

# DCP 466 Working Group - Meeting 01

11 December 2025 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Chris Ong [CO]	UKPN
David Fewings [DF]	SE First
Donna Jamieson [DJ]	Idcsl
Ed Grimsey [EG]	BU-UK
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Gen
Erik Baguzis [EB]	Indigo
Finn Breen [FB]	ESP
Hakan Feridun [HF]	Energunitie
John Harmer [JH]	Waters Wye
Joshua Robinson [JR]	NFU Energy
Kavya Kavya [KK]	Brook Green Supply
Lee Stone [LS]	EON
Neil Shah [NS]	Switch Business
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark
Peter Waymont [PW]	UKPN
Seun Adedapo [SA]	National Grid
Steve Harris [SH]	OVO
Tony Collings [TC]	Ecotricity
Victoria Burkett [VB]	EON Next
Wayne Farnell [WF]	Savills
<b>Code Administrator</b>	

Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
<b>Apologies</b>	
Kara Burke [KB]	NPg
Ryan Ward [RW]	Scottish Power

## 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.

### Actions

- 1.4 The Chair confirmed that all actions captured within this meeting will be recorded within the action log; this can be found in the Appendix.

## 2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair explained that the purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss the Change Proposal within the Working Group and agree next steps.

## 3. Overview of DCP 466 Change Proposal

- 3.1 The Chair invited the proposer [PW] to provide an overview of the DCP 466 Change Proposal to the Working Group.
- 3.2 The purpose of this change is to ensure tariff bands for HH settled sites are aligned to a Customer's capacity at all times (e.g. tariff bands are assessed/changed whenever a capacity change is agreed).
- 3.3 To do this, the proposer has suggested changing schedule 32 to state that tariff bands will be aligned to capacity, and each time capacity is agreed to be changed the band will be re-assessed according to the capacity banding thresholds. This change would not impact MPANs which do not have an agreed capacity.

- 3.4 This change would apply to increases as well as decreases of capacity. Currently the process requires a customer to request a banding change following a change of capacity and it is unlikely that a customer who increases their capacity requests their band to be reviewed. This change would align the process for all customers.
- 3.5 Reviewing all sites at the time of the capacity change would avoid issues where a customer contacts the DNO months after the capacity change took place asking for a backdated amendment to their banding, as it had not been requested at the time. This will be especially important with the change to the settlements window reducing from 14 to 4 months following the implementation of MHHS, which will otherwise result in some customers not realising the full benefit of a change of capacity.

## 4. Review and Discussion of the Change Proposal

---

- 4.1 The Chair invited the Working Group to both review and discuss the DCP 466 Change Proposal.
- 4.2 The key updates can be found below:
- 4.3 LS stated that the issues this CP addresses, along with the complexities of the price control changes will all be alleviated and simplified by following residual band settings based on where the capacity boundaries.
- 4.4 ED queried the history of the approach as this was not included within the CP, alongside any mention of DCP 360 '[Ofgem Targeted Charging Review Implementation: Allocation to Bands and Interventions](#)' as the original CP.
- 4.5 ED also stated that there was no mention of DCP 389 '[TCR – Clarification on Exceptional Circumstances and Allocation Review for 'New' Sites](#)' which made modifications to the Exceptional Circumstances, or the TCR decision principles. ED suggested that due to the amount of history relating to this CP, this should be reflected on.
- 4.6 EB asked the group what the appropriate tether would be for the capacity and residual charging band? EB stated that re-banding occurs once there is enough data within the price control period.
- 4.7 TC confirmed that this CP is supported and believes it would be beneficial to Customers.
- 4.8 KF suggested that it makes sense to release capacity when it is not being used for others that may need it, and to consider whether there should be an incentive within the market to do so.
- 4.9 In relation to ED's point, PW stated that previous CPs were not mentioned within the proposal as the CP was originally raised to deal with the current issues at present (as opposed to previous issues and/or discussions held).
- 4.10 CO informed the group that Ofgem have suggested previously at DCMDG meetings that they are open to discuss and review any changes in relation to decisions that may have made previously.
- 4.11 SH queried whether distribution band changes will then affect transmission fixed charges – LS confirmed this correct. SH stated that with the costs of transmission charges coming over the next 5 years, there is opportunity for gains by moving and/or lowering a band.

- 4.12 WF confirmed that they have a number of sites who could potentially give up 10-20% of their capacity, and they most likely would if there was a financial gain to do so.
- 4.13 JH queried what happens to the DNOs total revenue adjustment would work – PW stated that the capacity is not the only factor in revenue increasing or decreasing. WF stated that there are a number of Customers waiting for capacity (expected 2027) and suggests that the DNOs revenue should not decrease.
- 4.14 LS suggested it be made clear that capacity can go both ways (up and down) within the Change Proposal as there is a lot of discussions currently around it is going down but not up.
- 4.15 SH stated that although a Customer may give away some of their capacity, this might not necessarily mean they will change bands – with that being said, SH queried how many of these instances are going to be seen. WF confirmed that they have a number of buildings (on the cusp of their band) that would surrender 10/20% of their capacity, but not necessarily 50% of their capacity as it would not make it worth while for them if they cannot change bands.
- 4.16 NS queried whether there is any guidance around what would happen in relation to a fixed price contract and whose responsibility it is when a reduction in band occurs – LS stated it would be subject to what the contract says with that Supplier. To confirm, the group noted that this CP would not include any information around this as it would be a commercial contract between the Supplier and the Customer.
- 4.17 DF also stated that they have known a number of Suppliers who will change their rates within fixed contracts in relation to re-banding, however, there are also a number of Suppliers who do not do this. It is completely down to the Supplier and their Terms and Conditions.
- 4.18 JH asked members, when a Customer wants to increase their capacity which then passes the costs onto the Supplier (unable to pass them through on a fixed contract), can a Supplier stop the Customer increasing their capacity mid-contract – LS confirmed that Suppliers cannot do this as per the Connections Agreement, and therefore may be liable for costs.
- 4.19 In terms of concerns of this CP, ED stated that there needs to be a strong rationale as to why Ofgem's TCR decision warrants changing, which may be a challenge. ED also suggested how this change affects revenue collection will need to be considered.
- 4.20 TC stated that this change could also reduce capital investment, which could then balance out the concerns around revenue in the long-term.
- 4.21 HF suggested that a main issue with going out to Consultation is that Customers may not fully understand what this change will do and what impacts it will have. SH suggested that National Grid and DNOs will most likely be the ones most impacted.
- 4.22 SA asked the group whether including a cap on how many times and/or how many band changes a Customer could make a year/regulatory period should be considered – CO suggested that there is wording within the charging statements that mentions that a Customer can only decrease once in a 12 month period; however, it does not include any wording around increasing Customers.

- 4.23 WF noted that the Working Group should be mindful of data received as bands will be changing as of 01 April 2026. Members agreed to be specific that data requested is for where the Customer would be from April 2026.
- 4.24 Members suggested that it may be beneficial to have a conversation with Ofgem to seek views on whether gathering this data would be helpful and whether there is anything else that they would like to see to aid their decision. The Secretariat agreed to take an action to contact Ofgem with the above queries.

**ACTION 01/01: The Secretariat to contact Ofgem to seek views on whether gathering this data would be helpful and whether there is anything else they would like to see to aid their decision.**

- 4.25 JR queried whether seasonality could be a factor to consider in relation to impacts of this change – if the banding is going to be changed to match capacity, can Customers change their capacity more often as well? PW stated that it is not a consideration within the scope of this change.
- 4.26 It was noted that the risk to a Customer reducing their capacity, is that they would not be guaranteed to get it back if needed.
- 4.27 DJ suggested asking the respondent to provide the age of the MPAN (i.e., 1-2 years, 3-5 yrs etc.), however, members believe that this may make responding and providing data more complicated and agreed to keep the questions as simple as possible.

## 5. Agreed Consultation Questions

- 5.1 The Working Group agreed to the below draft Consultation questions:
- 5.2 Do you believe that the current process for exceptional circumstances would be fit for purpose if this CP is approved?
- 5.3 How many Customers have a MIC that is above the band boundary, but the maximum demand is below the band boundary (<50%)?
- 5.4 Based on the April 2026 banding, how many Customers maximum demand, over the last 24 months, would equate to them being in higher or lower band, compared to their AFC?
- 5.5 The Secretariat to produce a draft Consultation for the Working Group to review offline prior to the next meeting on 07 January 2026 (for a final review of the draft Consultation). The Secretariat confirmed the aim is to issue the Consultation in January and schedule in a Working Group in February 2026 to review the Consultation responses.

**ACTION 01/02: The Secretariat to produce a draft Consultation for the Working Group to review offline.**

## 6. Agreed Next Steps

- 6.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
- The Secretariat to reach out to Ofgem to discuss the data the Working Group is aiming to gather via the Consultation.

- The Secretariat to produce a draft Consultation for the Working Group to review online prior to the next meeting.

## 7. Any Other Business

---

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

## 8. Date of Next Meeting – 07 January 2026

---

- 8.1 The next Working Group meeting will be held on 07 January 2026 at 10am.

## 9. Attachments

---

- Attachment 1\_DCP 466 Work Plan

## APPENDIX A

---

### New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
<b>01/01</b>	The Secretariat to contact Ofgem to seek views on whether gathering this data would be helpful and whether there is anything else they would like to see to aid their decision.	Secretariat	<b>New Action.</b>
<b>01/02</b>	The Secretariat to produce a draft Consultation for the Working Group to review offline.	Secretariat	<b>New Action.</b>

### Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update