

Embedded Capacity Request DCUSA Subgroup Meeting 02

07 November 2025 at 13:00

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Helen Stack (HS)	Centrica
Frasier Gascoigne (FG)	NPg
Paul Bennet (PB)	Centrica
Julie Richmond (JR)	SPEN
Melike Ayaz (MA)	NESO
Christopher Ibeh (CI)	NESO
Conner Reid (CR)	SPEN
Peter Douglass (PD)	Ethical Power
Code Administrator	
Andy Green	Chair
Apologies	
None	N/A

1. Administration

Recording

- 1.1 The Chair advised members that this meeting will be recorded. 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 subgroup 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 review the ECR change requests that have been raised and then agree on next steps.
- 2.2 It was also noted that the RWE and ABO requests were still on hold so the two request to be discuss today were from Ethical Power and NGED.

3. Overview of Ethical Power ECR Change request.

- 3.1 The Subgroup started to review the Ethical Power ECR change request; this can be found within **Attachment 1-Embedded Capacity Register (ECR) Change Request Notice- Ethical Power**.
- 3.2 PD drew attention to the fact that UKPN that made some comments about the indexing and the unique identifier, saying that they're happy to add a unique identifier for those that are connected rather than accepted to connect.
- 3.3 PD went on to state that he thought it was a case of ensuring that there is that element of consistency. He advised that he knew SPEN create a unique identifier for all entries within the ECR, and that he wanted to understand the rationale as to why UKPN wouldn't want to have a unique identifier in in all entries.
- 3.4 SH advised that he'd re-engaged the relevant stakeholders at UKPN, and they were now comfortable with the unique identifier being used for all entries.
- 3.5 It waws noted that Ethical Powers request had an additional request centred around data cleanse and that it was agreed previously that this was ready to be issued to contract managers once the Subgroup had agreed on an approach for the unique identifier element of Ethical Powers request.
- 3.6 The Subgroup agreed that they were comfortable with the Ethical Power request so it was noted that this would be issued to contract managers week commencing 10 November 2025.

4. NGED ECR Change Request

- 4.1 CI walked the group through the ECR change request that his organisation had raised. This ECR Change Request can be found within **Attachment 2 ECR-Change-Request-Notice_NESO**

- 4.2 CI advised there were a few elements to the request they'd raised and stated that for the first element of the request, the Ethical Power request for a unique identifier might remedy this.
- 4.3 CI stated that having a primary key column in the dataset would be helpful as currently they are having to aggregate circa 5 different columns within the data set to identify a primary key CI went on to add that they use the primary key to conduct a month-by-month comparison.
- 4.4 CI also stated that even after aggregating these columns, it can still be difficult to establish a unique identifier.
- 4.5 CI suggested that it would be helpful to have the respecting DNO initials in a set format within the data, so it could help to identify the different DNOs.
- 4.6 SH highlighted that the register already captures the DNO licence area, however CI highlighted that there are a few issues with this currently as the spellings of the DNOs can differ with some lines having spelling mistakes, some line abbreviating the DNO name and others using capital letters and others lowercase.
- 4.7 This means that the current data still required a lot of effort by users to make the data useable so having a more usable, uniformed identifier would be helpful.
- 4.8 FG advised that the spelling issues could be remedied by using the distributor ID, specifically the first two digits of the MPAN number. The Subgroup agreed that this was a sensible approach.
- 4.9 PD highlighted that this request was similar to Ethical Powers unique identifier request and highlighted that he was concerned that if more and more unique identifiers are raised, this could become tricky for DNOs to maintain the data.
- 4.10 SH advised that whilst this is true, having a unique ID to identify each individual project, and another to identify the DNO seemed like it would be easy for DNOs to manage, and he went on to say these are two different areas.
- 4.11 CI advised that he was comfortable to take away the NGED request and amend it based on the discussion in the meeting.
- 4.12 The Chair advised once it's received, he'd share it with the Subgroup for a final review before issuing to contract managers.
- 4.13 CI started to walk the Subgroup through the second part of the request, which is linked into the standardisation point raised earlier.
- 4.14 CI noted that at the moment there is a situation where the naming convention for the respective grid supply points is different across the board.
- 4.15 He also noted that there is a situation of system interoperability such as that when they try to match the GSP names they get from the respective ECRs to the GSP names they get from organisations such as Elexon, they're hardly able to get matches for some of the GSPs.

- 4.16 The request therefore is to try and standardise how the GSPs are named and either to have a link in table that they can use to be able to link the respective GSPs to the Elexon GSP IDs or, have the Elexon ID GSP within the ECR so that it can use to know what specific GSPs are referred to in each of the projects.
- 4.17 It was noted that having the Elexon GSP IDs could be controversial and that this approach was unlikely to be approved across the industry. It was acknowledged with the meeting however that inconsistent naming conventions does cause issues and having some consistency here would be useful.
- 4.18 FG suggested maybe adopting the Elexon naming conventions rather than a collum for the GSP IDs as a more appropriate solution.
- 4.19 JR noted that the substation naming causes interoperability issues and that they were trying to resolve that as best as possible. One of the things that they were considering was trying to publish some form of reference table, but it would take some time to agree and create this reference table.
- 4.20 JR went on to state that they know actually changing the names within the documents and the systems themselves would take a fair amount of time so they believed that one of the easiest things to do would be to agree on a reference table to take forwards which the DNOs would publish.
- 4.21 SH went on to highlight that the GSP IDs are taken from their control system and the approach of using GSP IDs would require changes to this system, which would be a difficult task to undertake.
- 4.22 CI advised that he liked the idea of the reference table and ask if this table being suggested would be a reference table for them to be able to match GSP that's stated within the ECR, to a system like Elexon? CI went on to state most often they try to match what they have in the DNOs data to what they have in the Elexon system.
- 4.23 JR advised that they weren't planning on adding in the Elexon data to their reference tables, but they could potentially look at including this data at a later stage.
- 4.24 SH advised that it would be useful for DNOs to have a call with NGED to really understand what they are looking to extract from the data and what they want to use it for.
- 4.25 PD noted that this does loop back to data standardisation and that it should be an enduring action for this Subgroup to consider moving forwards but for this area, maybe the standardisation needs to be driven by NGED.
- 4.26 FG also noted that the CIM project would help to resolve this in the long term as the CIM data will be tied to the ECR, and as such would provide some consistency in naming conventions.
- 4.27 JR suggested potentially using the node IDs rather than the GSP ID or the GSP name because they believed it gave a more granular view as to what we're actually trying to achieve in this ECR change request.
- 4.28 It was clarified that this would mean DNOs would need to know the connected bus bar which would create more complexity if the node ID was used.

- 4.29 CI went on to clarify that regardless of whether it's the GSP ID or if it's the node ID, all they want from this is they want to be able to communicate from the respective DNO, whether with 24 submissions or the ECR to the election system.
- 4.30 FG reiterated that long term the CIM linking these systems up should resolve this. Short term he believed that a reference table, with the node would be fit for purpose as the generators should match up with the respected node somewhere.
- 4.31 CI went on to state that they believed that there was a concept for a solution, which could be improved upon later. The solution discussed in the Subgroup today was having a reference table that would link both what the respective DNO's have as the GSP name to what is held on Elexon network mapping statement as the respective EVAC grid supply point ID or the node ID.
- 4.32 It was agreed that further considering was required here for a long-term solution but in the short term DNOs would create a reference table and then publishing this to share GSP lookups to nodes and and the ECR GSPS.
- 4.33 The final element of the NGED request was centred around data quality. CI went on to give some examples of where data quality was poor, these were;
- the sequence of the columns might be different,
 - the naming of the column names might be different,
 - there might be technologies which are not in the DCUSA list of technologies,
 - issues with some customer site names, not the right customer site name
- 4.34 It was noted that downstream this does cause a lot of issues.
- 4.35 It was agreed that whilst data quality is an issue, it's not something that can be resolved in a single ECR change request. It was agreed that the Subgroup had already discussed the importance of standardisation and ensuring that here's better data quality will be an enduring principle moving forwards.
- 4.36 CI went on to state that another area that had issues with data quality was within the Bella and Begga project lists and asked if they could request the current list of project fall within the Bella and Begga contracts ad-hoc from DNOs.
- 4.37 SH advised that as part of connections reform, DNOs had to submit to NESO a lot of data including identifying the Bella and Begga projects. Based on this it was suggested for MA and CI to go to the connections reforms team to request see if they have the data in the first instance.
- 4.38 It was agreed that for now, no further action would be taken on this part of the request, except for the Subgroup considering the data quality and standardisation issues raised when raising future ECR change requests.

5. Next Meeting

- 5.1 It was agreed to reconvene meetings ad-hoc when new ECR change requests are raised.
- 5.2 It was noted that the December SIG meeting may be used to review how the CIM has progressed.

6. Any Other Business

- 6.1 There was no other business raised.

DCUSA