

DCP 461 Working Group - Meeting 14

19 February 2026 at 13:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Aishwarya Harsure [AH]	NESO
Brian Hoy [BH]	SP ENW
Claire Witty [CW]	SPEN
Drew Johnstone [DJ]	NPg
Ed Grimsey [EG]	BU-UK
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Generation
Erik Baguzis [EB]	Indigo
Hector Perez [HP]	Scottish Power
Helen Stack [HS]	Centrica
Jack Purchase [JP]	NGED
Kyran Hanks [KH]	Waters Wye
Liam Sweeney [LS]	Ofgem
Matthew Paige-Stimson [MPS]	National Grid
Natalija Zaiceva [NZ]	UKPN
Nikki Pillinger [NP]	Roadnight Taylor
Nina Sanghera [NS]	Drax
Rohan Sachdev [RS]	SSEN
Will Bowen [WB]	UKPN
Code Administrator	
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Ben Godfrey [BG]	NGED

Craig Booth [CB]	ElectraLink
Ed Birkett [EB]	Low Carbon
John Harmer [JH]	Waters Wye
Mark Askew [MA]	SSE

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.
- 1.6 **Action 10/03** – The Chair confirmed the new 3 CPs were presented to the February Panel. It was noted that they were not approved as of yet to progress to the next stage as it was felt that they should go out to Consultation for feedback initially as there may be a number that are no longer taken forward. Once the Consultation has been issued, the new CPs will be revisited.
- 1.7 The Chair confirmed the Panel and Ofgem will be kept updated at each meeting to continue engagement. LS agreed to take an action to speak internally and provide an update to the relevant colleagues around the details of this CP and the 3 new CPs.

ACTION 14/01: LS to speak internally and provide an update to the relevant colleagues around the details of this CP and the 3 new CPs.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair explained that the purpose of this meeting was to review and discuss the NESO Dataset, draft Consultation 2 document, the No Detriment Assessment and draft legal text options within the Working Group and agree next steps.

3. Review & Discuss 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 The Secretariat agreed to take an action to ensure the NESO dataset is clearly articulated within the Consultation 2 document.

ACTION 14/02: The Secretariat to ensure the NESO dataset is clearly articulated within the Consultation 2 document.

- 3.4 AH provided an overview of the updated NESO dataset to the Working Group for further discussion.
- 3.5 NZ queried whether the NESO dataset only contain transmission connection asset works – AH confirmed that this is correct, and it is based on 10 connection asset schemes. AH noted that the dataset does not allow for a split to find out what exact reinforcement works were triggered or what type of works.
- 3.6 Following analysis of the data, it was noted that at around £100k pMW there is a rapid increase. By following a similar method to how Ofgem set their previous high-cost project threshold, the Working Group noted that a methodology can be calculated should the high-cost project threshold option be chosen to progress.
- 3.7 ED suggested that a number of examples to go with the options would be useful (i.e., an example where it leads to the Customer not paying anything as it is below the threshold, and an example of where it is above the threshold).
- 3.8 Following the above discussions, WB agreed to take an action to draft these examples for the Working Group to review.

ACTION 14/03: WB to draft high-cost project threshold examples for the Working Group to review.

4. Review Draft Consultation 2 Document / No Detriment Assessment / Draft Legal Text

- 4.1 The Chair presented the draft Consultation 2 document live on screen for the Working Group to review and discuss.
- 4.2 The key updated can be found below:
- 4.3 The Working Group agreed to add 'may raise' to paragraph 2.4 following the Panel outcome.
- 4.4 It was agreed to remove paragraph 7.3 as the caveat can now be removed as there is now a value to include for the high-cost project threshold.
- 4.5 In terms of the high-cost project threshold, NZ stated that anything below the threshold will be CAF apportioned, and anything above will be 100% recovered from Customers; but queried what happens if there are multiple of these Customers and how the cost would be split. BH explained that the first comer would bear the cost and the second comer would pay their apportionment.
- 4.6 RS informed the group that the approach used in [CMP 460 'Improving Transmission Connection Asset Charging'](#) is similar in terms of the impact on Gate 2 offers accepted, in that they wanted to remove any transmission charges onto users that have accepted offers. RS queried whether Ofgem would prefer if these two changes were aligned with one another.

- 4.7 In terms of implementation, NZ stated that Customers would expect securities to be removed and the security statements come from NESO which cannot be changed. BH stated that this proposal is not touching securities, so the Customer will not have to pay the charge.
- 4.8 ED questioned whether it was possible to confirm implementation timelines at this stage, given that connection reform and queue management changes could affect them. BH noted that, in light of this, there may be a strong rationale for choosing option 2 because of the uniqueness and timing advantages offered by gate 2. RS agreed, adding that option 2 may be the better approach as it removes costs for all parties and provides consistency, provided the offer is made after the go-live date.
- 4.9 RS queried whether both options need to be consulted on or whether the Working Group can state that two options were considered, but option 2 is the solution the group have chosen to progress – BH stated that the timing of the offers is outside of the Customers control and therefore it is right to bring this to all Parties (and not have unintended consequences).
- 4.10 It was noted that option 1.2 states that the Customer will not pay unless the GSP is to feed one Customer and queried who is paying; NZ stated that a Customer may get dedicated a standalone transformer and suggested that this many need to be included.
- 4.11 MPS suggested considering that some cases might be a single transformer and not through user choice. BH explained that option 1.2 was trying to guard against this. BH also stated that there needs to be a clear position for new connections and draw out any nuances, and accepted, but not connected projects should benefit from these changes.
- 4.12 The Secretariat agreed to take an action to articulate this within the Change Report.

ACTION 14/04: The Secretariat / Working Group to articulate discussions around a single transformer within the Change Report.

- 4.13 In regard to ‘the risk of a Variable and Unsustainable Financial Burden on Individual Customers Defect’ section of the Consultation, BH queried whether paragraphs 8.23.1 and 8.23.2 (make no change to offer; or make a variation to CAF the charges, if any) should remain as a choice, or whether the Working Group should make a recommendation.
- 4.14 RS stated that the wording may need a slight amendment as it may appear as though it states if there are no changes, some could be added. Members discussed this and agreed it may be cleaner to remove paragraph 8.23.1 and insert the No Detriment Assessment table. Following this, minor amendments were made to the No Detriment Assessment table to reflect this (i.e., removal of option 1 – no change under gate 2 offer accepted column).
- 4.15 Following the above discussions, the Working Group agreed to remove the current wording from this section, add commentary to introduce the No Detriment Assessment table, and insert the table into the Consultation.

ACTION 14/05: The Secretariat / Working Group to add introductory wording in relation to the No Detriment Assessment Table within the Consultation document.

- 4.16 In regard to the DCUSA Charging Objectives, the Chair noted that there will need to be commentary added around why the Working Group believes this change meets these Objectives within the Consultation 2 document. The Change Report will need to assess the DCUSA Charging Objectives

against each option. BH noted that these could be lifted from the new 3 CPs that were drafted to be included within the Consultation 2 document for now.

ACTION 14/06: The Secretariat lift the assessed DCUSA Charging Objectives from the 3 new CPs and include these within the Consultation 2 document.

- 4.17 In regard to the implementation date, BH confirmed that the implementation date is when the change goes into the DCUSA, and the go-live date is when the change applies.
- 4.18 ED queried whether there are any Consultation questions yet around impacts and implementation issues – the Working Group agreed to amend the current question to also ask if not supportive, what issues do they envision.
- 4.19 ED also suggested that there should be a question around impacts as where there is full socialisation, that will have an effect on the residual. The Working Group noted that there is currently a placeholder under section 11 of the Consultation 2 document to discuss the feasibility of an Impact Assessment.
- 4.20 Following the above, it was agreed to add further context within paragraph 11.2 in terms of consumer impacts.

ACTION 14/07: The Secretariat / Working Group to add further context within paragraph 11.2 of the Consultation 2 document in relation to consumer impacts.

- 4.21 Members discussed whether there were any additional points that need to be added to the draft legal text options, and it was agreed that for now, everything that is needed is there. It was noted that the feedback from the Consultation responses will point out if any additional information is needed.
- 4.22 The Working Group agreed that it may be worth including a shortened version of the legal text which shows all 9 variational extracts within one document as opposed to attaching 9 variations of the draft legal text to the Consultation 2 document.
- 4.23 Following the inclusion of the No Detriment Assessment within the Consultation 2 document, it was agreed to include the question ‘What are your views on the options above? Are there any options above that you believe the Working Group should not progress to Change Report?’
- 4.24 Following discussions, the Secretariat agreed to make the necessary updates to the Consultation 2 document and draft legal texts and circulate to the Working Group for an offline review.

ACTION 14/08: The Secretariat to make the necessary updates to the Consultation 2 document and draft legal texts and circulate to the Working Group for an offline review.

- 4.25 The Chair noted that if an additional meeting is needed for a final review of the documents before they are issued, a meeting poll can be circulated.

5. Agreed Next Steps

- 5.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
 - The Secretariat to make the necessary updates to the Consultation 2 document and draft legal texts and circulate to the Working Group for an offline review.

6. Any Other Business

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

6.2 There were no other items raised.

7. Date of Next Meeting – TBC

7.1 The next Working Group meeting is TBC. A meeting poll will be issued in due course.

8. 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>
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.
12/05	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.

14/01	LW to speak internally and provide an update to the relevant colleagues around the details of this CP and the 3 new CPs.	Liam Sweeney	New Action.
14/02	The Secretariat to ensure the NESO dataset is clearly articulated within the Consultation 2 document.	Secretariat	New Action.
14/03	WB to draft high-cost project threshold examples for the Working Group to review.	Will Bowen	New Action.
14/04	The Secretariat / Working Group to articulate discussions around a single transformer within the Change Report.	Secretariat / Working Group	New Action.
14/05	The Secretariat / Working Group to add introductory wording in relation to the No Detriment Assessment Table within the Consultation document.	Secretariat / Working Group	New Action.
14/06	The Secretariat lift the assessed DCUSA Charging Objectives from the 3 new CPs and include these within the Consultation 2 document.	Secretariat	New Action.
14/07	The Secretariat / Working Group to add further context within paragraph 11.2 of the Consultation 2 document in relation to consumer impacts.	Secretariat / Working Group	New Action.
14/08	The Secretariat to make the necessary updates to the Consultation 2 document and draft legal texts and circulate to the Working Group for an offline review.	Secretariat	New Action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update
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	Closed. <i>The Chair confirmed this was presented at the February Panel.</i>

12/04	AH 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	Closed.
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	Closed.
13/01	The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group for the next meeting.	Secretariat	Closed.
13/02	AH to include notes on the NESO dataset tabs to clarify what the data is based on.	Aishwarya	Closed.
13/03	The Secretariat to issue updated NESO dataset, Consultation 2 and no detriment documents to the Working Group for review offline.	Secretariat	Closed.
13/04	The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group for the next meeting.	Secretariat	Closed.