

## DCP 458 Working Group Meeting 03

15 September 2025 at 10:00

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Kara Burke [KB]	NPg
Chris Ong [CO]	UKPN
Clair Richards [CR]	NGED
Donna Jamieson [DJ]	IDCSL
Ed Grimsey [EG]	BUUK
Ephie Chalakateva [EC]	NGED
Philip Mark [PM]	SSEN
Peter Waymont [PW]	UKPN
Natalie Hay [NH]	BUUK
Lee Stone [LS]	EON
Hazel Paterson [HP]	SPEN
Tim Porter [TP]	SSEN
Blessing Ekpe [BE]	SSEN
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
Andy Green [AG]	Chair
Hannah Proffitt [HPr]	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. 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.

## Minutes & Actions

- 1.3 No feedback was provided on the minutes from the previous meeting. Updates on the actions are included in the appendix.

## 2. Purpose of the Meeting

---

- 2.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was to agree on which solution to take forward and to review the change report.
- 2.2 He also noted that there had been a late consultation response submitted that the Working Group would review before discussing both solutions and reviewing the change report.

## 3. Review late Consultation Response

---

- 3.1 The last consultation responses meant that in total 12 responses were received. The full responses are included as **Attachment 1**.
- 3.2 After reviewing the response document for the late responses, the Working Group concluded that no new points had been raised that the initial 11 responses that highlighted.
- 3.3 This meant that other than checking that the responses in the change report were updated correctly to reflect all responses, the late response did not alter the previous conclusions or the approach the Working Group was seeking to take.

## 4. Which Solution to take forwards.

---

- 4.1 PW noted that as proposer he wanted to take his solution forwards and that after reviewing the legal text drafting from the previous Working Group, he was happy to leave the original solution as it had been drafted.
- 4.2 PW noted that the consultation responses showed a majority of seven out of twelve respondents felt applying a default capacity of 71kVA was appropriate.
- 4.3 Six out of the ten Working Group members agreed that DCUSA general objective 4 would be better facilitated if the default capacity solution (Solution A) was implemented.
- 4.4 Seven of the ten Working Group members agreed that that DCUSA general objective 4 would be better facilitated if the calculated capacity based on the highest MD over the 12-month assessment period solution (Solution B) was implemented.

## 5. Change Report Review

---

- 5.1 The Chair went through the draft Change Report with the Working Group line by line to allow a full robust review.
- 5.2 It was noted that the date the change report had this CP being raised was February 2025, which was incorrect so this was updated.

- 5.3 It was agreed that the way the consolidated responses had been captured would read better if they were it made clear on how each party category had responded i.e. splitting these into DNO, IDNO and supplier responses.
- 5.4 PW as the proposer stated that he was happy with how the change report had captured why the change was needed and noted that it does reflect his view as the proposer so on that part, it was stating fact.
- 5.5 It was noted within question 5, Have you used default capacities in other circumstances? If so, what were these circumstances and what defaults were applied?, the NGED response of N/A was due to them not using default capacities in any other circumstances.
- 5.6 A clarification was made to the responses for question 10 by SSE that they preferred to leave the process as DCP 414 had created.
- 5.7 It was agreed to split out both solutions within the Objectives section so its clear they have been reviewed on their own merit.
- 5.8 It was agreed that for voting, parties would be able to vote for both solutions highlighting which of the two is the preferred solution.
- 5.9 Six out of the ten Working Group members agreed that DCUSA general objective 4 would be better facilitated if the default capacity solution (Solution A) was implemented.
- 5.10 Seven of the ten Working Group members agreed that that DCUSA general objective 4 would be better facilitated if the calculated capacity based on the highest MD over the 12-month assessment period solution (Solution B) was implemented.
- 5.11 No Working Group members raised any other DCUSA Objectives being positively or negatively impacted if either solution was implemented.
- 5.12 There were several typographical and grammatical suggestions raised which were made.
- 5.13 That concluded the review of both solutions and the change report. It was agreed by the chair to issue the change report and legal text to the Working Group for a final review and that the legal text would also be issued to Gowlings for them to carry out their assessment.

## 6. Next Meeting

---

- 6.1 No further meetings are planned at this time.

## 7. Any Other Business

---

- 7.1 No other business was raised.

## Attachments

---

- Attachment 1 – DCP 458 Collated Consultation Responses

- Attachment 2 - DCP 458 Proposers Legal Text Solution A
- Attachment 3 - DCP 458 Alternate Legal Text Solution B
- Attachment 4 – DCP 458 Change Report

•

- Attachment 2 - DCP 458 Alternate Legal Text

## New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
02/01	The Chair to contact Drax to clarify what method they are intending to use to share with Distributors which customers they are migrating as part of the DCP 414 obligation.	Chair	<b>New action.</b>
02/02	The Chair to add an item to the next SIG agenda regarding removing SDEP from the guidance document and leaving email only.	Chair	<b>New action.</b>
02/03	The Chair to speak to the Panel Ofgem representative and warn them that DCP 458 may be updated to a Part 1 matter and is an urgent change.	Chair	<b>New action.</b>

## Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update
01/01	Chair to draft a consultation and issue to the Working Group for review.	Chair	<b>Action closed.</b> Complete.
02/01	Chair to issue the consultation to DCMDG and SIG members, in addition to the usual recipients.	Chair	<b>Action closed.</b> Complete.

03/01	Secretariat to raise awareness of the DCP 458 consultation at the next DCMDG meeting.	Secretariat	<b>Action closed.</b> Complete.
-------	---	-------------	------------------------------------