

DCP 455 Working Group Meeting 03

01 September 2025 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Dave Wornell [DW]	National Grid
Donald Preston [DP]	SSE
Stephen Millar [SM]	SPEN
Code Administrator	
Richard Colwill [RC]	Chair
Hannah Proffitt [HP]	Secretariat

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.

Apologies

- 1.2 No apologies were received ahead of the meeting.

Competition Law Guidance and Terms of Reference

- 1.3 The Working Group agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.

Minutes of the previous meeting

- 1.4 No comments were received.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair advised that the purpose of the meeting was to review responses to the DCP 455 consultation.

3. Review Consultation Responses

- 3.1 The Working Group reviewed the 8 responses. A summary of the responses and any group discussion is as follows.

Question 1 – Do you understand the intent of the CP?

- 3.2 All respondents stated they did.

Question 2 – Are you supportive of the principle of the CP?

- 3.3 All respondents stated they were supportive of the principle of the CP. One noted they did not hold a particularly strong view in favour or against the proposal, however they acknowledge that the consultation paper provided rationale for the change.

Question 3 - Do you agree with the Working Group position of taking forward solution B? Please provide your rationale either way.

- 3.4 All respondents agreed with the Working Group position of taking forward solution B. Reasons included:

- It ensures Schedule 1 remains the single, definitive reference document for credit cover matters, thereby avoiding unnecessary complexity.
- The PCFM file, while technically available, is not user-friendly and could lead to calculation errors by parties who are less familiar with its structure. By keeping the formula within Schedule 1, the risk of misinterpretation is reduced and consistency across the industry is more likely to be maintained.
- Solution B allows users to calculate RAV using published CPIH directly from ONS.
- Solution B is more practical and transparent when compared with solution A.
- Solution A depends on the user selecting the correct version of the PCFM, even if the correct version is selected, CPIH is subject to forecasting assumptions. Whereas solution B does not have these issues as it is explicitly stated to the user where to get the CPIH from, and it is also not a forecast value, which is an advantage.
- Referencing a fixed data point location in the PCFM may require further change if a subsequent PCFM update moves that item.

Question 4 - Do you have any other solutions you would like the Working Group to consider?

- 3.5 All respondents stated they did not have any other solutions for consideration.

- 3.6 One respondent noted it would be useful to understand if the legal text can be drafted in a way to ensure the solution is enduring, considering ED3 is coming. The Chair agreed to ask Gowling when the CP is sent for legal review.

03/01 – The Chair to ask Gowling whether the legal text can be drafted in a way to ensure the solution is enduring, considering ED3 is coming.

Question 5 - Do you consider that the proposal better facilitates the DCUSA Charging Objectives? Please give supporting reasons.

3.7 All respondents agreed with the Working Group's view that Charging Objective 3 is better facilitated.

Question 6 - Are you aware of any wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP?

3.8 Nothing was raised by respondents.

Question 7 - Are you supportive of the proposal to implement this CP by 6 November 2025?

3.9 All respondents were supportive of the proposed implementation date.

Question 8 - Do you have any comments on the draft legal text?

3.10 Nothing was raised by respondents.

4. Finalise Legal Text

4.1 The Working Group agreed for the current legal text to be issued to Gowling for review.

5. Agree Final Content for Change Report

5.1 The Chair agreed to draft the Change Report following the meeting and to circulate to members for review.

6. Next Steps and Work Plan

6.1 The Working Group agreed the following next steps:

- The Chair to draft the Change Report and to circulate to members for review.
- The Chair to send the legal text to Gowling following the meeting (including the question regarding futureproofing).
- Meeting to be held on 9 September at 10am to discuss Change Report if needed.

7. Any Other Business

7.1 No other business was raised.

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
03/01	The Chair to ask Gowling whether the legal text can be drafted in a way to ensure the solution is enduring, considering ED3 is coming.	The Chair	New action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update