

Distribution Charging Methodologies Development Group (“DCMDG”) - Meeting 100

18 June 2026 at 10:00 via Microsoft Teams

Attendees	Company
Ahna Taylor [AT]	SSE
Amanda McFarlane [AMF]	Aurora
Andrew Malley [AM]	Ofgem
Chris Ong [CO]	
David Fewings [DF]	Sustainable Energy First
Diandra Orodan [DO]	BUUK
Dimuthu Wijetunga [DW]	Shell
Donald Preston [DP]	SSE
Donna Jamieson [DJ]	Idcsl
Ed Grimsey [EG]	BUUK
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Gen
Emma Clark [EC]	SSE
Ethan Seager [ES]	
Georgia Preece [GP]	NPg
Gordon Frazer [GF]	NESO
Itunu Akin-Olawale [IAO]	SP ENW
James Knight [JK]	Centrica
John Harmer [JH]	Waters Wye
Kara Burke [KB]	NPg
Lee Stone [LS]	EON
Leon Heard [LH]	
Liam Beckwith [LB]	St Clements
Luke Norris [LN]	Drax
Lorna Murray [LM]	SPEN
Meg Wong [MW]	Stark
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark
Ryan Farrell [RF]	NPg
Seema Singtalur [SS]	Shell
Seun Adedapo [SA]	National Grid
Shyam Doraiswamy [SD]	Ofgem
Tom Jenkins [TJ]	Indigo
Tony Collings [TC]	Ecotricity
Vicki Holland [VH]	St-Clements
Secretariat	
Craig Booth [CB] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Richard Colwill [RC]	ElectraLink

1. Administration

Recording

- 1.1 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 after the minutes are approved.

Competition Law Guidance

- 1.2 The Working Group reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance” and it was noted that all members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.

Draft Minutes

- 1.3 Attendees reviewed the draft minutes from the previous meeting.
- 1.4 ED queried a potential error in the record of initials within paragraph 5.9 – AT confirmed that this should be ‘AT’ and not ‘AH’. The Secretariat agreed to take an action to amend this.

Action 100/01	The Secretariat to update the previous DCMDG Draft Minutes (Meeting 99) to correct the typo of initials under paragraph 5.9.
---------------	--

- 1.5 In relation to the AOB item regarding ‘DCC Costs/Smart Meter Costs’, AT noted that it was encouraged at the last meeting for a DNO member to reach out and confirm whether DNOs have included an increase within their published charges recently and confirmed that no confirmation has yet to be received by a DNO. The Chair agreed to take an action to follow-up with DNO members seeking this clarification.

Action 100/02	The Secretariat to follow-up with DNO members seeking clarification around DCC Costs/Smart Meter Costs.
---------------	---

- 1.6 No further feedback was received, and the previous minutes were approved.

2. DCMDG Forward Work Plan and Issues Log

- 2.1 The group reviewed the DCMDG Forward Work Plan and Issues Log, latest updates can be found in attachment 1.

Action Updates

- 2.2 Action 95/01 – No further updates have been received. Due to this, members agreed to close this action, noting that it can be raised again in the future if needed.
- 2.3 Action 96/01 – The Chair noted that there have been no further updates, and members agreed to keep the action open.
- 2.4 Action 96/02 – The Chair noted that there have been no further updates.
- 2.5 Action 97/05 - The Chair noted that this is an ongoing item and shall remain open. LS provided members with a link that tracks the MHHS migration process by market segment ([Half hourly settlement data - Exelon BSC](#))

- 2.6 Action 98/02 – The Chair informed the group that the SIG determined no further changes are required to the DCP 414 guidance document and template. As such, this has now been uploaded to the DCUSA website. The Chair provided an overview of the SIG Headline Report that was presented to the DCUSA Panel (meeting 240) on 17 June 2026 – the link to the meeting pack (containing the SIG Headline Report) can be found [here](#). This action is now closed.
- 2.7 Action 98/03 – Members agreed to close this action.
- 2.8 Action 98/04 – Members agreed to close this action.
- 2.9 Action 98/05 – The Chair confirmed that the DCMDG DNO Annual Obligation paper has now been produced and presented it on screen for members to review. ED queried whether the paper could mention where the obligation is within the DCUSA/licence and suggested that the wording could be presented as an Annex. ED also suggested a brief summary is included outlining any actions that have come from this obligation. The Chair explained that these issues are raised all year round (as and when necessary) and agreed to take an action to review previous DCMDG minutes and pull examples of where these discussions have led to creating specific guidance or a new Change Proposal. The Chair also agreed to take an action to reach out to Dave Wornell for this specific licence obligation as it is not within the DCUSA. The Chair updated the action reflecting the above discussions and agreed to keep this action open.
- 2.10 Action 98/06 – EC agreed for this action to now be closed.
- 2.11 Action 99/01 – The Chair informed the group that the headline report was produced and issued with the DCMDG agenda. This was presented to the group live on screen and members agreed for this action to be closed.
- 2.12 Action 99/02 – The Chair presented the template agenda for including both agenda items in relation to DNO Obligations live on screen during the June DCMDG meeting - members reviewed this and agreed to close this action.

3. Ofgem Update

- 3.1 The Chair invited AM to provide an Ofgem update.
- 3.2 The key points can be found below:
- 3.3 AM informed the group that Ofgem are expecting to issue three Consultations over the next couple of months:
- [DCP 412 Allocation of banding for TCR Charges for 'Peaky' Final Demand Customers](#)
 - [P441 Creation of Complex Site Classes](#)
 - [DCP 424 Use of System charging for Complex Sites](#)
- 3.4 AM also noted that Ofgem are expecting to consult on initial thoughts around how tariffs will be set for the ED3 period. AM thanked DNOs for their engagement around this and the work that they have carried out.

- 3.5 AM informed the group that Ofgem gave a presentation at the DCUSA Stakeholder Engagement Day held on 16 June 2026 in relation to where Ofgem see Code Reform and confirmed that these slides can be provided to any members who are interested. Following this, members stated that these slides would be useful to have, and AM agreed to circulate these slides to the group.

Action 100/03	AM to circulate the Ofgem Update slides presented at the DCUSA Stakeholder Engagement Day to DCMDG members for their information.
---------------	---

- 3.6 ED queried whether Ofgem could provide an estimated timeline for the above-mentioned Consultations – AM suggested that the tariff setting for the ED3 period will most likely be Consulted on first, with DCP 412 being issued shortly after. AM expects the P441 Consultation to potentially take a bit longer (expected late July/early August).
- 3.7 DW queried whether Ofgem have a view yet in regard to DCP 466 '[Tariff Band to Follow Capacity](#)' – AM confirmed that DCP 466 has not yet been reviewed, however, it is assumed that a decision could be expected soon.
- 3.8 EC added that it would be useful to know when a decision on DCP 466 will be likely as the deadline for the Annual Allocation Review is 15 September 2026; there will be a different process to follow if DCP 466 is approved. AM confirmed that Ofgem will keep this mind and encouraged members to reach out if there is a certain date for the decision to be made that would be useful for industry.
- 3.9 Following the above discussion, the Secretariat agreed to take an action to review the previous DCP 466 minutes to see if the Working Group had considered a 'backstop' date for a decision on this change. RF suggested that there may not be time for DCP 466 to be implemented before this years' Annual Allocation Review, given that it goes live 2 months after implementation once approved.

Action 100/04	The Secretariat to review the previous DCP 466 minutes to if the Working Group had considered a 'backstop' date for a decision on this change.
---------------	--

4. FCP Subgroup Headline Report

- 4.1 The Chair presented the headline report live on screen to the group for review during the actions update.
- 4.2 No further feedback was provided from the group and the action was closed.

5. DCP 414/458 Guidance Update

- 5.1 The Chair reiterated the update provided within the actions update and stated that the SIG determined no further changes are required to the [DCP 414 guidance document and template](#). As such, this has now been uploaded to the DCUSA website.
- 5.2 LS stated that the guidance may need reviewing, however from November 2026, everything should be half hourly settled, at which point the protections associated to the DCP 414/458 changes should be in place if industry are following the guidance correctly.

- 5.3 RF informed the group that they have had a number of sites come through from Suppliers where they are currently on a related LLFC, and no tariff. RF stated that there is no equivalent tariff created for the related Customer and suggested that the guidance document does not cover scenarios like this. LS thanked RF for flagging and suggested the only answer for now would be to go on to non-domestic LLFCs. LS also suggested an issue may need to be raised to resolve this.
- 5.4 Following the above, the Secretariat agreed to take an action to setup a subgroup to further discuss this issue and agree next steps.

Action 100/05	The Secretariat to set up a DCP 414/458 DCMDG Subgroup to discuss the current issue relating to related LLFC sites with no tariff.
---------------	--

- 5.5 No further feedback was provided from the group and the action was closed.

6. DCMDG Meeting Dates

- 6.1 The Chair informed the group that recent feedback from DCMDG has been received suggesting that it would be more beneficial for opportunity to comment on charging related CPs that are being brought forward by proposers; however, the timing of the DCMDG often makes it difficult if a draft CP is received (i.e., presenting a charging related CP to the DCMDG may delay it being presented to the DCUSA Panel by a month).
- 6.2 As proposers are not obligated to present a draft CP to the DCMDG, this could mean that DCMDG may ultimately risk not being involved and having an opportunity to discuss the CP if the change is submitted directly to the DCUSA Panel.
- 6.3 Due to this, the Chair suggested moving the monthly DCMDG meetings to the first Thursday of the month (as opposed to the third Thursday of the month). This would allow the proposer of the change to seek further feedback and refinement of the CP at the DCMDG that month prior to submitting it to the DCUSA Panel later that month.
- 6.4 ED suggested that if the DCMDG meeting dates are to be moved, it may be more beneficial to move them to the last Thursday of the month (as opposed to the first Thursday of the month) to provide enough lead time prior to submitting to the DCUSA Panel. This would allow more time for any additional updated/refinements to be made before submission. LS agreed with this suggestion.
- 6.5 A number of members flagged that there may be clash with the TCMF (Transmission Charging Methodologies Forum) as this is also held on the first Thursday of the month. Members also noted that it may be worth considering moving the DCMDG from a Thursday to an alternate day of the week to avoid other meeting clashes.
- 6.6 The Secretariat agreed to take an action to take this away and have a review offline of alternate dates for the DCMDG meetings and seek feedback from the group in due course.
- 6.7 The Chair also added that the thought process ahead of the DCP 471 '[Lead Time For DCPs](#)' change is if a CP is received prior to the eight Working Days (i.e., Monday of the week), the Secretariat can then perform the 'critical friend' role to help refine the CP. Following this, if the proposer wishes to do so, they could then present this CP to the DCMDG on the Thursday of the week.

- 6.8 Following the above discussions, the Chair agreed to further discuss the above suggestions offline and come back to the DCMDG to discuss the various options in more detail and seek feedback.

Action 100/06	The Secretariat to seek alternate dates for the DCMDG meetings and feedback to the group in due course.
---------------	---

7. Any Other Business

- 7.1 The Chair asked if there were any other items of business to discuss.
- 7.2 CIRP (Cost Information Review Pack)
- 7.3 The Chair informed the group that feedback has been received around the recently published CIRPs on the DCUSA website.
- 7.4 The Chair noted that three DNOs CIRPs have a combination of copy and paste issues, hard-coded values not being updated or macros not being executed. Following these issues, it has been queried whether there are sufficient quality checks in place, or whether there needs to be more to help improve the packs.
- 7.5 CO confirmed that they were one of the DNOs that have experienced issues with their packs, however, they have since identified the issue and believe there should not be any further issues moving forward. CO believes that the quality checks are sufficient, so long as each DNO who experienced issues, identifies the problem and ensures it does not happen again. Both LM and EC agreed with CO and confirmed that they have identified their issues, and the problem has now been resolved.
- 7.6 ED queried whether the files of the three DNOs have now been updated and uploaded – the Chair confirmed that is correct.
- 7.7 AT suggested that it would be helpful if the dates uploaded and version numbers of the published documents (i.e., v1.1/v2.0) were consistent to help avoid any confusion. The Chair agreed to take an action to improve the clarity of the website and update the published documents version numbers to make this clearer.

Action 100/07	The Secretariat to improve the clarity of the website and update the published documents version numbers to make this clearer.
---------------	--

- 7.8 Market-Wide Migration – REP-900 Flows
- 7.9 LS informed the group that in terms of market-wide migration REP-900 flows, their billing team has stated that IDNOs are issuing cancellation notices with positive values, essentially billing them twice. LS asked other members if they were aware of this, as the billing team have stated that DNOs should be issuing cancellation notices with a negative value to credit the previous invoice.
- 7.10 VH confirmed that this has been an issue with Suppliers. VH stated that the D2021 mandates that invoices should be correctly signed; if it is a credit (whether generation or a cancellation) it has to be negative. VH does not believe that text appeared when the REP-900 flow was created and believes it is just an omission. LS stated that this may need to be raised separately as if it is an omission in the file, it may need updating.

- 7.11 Due to potential commercially sensitive information, DJ offered to provide LS with the contact details for the INA (Independent Networks Association) Secretariat who may be able to help with these issues. LS agreed that this would be helpful.

Action 100/08	DJ to provide LS with the contact details for the INA Secretariat to further investigate the REP-900 flow issues.
---------------	---

- 7.12 New DCUSA Change Proposal – Connections Reform Costs
- 7.13 KB informed the group that a new DCUSA CP will be raised shortly (Part 2 Matter) as the electricity distribution licence (in the special conditions) has a new pass-through term for connections reform costs.
- 7.14 The new CP is being raised to allow the new term to be added into the CIRP and the DCMDG input tables and should not need a Working Group to progress this change.
- 7.15 ED queried whether the impacts of this change will be fully explored and whether Stakeholders would become sufficiently aware of this change if there are no Working Groups – KB explained that there should not be any impact of this change as it ensures that they can put all of their allowed revenue into the allowed revenue table. Currently, there is nowhere for this particular input to go, and therefore it is being put against pensions deficit as that was 0 for the year.
- 7.16 In regard to the allowed revenue being input against pensions deficit, AT queried whether all DNOs are taking the same approach – KB confirmed that this is worth flagging, but stated that they only include the values that are above the threshold (one licence went above the threshold); if under the threshold, it is recorded as 0. Other DNO members could not confirm whether they have taken the same approach but agreed to check internally and provide an update to the group.

Action 100/09	DNOs to check internally their current approach to Connection Reform Costs and update the group.
---------------	--

- 7.17 Annual Allocation Review
- 7.18 RF informed the group that the Annual Allocation Review is coming up in September 2026 and there may be a number of obstacles leading up to this. RF raised awareness that sites that have migrated to Market-Wide Half Hourly cannot be backdated beyond 01 August the year prior, and this wording may need to be amended/updated to allow backdating to be able to happen prior to this date (Part 2 Matter CP). Another suggestion would be to start thinking about potential derogations.
- 7.19 RF also stated that they are splitting their Annual Allocation Reviews into two parts – the first part is anything from August 2025 to the end of March 2026 and is using the previous thresholds. The second part is anything from April 2026 onwards using the latest thresholds.
- 7.20 RF reminded the Secretariat that ElectraLink may need to start considering the measurement class G volumes and this is usually provided for the Annual Allocation Review.
- 7.21 Members were asked whether they have received the IFC-040 data flow yet as RF confirmed they have not got access to this yet and unsure of what this flow will look like but confirmed that this flow will be needed when it comes to allocating sites the next time this is done.

- 7.22 Following the above discussions, members agreed that it would be beneficial to setup a DCMDG Subgroup to further discuss the AAR to ensure there are no issues when it comes to September 2026. The Chair agreed to take an action to setup this subgroup and produce a Terms of Reference for RF to review.

Action 100/010	The Secretariat to create a DCMDG Subgroup in relation to the Annual Allocation Review (AAR) and produce a Terms of Reference for RF to review.
-------------------	---

- 7.23 No other items were discussed.

8. Agenda Items for the Next Meeting

- 8.1 The Chair explained that there we no specific items for the agenda, however the progress of the actions would be assessed and an agenda produced with these in mind.

9. DNO (“Distribution Network Operator”) Operational Matters

- 9.1 The Chair asked if there were any DNO Matters to be raised. No matters were raised.

10. Date of Next Meeting

- 10.1 The next DCMDG meeting will be held on 16 July 2026 via Microsoft Teams.

11. Attachments

- 11.1 Attachment 1 – DCMDG Action Log & Forward Work Plan