

Embedded Capacity Request DCUSA Subgroup Meeting 04

23 March 2025 at 14:00

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Dario Minissale (DM)	SSE
Frasier Gascoigne (FG)	NPg
Steve Mould (SM)	UKPN
Steve Halsey (SH)	UKPN
Phil Moseley (PM)	NGED
Christopher Ibeh (CI)	NESO
Conner Reid (CR)	SPEN
Peter Douglass (PD)	Ethical Power
Julie Richmond (JR)	SPEN
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 NESO ECR change requests that have been raised and then agree on next steps.

3. Overview of NESO ECR Change request.

- 3.1 The Subgroup started to review the NESO ECR change request; this can be found within **Attachment 1 ECR Change Request Notice**.
- 3.2 It was also noted that the Subgroup would specifically focus on the representations for this ECR change request. Then representations can be found within **Attachment 2_ECR Change Request Notice_Representations and Objections**.
- 3.3 The Chair advised that this ECR change request was presented to the DCUSA panel on 18 March 2026 and it was noted that there were two parties who’d provided representation for this change that did not support it.
- 3.4 The Chair advised the panel had instructed the DCUSA secretariat to bring this change request back to the DCUSA ECR subgroup, specifically to those who’d provided representations that were not in support of the amendment to see if an agreement could be reached so the NESO ECR change request could be progressed, as there were also some parties who did support the change request so views were mixed within the initial representations.
- 3.5 Both parties who had provided representations not in support of the change request were present (NGED and UKPN) and both parties advised that their position on this had not changed since representations were submitted.
- 3.6 It was explained that the lookup tables would be a one-off exercise, optional and would support users of the ECR to better utilise the information, it was also noted that the belief was the activity wouldn’t create a huge burden on Parties updating the ECR either.
- 3.7 SM advised that as a concept, he agreed with the above but highlighted a concern in whether there is a consistent understanding of what a GSP was across the data sets, especially where there are changes to boundaries and other elements of a site.

- 3.8 FG also noted that whilst he appreciated the point SM made, the lookup would still be useful as it would still give a view of what a GSP is fed off, and that having a single view of that would be useful.
- 3.9 SM stated that he did understand what the lookup table was trying to achieve but wanted clarity that the lookup table would capture the right granularity of information, and the correct level of information to make producing the lookup table value.
- 3.10 CI advised that the intent was to not go much deeper than the node level or the respective site.
- 3.11 CI went on further to explain that if they were able to get what DNOs call the GSP name alongside other elements of the ECR, they would be able link up the GSP name and GSP ID within the lookup table if they are able to get what the DNOs called the same GSP in a DNOs respective GSP naming convention.
- 3.12 SM again advise that whilst the concept of the change request made sense, was the ECR the most appropriate publication to support the issue the lookup table was seeking to address, as the data that was required may already be held within other data items in the ECR.
- 3.13 SM explained that the ECR already had lots of data items and queried if there was something that can be done within the register itself. He advised this may that be a better solution, rather than adding in another process for DNOs to create the lookup table.
- 3.14 SM also noted that the lookup table captured a lot of data that users didn't own so again, was it correct to be asking DNOs to update a lookup table using data they had no influence over?
- 3.15 FG noted the concerns raised by SM and queried if there could be something changed within the GSP id column in the ECR. He also queried how new connection nodes and new GSP would be handled.
- 3.16 SH advised they had the same issue last year with a new node and they spoke to NESO as NESO were not aware of the new node.
- 3.17 CI stated the lookup table, in line with the ECR, provided the best platform to link up the data across multiple areas.
- 3.18 SM asked where the BSC definition of GSP was captured and why was the Elexon definition the most reliable definition, rather than elsewhere (i.e. the ECR).
- 3.19 It was agreed that standardisation/a national summery was difficult due the number of different users, data sources and data items and that the lookup table would help that.
- 3.20 CI advised that the Elexon view has a national picture of what GSP IDs are and then they have the respective DNOs with different naming conventions, but as they need to be able to move from one DNO to another and at the moment the best national standard that had a national picture that captures all the GSP ID was the Elexon GSP ID approach.
- 3.21 CI went on to highlight that it doesn't necessarily mean that Elexon have captured this information better than DNOs, it gave a national outlook that can be use as a baseline to be able to move between the respective DNOs.

- 3.22 SM drew attention to NESOs EMID platform and noted that this should be giving a consistent level of information and data exchanges between relevant stakeholders, and as such wondered if that's an opportunity in the background to have that mapping between the information that is presented in the ECR versus the connections that are made between that information relative to the GSPS.
- 3.23 CI advised that the issue is that NESO would not directly have an overview of the naming conventions within each DNO and as such, the naming conventions are so different, this ruled out using the EMID platform at this time.
- 3.24 SM advised that the LTDS is seeking to remedy similar challenges with the data in the ECR as the NESO ECR change request, and queried if these issues could be resolved independently of the ECR by working directly with DNOs with these boundary points to get the standardisation in place, especially as some of the issues are fairly rare in working practice.
- 3.25 CI again appealed to the parties would did not support the original change if their view had changed during this discussion and as such, they would approve the change request and if not, were there any steps that could be taken to help gain support for the update.
- 3.26 It was highlighted by some Subgroup members that the production of the ECR is initially automated but then it requires some manual intervention and manual work to get to the final publication.
- 3.27 SM advised that the conversation during this meeting had been quite abstract and conceptual so maybe if CI could provide DNOs with examples for the DNOs to review and work through then that would be helpful in order to determine if the ECR is the answer to this issue or if it could be resolved via a platform/method that sits outside of the ECR.
- 3.28 CI agreed to create these examples and share with each DNO and once these examples had been reviewed, options could then be debated and an approach agreed upon.
- 3.29 This approach was agreed and the Chair advised that once the DNOs had reviewed the examples, he would issue a poll to agree a new meeting date to discuss this.
- 3.30 SM advised that once he had the examples he could take these to the LTDS group to see if they were seeking to resolve the issue, he would also take them to a contact at NESO to see if the EMID could solve the issue and finally he would share it with his data quality team to see if the data could be cleaned up internally

4. A.O.B

- 4.1 FG asked the group how members of the ECR subgroup were handling connection reform and specifically how were DNOs handling gate one in their version of the ECR? He asked if they were keeping schemes in or were they removing schemes.
- 4.2 SH advised that if it wasn't a hybrid scheme they would simply remove it from the ECR because it's neither connected, it's neither accepted to connect or connected. He went on to state that f it's a hybrid scheme, then he believed that the thinking was to remove that technology from the appropriate set of 6 column i.e. tech one, tech two, tech three and leave just the relevant technology.

- 4.3 SH did also advise if they got the opportunity to come back for their second technology in 434, then that probably needs a little bit more thought.
- 4.4 FG noted that they had similar thoughts so SM noted that he would raise this on the TMO 4 plus call but that this probably needed more thought moving forwards.

5. Next Meeting

- 5.1 It was agreed to reconvene a meeting once the examples shared by CI had been reviewed.

DCUSA