

DCP 464 Working Group - Meeting 07

12 March 2026 at 13:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Alex Pentecost [AP]	Eclipse
Donna Jamieson [DJ]	IDSCL
Ed Grimsey [EG]	BU-UK
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Generation
Ephie Chalakateva [EC]	National Grid
Erik Baguzis [EB]	Indigo Networks
Gus Wood [GW]	Gowling
Mark Mclean [MM]	Green Deal
Martin Brace [MB]	UKPN
Michael Allison [MA]	SSEN
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark
Ollie Easterbrook [OE]	National Grid
Tracey Taylor [TT]	SPENW
Code Administrator	
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	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.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair explained that the purpose of this meeting is to continue to review the draft legal text and discuss the solution development within the Working Group and agree next steps.

3. Review Draft Legal Text

- 3.1 The Chair presented the draft legal text live on screen for the Working Group to review and discuss.
- 3.2 The key updates can be found below:
- 3.3 The Chair informed the group that GW is present during this meeting to help provide members with the relevant legal steer.
- 3.4 In terms of 'the host' or 'embedded networks', GW asked the group which use of 'host' they are thinking about – this term is used within the methodology and questioned whether it would be beneficial to define the term (i.e., the DNO system).
- 3.5 GW suggested something similar with 'embedded networks' by making it a defined term.
- 3.6 GW queried why shared use (more than one connection) is relevant to the concept of reinforcement; reinforcement is defined as adding capacity to the existing shared use distribution system, but asked members what happens when there is a distribution system that is not shared use?
- 3.7 MB explained that sole use is a single Customer that benefits from the upgrading of the cables. Shared use is where there is more than once connection and therefore it can be treated as

reinforcement works, meaning the cost of that reinforcement is then socialised on the DNOs network.

- 3.8 GW agreed that defining shared use could be a way to move forward with this, however, noted that is important to ensure there is no scenario where a Customer is neither sole use nor shared use. The Working Group agreed it would be helpful to also define sole use and should be aligned with the Connection Charging methodology.
- 3.9 GW informed the group that sole use is defined within the EDCM as 'assets for the use of sole connectee and suggested that this definition does not need to be changed. The Working Group only need to focus on the CCCM definition basing it on entry/exit points.
- 3.10 In relation to paragraph 1.36 (where the distributor will fully fund the reinforcement), MB explained that this is a requirement from Ofgem. TT stated that currently, charges are based on whether they are a sole user (regardless of how many MPANs or Customers that are connected to their network. TT noted that this was not accounted for within the Consultation.
- 3.11 TT continued to explain that the reinforcement would be considered as sole use and charge to the IDNO, but if their application for load growth based on low carbon technology (in line with 1.36), the DNO should be funding that reinforcement. TT suggested that this needs to be captured within the legal text and ensure that the related scenarios are clearly outlined.
- 3.12 TT stated that the wording also depends on which option is taken forward as part of the DCUSA, and the difference is that the high-cost project threshold would not apply to any reinforcement that falls under paragraph 1.36.
- 3.13 In terms of derogations, GW stated that whether this is needed, depends on when this change is going to be in practice. GW suggested it is worth considering asking respondents whether they need or want to change their user system based on this.
- 3.14 GW suggested two options for the Working Group to consider:
- Leave individual distributors to apply for a derogation.
 - Write some special rules into this part of the CP, meaning distributors are able to change their charges without going through that process.
- 3.15 Members agreed that it may be beneficial to include this as a Consultation question to seek wider views.
- 3.16 Following discussions, the Secretariat agreed to circulate the most up-to-date version of draft legal text to the Working Group for review.
- 3.17 GW also agreed to take an action to make amendments to this version of draft legal text and will circulate to the group for review once completed.

ACTION 07/01: The Secretariat to circulate the most up-to-date version of draft legal text to the Working Group for review offline.

ACTION 07/02: GW to circulate an amended version of the draft legal text to the Working Group for review.

- 3.18 The Working Group noted that this change will most likely go back out to Consult with wider industry but believe it will be beneficial to schedule a meeting to review the redrafted legal text once Gus has circulated this, and progress this change from there.

4. Agreed Next Steps

- 4.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
- The Secretariat to circulate the current version of the draft legal text to the Working Group.
 - Guss Wood to redraft the legal text and circulate to Working Group members for review prior to the next meeting (scheduled for 23 March 2026).

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 – 23 March 2026

- 6.1 The next Working Group has been scheduled for 23 March 2026 at 10am.

7. 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	Ongoing. <i>This will be completed in due course.</i>
05/03	The Secretariat to develop a matrix showing how many respondents preferred each option and a list of pros and cons for each of the options.	Secretariat	Ongoing. <i>This will be completed in due course.</i>
07/01	The Secretariat to circulate the most up-to-date version of draft legal text to the Working Group for review offline.	Secretariat	New Action.
07/02	GW to circulate an amended version of the draft legal text to the Working Group for review.	Gus Wood	New Action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
06/01	The Secretariat to invite Gus from Gowling WLG to the next Working Group to review and discuss the draft legal text.	Secretariat	Closed.
06/02	The Secretariat to circulate the draft legal text document to the Working Group post-meeting.	Secretariat	Closed.

06/03

The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group for the next meeting.

Secretariat

Closed.