

DCP 461 Working Group - Meeting 13

05 February 2026 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Aishwarya Harsure [AH]	NESO
Alexander Pentecost [AP]	Eclipse
Ben Godfrey [BG]	NGED
Drew Johnstone [DJ]	NPg
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Generation
Erik Baguzis [EB]	Indigo
Hector Perez [HP]	Scottish Power
Jack Purchase [JP]	NGED
John Harmer [JH]	Waters Wye
Liam Sweeney [LS]	Ofgem
Mark Askew [MA]	SSE
Matthew Paige-Stimson [MPS]	National Grid
Natalija Zaiceva [NZ]	UKPN
Nina Sanghera [NS]	Drax
Will Bowen [WB]	UKPN
Code Administrator	
Craig Booth [CB]	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Ed Grimsey [EG]	BU-UK

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 and Open Actions

- 1.4 The Chair shared the minutes of the previous meeting and there were no further comments/feedback. These minutes were approved.
- 1.5 The Chair provided the updates on the current open actions; these can be found within the Appendix.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair explained that the purpose of this meeting was carry out a final review of the draft legal text and draft Consultation 2 document within the Working Group and agree next steps.
- 2.2 The Chair suggested that as there was no feedback provided on either of the documents, it may be beneficial to reschedule the meeting to enable any feedback to be received and then reviewed prior to finalising the documents. The Working Group agreed with this approach.
- 2.3 It was noted that there may have been miscommunication during the previous meeting whereby members believed they were to be sent updated documents to review and this may be why feedback has not been received yet, as the updated documents have not yet been circulated.
- 2.4 The Chair agreed to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group for their availability for the next meeting.

ACTION 13/01: The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group for the next meeting.

- 2.5 Whilst members were on the call, AW proposed a quick overview of the recent NESO dataset that was made available – Working Group members agreed this would be beneficial.

3. Overview of NESO Dataset

- 3.1 The Chair presented the NESO dataset live on screen for AW to walk through with the Working Group.
- 3.2 The key updated can be found below:
- 3.3 AW noted that the dataset has been compiled across 2 years and includes SHED and SPD as well as NGED, however, they are all anonymised. This includes the triggered MW and total connection work cost (not included: voltage level due to time constraints).
- 3.4 AW informed the group that this subset of data may be able to give the Working Group an indication of the range and variability in the unit costs. Within the dataset on tab 1, there are 10 connection asset

schemes from the TOCOs (Transmission Owner Construction Offer) from last year across TOs (Transmission Owner). AW also stated that the spreadsheet includes NESOs summary data.

- 3.5 On the second tab, AW showed 49 DNO schemes taken from signed TOCOs over the last 6-month security cycle (NGED data only).
- 3.6 Tab 3 showed some standard deviation analysis of £/MW. AW noted that these are high-level figures only. AW confirmed that the 95th percentile is around 120k £/MW which demonstrates the wide range in complexity.
- 3.7 MPS stated that the dataset shows quite a wide variation for typical MW ranges, typically SGT ratings.
- 3.8 ED suggested that a high-cost threshold may need to differ between different levels of capacity. ED also noted that the dataset shows unit cost as opposed to project total cost.
- 3.9 BG stated that this dataset may be beneficial as supporting evidence around whether there is sufficient data available in terms of providing a high-cost threshold. BG also noted that the consequences of not including a high-cost threshold should be considered.
- 3.10 MPS stated that due to the highly regional variations of some of these costs, it may still be efficient for designing a substation in London to deliver that capacity, for example, but it would be a different expense compared to developing a substation elsewhere.
- 3.11 ED queried whether location-driven variation in connection costs already exists and, if so, why a uniform threshold would be considered discriminatory – MPS explained that those within metropolitan areas have been exposed, through no fault of their own, to higher costs such as recharge liability, than those from a low-cost grade area.
- 3.12 ED reiterated that connection costs already vary by location today. MPS clarified that with the default scenario in CUSC, connection charges are spread over 40 years and recovered via allowed revenue through DUoS; if there was enough appropriate funding to permit increased annual connection charging, MPS suggested that individual Customers would not be directly exposed to high development costs that are needed to give the DNO extra capability.
- 3.13 WB stated that developing a very complex approach should be carefully considered, suggesting that the high-cost project threshold should set a level that captures the exceptional cases and are protecting the socialisation of those costs from exceptionally high reinforcement costs. WB suggested keeping this approach simple.
- 3.14 AW clarified that tab 1 is the User MW that triggered the reinforcement and NESOs data (tabs 2/3) is £/MW based on GSP capabilities. AW agreed to take an action to add a note to clarify this on each of the tabs.

ACTION 13/02: AW to include notes on the NESO dataset tabs to clarify what the data is based on.

- 3.15 Following the above discussions, the Secretariat agreed to circulate the below to the Working Group post-meeting for review:
 - Updated NESO dataset.
 - Updated Consultation 2 document.

- No detriment document.

3.16 The Secretariat also agreed to issue a meeting poll for the next Working Group meeting to review the above documents.

ACTION 13/03: The Secretariat to issue updated NESO dataset, Consultation 2 and no detriment documents to the Working Group for review offline.

ACTION 13/04: The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group for the next meeting.

4. Agreed Next Steps

4.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:

- The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group for the next meeting.
- The Working Group to provide any comments/feedback on the updated documents.

5. Any Other Business

5.1 The Chair asked the group whether there were any other items of business to discuss.

5.2 There were no other items raised.

6. Date of Next Meeting – 19 February 2026

6.1 The next Working Group meeting will be held on 19 February 2026 at 1pm.

7. Attachments

- Attachment 1_DCP 461 Work Plan

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
02/02	MA, BH and BG to pull together work done by previous ENA group to see if it can be used by the Working Group.	Mark / Brian / Ben	On Hold (Post-Consultation). <i>Members agreed to keep this action open as it is not required to consult, but may be required for an Impact Assessment, following the Consultation.</i>
10/03	BH, BG & LW to draft the 3 new CPs (BH – option 1, BG - option 2, LW – option 3) to review at the January DCUSA Panel.	Brian / Ben / Lee	Ongoing. <i>Will be presented at the February Panel.</i>
12/01	The Working Group to cross-check the draft legal text (specifically for Option 2) to seek whether it addresses double cost-apportioning the charge.	Working Group	Ongoing.
12/02	BH to draft the no detriment approach provisions within the draft legal text options offline for the Working Group to review.	Brian	Ongoing.
12/03	The Working Group to review the draft legal text to establish whether additional wording is needed to allow for the ability to recover exceptional charges and whether it was requested by the Customer or not.	Working Group	Ongoing.
12/04	AW to check with their internal securities team to see if it is possible to gather a data set that provides connection scheme costs for DNOs.	Aishwarya	Ongoing.

12/05	The Secretariat to draft the legal text for all options to show only the relevant changed extracts.	Secretariat	Ongoing.
12/06	DJ to provide an explanation in relation to ECCR impacts for paragraph 8.40 of the Consultation 2 document.	Drew	Ongoing.
12/07	BH to draft wording within the Consultation 2 document to explain the ECCR assumptions in relation to option 2.1.	Brian	Ongoing.
12/08	Working Group members to review the draft Consultation 2 document offline and provide any feedback/comments prior to the next meeting.	Working Group	Ongoing.
13/01	The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group for the next meeting.	Secretariat	New Action.
13/02	AW to include notes on the NESO dataset tabs to clarify what the data is based on.	AW	New Action.
13/03	The Secretariat to issue updated NESO dataset, Consultation 2 and no detriment documents to the Working Group for review offline.	Secretariat	New Action.
13/04	The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group for the next meeting.	Secretariat	New Action.
13/05		Secretariat	New Action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.		Update	
09/05	The Secretariat to bring the discussions around the potential 3 DCP 461 CPs to the January DCUSA Panel meeting.	Secretariat	Closed. <i>Update was provided to the group.</i>
10/01	The Secretariat to seek advice at the January DCUSA Panel meeting as to whether it would be feasible to seek wider industry feedback around the 3 potential solutions (new CPs) within the DCP 461	Secretariat	Closed. <i>Update was provided to the group.</i>

	Consultation, leading to the 3 new CPs going straight to Change Report.		
10/02	BH to either include or reference to a definition of Transmission High-Cost Project Threshold within the draft Legal Text for option 2.4.	Brian	Closed. <i>BH noted that this has now been circulated but is yet to be reviewed.</i>
11/01	The Secretariat to seek whether the DCUSA Panel would agree to review the 3 CPs offline during an ex-committee meeting.	Secretariat	Closed. <i>The panel agreed to review and approve these ex-committee.</i>
11/02	The Secretariat to follow up with Matthew Paige-Stimson to Q5 of Consultation 1 in regard to the likely typo of 5-125 years (cost for Scottish GSPs).	Secretariat	Closed.
11/03	The Secretariat to include an explainer paragraph to the beginning of the legal text commentary to explain that paragraph references are to the legal text document (not the Consultation).	Secretariat	Closed.
11/04	AW to seek internally what data is available from NESO in relation to capital costs on an upfront basis and customer requested capacity, and feedback to the group.	Aishwarya Harsure	Closed.
11/05	Once the available NESO data is known, the Working Group to make a request for specific data from NESO.	Working Group	Closed. <i>It was noted that when the data would be available is the current issue.</i>
11/06	The Secretariat to include specific line numbers when referencing 'see above' within the options matrix table.	Secretariat	Closed.
11/07	The Secretariat to circulate a clean version of the options matrix table to the Working Group offline for review.	Secretariat	Closed.
11/08	The Secretariat to include wording within the Consultation 2 document around ECCR provisions.	Secretariat	Closed.