 is where complex sites will be defined and that P441 was still in flight.
- 4.5 It was quired if the parts in the consultation document that refer to the BSC change were still accurate and if anything needed to be added after the BSC had made some changes to their process.
- 4.6 As per the previous DCP 424 Working Group, it was believed that there was nothing that was required to change in the DCUSA CP post the BSC completing their additional analysis, but it was agreed for Working Group members to review this section of the consultation document to make sure all the relevant and correct BSC change details are captured.

Action 08/01-Working Group members to review paragraph 1.5

- 4.7 It was noted that the reference to the REC MOD needed to be updated. The Chair agreed to contact LM to get the new REC MOD reference as well as finding out what the timeline for the REC MOD is.

Action 08/02-The Chair update the consultation document with the new REC change ID as well as contacting the REC to find out their timelines for the consultation to be issued.

- 4.8 It was queried if the pros and cons table in paragraph 4.11 was up to date and captured all the pros and cons. It was agreed for all Working Group members to check the table and feedback if anything was missing or needed updating in this table.

Action 08/03 Working Group to check the table in paragraph 4.11 to ensure all the pros and cons have been captured accurately.

- 4.9 It was agreed to add in a question asking " Do you have any comments on actions which could be taken in the near future to ensure a smooth transition to the post MHHS process?" to the consultation to accompany the question that was already being asked around the MHHS transition.

- 4.10 It was agreed that the Chair would make the relevant changes to the consultation document and share with the Working Group for feedback.

Action 08/04 Working Group to check the table in paragraph 4.11 to ensure all the pros and cons have been captured accurately.

5. Next Meeting

- 5.1 The next meeting will be agreed via doodle poll once it has been agreed what date the consultation is to be issued.

6. Any Other Business

- 6.1 No other business was raised.

7. Attachments

- Attachment 1 DCP 424 consultation 8.0

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/08	Working Group members to review paragraph 1.5	All	New action
02/08	The Chair update the consultation document with the new REC change ID as well as contacting the REC to find out their timelines for the consultation to be issued.	Chair	New action
03/08	Working Group to check the table in paragraph 4.11 to ensure all the pros and cons have been captured accurately.	All	New action
04/08	Chair to update the consultation and issue to the Working Group for review.	Chair	New action

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	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