

DCMDG Subgroup 03 Meeting 01

21 October 2025 at 10:00 via Microsoft Teams

Attendees	Company
Chris Barker	SPENWL
David Williams	SSEN
Erik Baguzis	Indigo Networks
Giao Le	SSEN
Kara Burke	NPg
Karl Watson	SP Distribution
Monique Pereira	Indigo Networks
Secretariat	
Craig Booth (TechSec)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill (Chair)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Emma Clark	SSEN
Lorna Murray	SP Distribution

1. Administration

- 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 after the minutes are approved.
- 1.2 The Working Group reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance” and it was noted that all members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.
- 1.3 Attendees reviewed the draft minutes from the previous meeting. No comments were made on the accuracy of the minutes.

2. Introduction

- 2.1 Chris Barker gave an introduction to the issue, showing that there was some ambiguity depending on the way a site is connected to a substation. The issue had been raised due to a scenario where a new customer’s connection at a substation (with shared cabling) did not clearly fit into either category, leading to uncertainty about which charging category should apply.

3. Discussion of the issue

- 3.1 The group debated whether the point of common coupling changes when a second customer connects and whether this should affect the category for the first customer. The group discussed that if the subsequent connection should change the point of common coupling, this may prove difficult as there is little record keeping on which customer was the original (1100) when others are added (1110).
- 3.2 The group also discussed the ambiguity, due to the wording around “at the substation”, noting that there are connections within the substation that are not connected directly to the busbar.
- 3.3 The group discussed whether the legal text provides a clear enough definition of “substation” and “point of common coupling.” It was noted that the definitions are ambiguous and that they may differ between different documents.
- 3.4 The group observed that that if the current wording is not sufficiently clear, this could lead to inconsistent applications across different network operators.
- 3.5 The group agreed it would be useful to see a worked example of the issue and to understand whether this issue has been observed by other network operators. The RFI would need to gather examples of similar scenarios from network operators, understand how each network operator deals with these examples, and request volume data to understand the scale of the issue.

Action 01/01	Chris Barker to prepare a representative charging example, illustrating the impact of assigning a connection to 1100 vs. 1110, to help the group and wider industry understand the implications.
Action 01/02	Secretariat to prepare a draft RFI and share this with the group for review and comment.

4. Agenda Items for the Next Meeting

4.1 Review the draft RFI.

5. Date of Next Meeting

5.1 The next meeting is being arranged by poll.

6. Attachments

6.1 There are no attachments to these minutes.

7. Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/01	Prepare a representative charging example, illustrating the impact of assigning a connection to 1100 vs. 1110, to help the group and wider industry understand the implications.	Chris Barker	New Action
01/02	Prepare a draft RFI and share this with the group for review and comment.	Secretariat	New Action

8. Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update