

# DCP 464 Working Group - Meeting 03

25 November 2025 at 13:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Donna Jamieson [DJa]	IDCSL
Drew Johnstone [DJo]	NPg
Ed Grimsey [EG]	BU-UK
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Generation
Ephie Chalakateva [AC]	National Grid
Erik Baguzis [EB]	Indigo Networks
Finn Breen [FB]	ESP
Ian Burman [IB]	Green GEN Cymru
Mallory Hogan [MH]	Eclipse
Mark Mclean [MM]	SPEN
Martin Brace [MB]	UKPN
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark
Rob Gladstone [RG]	SSEN Distribution
Tom Cadge [TC]	BU-UK
Tracey Taylor [TT]	SPENW
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
<b>Apologies</b>	
Charles Deacon [CD]	Eclipse
Craig Booth [CB]	ElectraLink

## 1. Administration

---

### **Recording**

- 1.1 The Chair noted that the meeting is being recorded. The purpose of this recording is purely to aid the Technical Secretariat in producing an accurate report of the meeting.

### **Apologies**

- 1.2 The Chair noted received apologies. These can be found in the attendees list above.

### **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.

### **Previous Minutes**

- 1.4 The Chair invited the Working Group to review the previous meeting minutes – no further feedback was received and the minutes were approved.

### **Open Actions**

- 1.5 The Chair confirmed that all actions captured within this meeting will be recorded within the action log; this can be found in the Appendix.
- 1.6 The Working Group discussed a number of open actions, and the key updates can be found below:

## 2. Purpose of the Meeting

---

- 2.1 The Chair explained that the purpose of this meeting is to review and develop the draft Consultation within the Working Group and agree next steps.

## 3. Review and Develop the Draft Consultation

---

- 3.1 The Chair invited the Working Group to discuss and agree the draft Consultation content.
- 3.2 The key updates can be found below:
- 3.3 In relation to the intent of the CP, it was agreed to update 'network assets' to 'Distribution Network assets'.
- 3.4 DJ queried whether other parties may be affected by this CP (other than DNOs and IDNOs only) – TC suggested this CP should mirror that of the SCRs that impacted Socialisation of reinforcement as the impact on DUoS was significantly bigger. ED agreed that Suppliers may be impacted dependant on the solution that is taken forward.
- 3.5 Following the above discussion, the Secretariat agreed to check the impacted parties for the SCRs and look to use the same within this CP.

**ACTION 03/01: The Secretariat to check the impacted parties for the SCRs and look to use the same within this CP.**

- 3.6 Members discussed whether the terms IDNO or LDNO should be used throughout the document – members agreed that it would be beneficial to include additional wording to section 1 of the draft Consultation to provide clarity around this; for example, ‘please note that where LDNO is referred to throughout this Consultation, this also refers to DNO’. TC agreed to take an action to draft some wording and provide it to the group for further review.

**ACTION 03/02: Tom Cadge to draft additional wording that provides clarity between the references to LDNO and IDNO for the group to further review.**

- 3.7 In regard to paragraph 1.6, DJ suggested that it would be beneficial to have a link or reference to example 6. After further discussion, members agreed to copy the example 6 diagram directly under paragraph 1.6 (as well as keeping a copy with the other examples further below). RG agreed to send the Secretariat an updated example to use within this section.

**ACTION 03/03: Rob Gladstone to send the Secretariat an updated example 6 diagram to use under paragraph 1.6 of the Consultation.**

**ACTION 03/04: The Secretariat to insert the updated example 6 diagram under paragraph 1.6 of the Consultation.**

- 3.8 It was noted that paragraphs 1.7 and 1.8 make references to earlier paragraphs (1.1 – 1.4) and will need to be reviewed to check the intent is still accurate after adding additional paragraphs to the above section.
- 3.9 TT stated that sole use is not a defined term, and suggested paragraph 1.9 (option 1) is amended to state: ‘The DNO assets shall continue to be treated as extension assets as they will not meet the definition of Reinforcement and therefore network upgrades are to be fully funded by the IDNO’.
- 3.10 ED suggested that both options in paragraphs 1.9 and 1.10 should expand to explain what DNO assets are being discussed; for example, ‘..and therefore upgrades are to be fully funded by the IDNO’. This was updated live on screen.
- 3.11 In regard to option 2, TT stated that whilst in most cases for demand, the DNO would fund the enforcement, there are also abnormalities to this.
- 3.12 In relation to paragraph 4.6, DJ agreed to take an action to amend the wording to clarify the third option and inconsistent treatment.

**ACTION 03/05: Drew Johnstone agreed to take an action to amend paragraph 4.6 to clarify the third option and inconsistent treatment.**

- 3.13 In regard to paragraph 4.19, members agreed to update the wording to state ‘It was queried whether this scenario could only arise for DNO and IDNO parties. The Working Group would like to seek industry views to help share their understanding’. Following this, the relative question (Q9) was amended to ask ‘Is this a scenario that can only impact DNO and IDNO parties? If other party Categories can be impacted’.
- 3.14 Under the legal text section of the Consultation, ED suggested that the way the term ‘Reinforced’ is used, may need to be reviewed. Following this, references to ‘reinforcing’ throughout this section have now been amended to ‘upgrading’.

- 3.15 In regard to paragraphs 4.2-4.5 (section 5 and will be updated to 5.2-5.5), ED also stated that it is currently unclear as to why there are two versions of each option as this has not been outlined or explained earlier in the document. Members agreed with this and a number of members suggested potentially removing the first options of all (a's) and keep the second options (b's) as they are cleaner and simpler. The Working Group agreed that these two options (1b and 2b) will be renamed as option 1 and option 2).
- 3.16 ED suggested that the current option 2b (which will now be the new option 2) defines reinforcement but does not mention certain scenarios where the upgrade is not to be treated as a reinforcement. RG disagreed stating that it says that in determining whether that asset is counted as shared use, and then reinforcement, the number of connections on the IDNOs distribution system will be looked at.
- 3.17 TT stated then once the Working Group have some examples, this can be built into the CCCM to demonstrate how this is charged (potentially a couple of examples to explain this).
- 3.18 MB suggested rather than removing two of the options (1a and 2a), it may be worth asking a Consultation question to seek industry views around which options are clearer. TC suggested including all options for feedback may be too confusing and suggested there is no value.
- 3.19 The Working Group held a vote on whether to include all 4 options to consult on or only take the option bs forward – the majority of the Working Group (9 members) voted to only move forward with options 1b and 2b to include within the Consultation. Following this, only options 1b and 2b will be included within the Consultation.
- 3.20 In regard to the current paragraph 4.8, members agreed to remove this as it does not appear to be needed.
- 3.21 ED provided feedback to amend paragraph 4.6 to provide further clarity around the proposed third option for the reader. TC reiterated the intent of this change is to determine how a DNO recovers its cost for upgrade work to its network, with the options being to socialise these costs or it is passed to the IDNO. TC stated that what the IDNO does with these costs, if passed, is out of scope of this change.
- 3.22 Following the above discussions, it was agreed to remove the current Q5 as it asked a question on an option that no longer will be progressed and has been deemed as discounted by the Working Group as it is believed be outside of the scope of this change. The Secretariat agreed to take an action to include additional wording that outlines why the potential third option was considered by the Working Group and why this was ultimately discounted.

**ACTION 03/06: The Secretariat to include additional wording within section 4 of the draft Consultation that outlines why the potential third option was considered by the Working Group and why this was ultimately discounted.**

- 3.23 Members discussed the relations between this CP and that of DCP 461 '[Reducing the Impact of Transmission Distribution Charges](#)'. It was agreed that although a similar subject matter, members do not believe there are any direct interactions or impacts between this CP and DCPO 461. Following this, it was agreed to remove paragraphs 4.9 and 4.10.

- 3.24 Following discussions, the Secretariat agreed to circulate a clean version of the draft Consultation to the Working Group offline for review.

**ACTION 03/06: The Secretariat to circulate a clean version of the draft Consultation to review offline.**

#### 4. Any Other Business

---

- 4.1 The Chair asked the group whether there were any other items of business to discuss.
- 4.2 There were no other items raised.

#### 5. Date of Next Meeting – 03 December 2025

---

- 5.1 The next Working Group meeting will be held on 03 December 2025 at 1pm.

#### 6. Attachments

---

- Attachment 1\_DCP 464 Work Plan

## APPENDIX A

### New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/03	The Secretariat to seek legal advice around how the additional wording should be added to paragraph 1.17 within Schedule 22.	Secretariat	<b>Ongoing.</b> <i>This will be completed in due course.</i>
01/05	RG/TC to provide previously presented materials (i.e., with Ofgem and COG) relating to discussions around this CP, to the next Working Group meeting for review, to aid the development of the Consultation.	RG / TC	<b>Ongoing.</b> <i>Materials are still being sought after.</i>
02/01	The Secretariat to update all references to 'IDNO' to 'LDNO'.	Secretariat	<b>Ongoing.</b> <i>To be completed.</i>
02/02	The Secretariat/Working Group to draft a glossary/annex to be included within the draft Consultation to clarify terms being used.	Secretariat / Working Group	<b>Ongoing.</b> <i>To be completed.</i>
03/01	The Secretariat to check the impacted parties for the SCRs and look to use the same within this CP.	Secretariat	<b>New Action.</b>
03/02	Tom Cadge to draft additional wording that provides clarity between the references to LDNO and IDNO for the group to further review.	Tom Cadge	<b>New Action.</b>
03/03	Rob Gladstone to send the Secretariat an updated example 6 diagram to use under paragraph 1.6 of the Consultation.	Rob Gladstone	<b>New Action.</b>

<b>03/04</b>	The Secretariat to insert the updated example 6 diagram under paragraph 1.6 of the Consultation.	Secretariat	<b>New Action.</b>
<b>03/05</b>	Drew Johnstone agreed to take an action to amend paragraph 4.6 to clarify the third option and inconsistent treatment.	Drew Johnstone	<b>New Action.</b>
<b>03/06</b>	The Secretariat to include additional wording within section 4 of the draft Consultation that outlines why the potential third option was considered by the Working Group and why this was ultimately discounted.	Secretariat	<b>New Action.</b>
<b>03/07</b>	The Secretariat to circulate a clean version of the draft Consultation to review offline.	Secretariat	<b>New Action.</b>

## Closed Actions

Action Ref.		Update	
<b>01/06</b>	IDNO representatives to bring available data sets around how many requests they have made for this situation and how they have been charged, to the next Working Group for further discussion.	IDNO Representatives	<b>Closed.</b> <i>Discussed on the agenda. EB confirmed that 4 sites have been in this situation.</i>
<b>02/03</b>	The Secretariat develop a draft Consultation for the Working Group to review.	Secretariat	<b>Closed.</b>
<b>02/04</b>	The Secretariat agreed to circulate a word version of the draft Consultation to members to provide feedback/additional comments.	Secretariat	<b>Closed.</b>