

DCP 464 Working Group - Meeting 10

24 June 2026 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Alex Pentecost [AP]	Eclipse
Anne-Claire Leydier [ACL]	UKPN
Drew Johnstone [DJo]	NPg
Ed Grimsey [EG]	BU-UK
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Generation
Ian Burman [IB]	Green Gen Cymru
Louise Robinson [LR]	ESP
Martin Brace [MB]	UKPN
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark
Ollie Easterbrook [OE]	National Grid
Owen Black [OB]	SPEN
Rob Gladstone [RG]	SSE
Code Administrator	
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Charles Deacon [CD]	Eclipse
Drew Johnstone [DJ]	NPg
Tracey Taylor [TT]	SP ENW

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.
- 1.6 Action 05/03 - The group discussed this and agreed that this would still be beneficial to produce, but potentially in a different way. This action will be revisited when reviewing the Change Report.
- 1.7 Action 08/08 – MB informed the Chair that the diagrams have not yet been updated within the draft Change Report that has been circulated. The Chair agreed to take an action to ensure the diagrams are updated.

ACTION 10/01: The Secretariat to update the diagrams within the current version of the draft Change Report.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair explained that the purpose of this meeting is to review both options (01/02) of the draft legal text and discuss the impacts of CMP 460 '[Improving Transmission Connection Asset Charging](#)' and DCP 461 '[Reducing the Impact of Transmission Distribution Charges](#)' within the Working Group and agree next steps.

3. Review Option 01/02 Draft Legal Text

- 3.1 The Chair presented both versions of draft legal text (Option 01/02) live on screen for the Working Group to review and discuss.

- 3.2 The key updates can be found below:

3.3 Option 01 Draft Legal Text

- 3.4 Following a review of the draft Legal Text for Option 01, ED highlighted that GW has included a reference to load grown (as described in paragraph 1.36) – however, the wording for paragraph 1.36

does not include the term 'load growth'. MB stated that the only reference to 'load growth' within Schedule 22 is within paragraph 1.38.

- 3.5 To avoid any ambiguity, members suggested that the reference to paragraph 1.36 should be deleted. It was agreed to query this with GW first prior to deletion.

ACTION 10/02: The Secretariat to discuss with GW (Gowling) the deletion of the reference to 'load growth' within paragraph 1.36 in the draft Legal Text for Option 01

- 3.6 ACL queried whether 'load growth' is defined anywhere within Schedule 22 – members explained that it is not a defined term and is described only within paragraph 1.38. During the previous meeting, GW (Gowling) informed the group that whilst it is not a defined term, it is clearly explained within paragraph 1.38.
- 3.7 RG agreed that the description of 'load growth' in paragraph 1.38 may not explicitly clear, however, believes that adding clarification to this term may be out of scope of this change.
- 3.8 ED queried whether a discussion is needed around a potential further RFI/Consultation – RG explained that members previously agreed to develop and review the draft Change Report, and then decide whether further information via an RFI/Consultation would be needed before finalising the Change Report.
- 3.9 Regarding the Impact Assessment, a number of members feel that it is currently lacking – MB stated that the previous Consultation requested data in relation to impacts of this change, however, responses showed that this was proving difficult to obtain the data requested.
- 3.10 Following this, members noted that the previous Consultation question asked how many times this instance has occurred and agreed that the responses were limited and therefore financial impacts should be the next question to gain a better understanding.
- 3.11 ED noted that only a small number of IDNOs responded to the original question that they had been charged for upgrades when they have been determined to be extension assets and is concerned that additional information may not be provided. Both ACL and EG offered to speak to colleagues internally to seek whether financial values could be provided in response to question 7 of the Consultation and feedback to the group.

ACTION 10/03: ACL/EG to speak internally to colleagues to seek whether financial values could be provided in response to Q7 of the Consultation.

- 3.12 DJ stated that it is important to ensure that the Impact Assessment provides enough understanding of what the impacts of this change may be for the Authority to be able to make a decision. DJ also stated that both CMP 460 and DCP 461 are experiencing similar issues with gaining enough data in relation to impacts. ACL added that a sample of two IDNOs who have experienced impacts may not be a viable dataset of an Impact Assessment.
- 3.13 MB suggested that it will be beneficial to issue an RFI to all 14 DNO licenced areas seeking further information for the Impact Assessment so that the Working Group have demonstrated that they have requested this data a number of times to present to the Authority within the Change Report. If

the Impact Assessment does not include all of the data requested (dependant on the responses received) then it may not be possible to fulfil the entire Impact Assessment.

4. Drafting of RFI Document

- 4.1 Following the above discussions, the group agreed that it would be beneficial to produce an RFI for additional information prior to progressing to Change Report.
- 4.2 ACL stated reminded the group that a contributing factor to the increase of volume, is the maturity of the IDNO networks, not how many new IDNO entrants there are. ACL suggested that the low level of engagement may be due to IDNOs trying to look at something that does not exist, there is no volume, or very low volume.
- 4.3 RG flagged that a possible outcome of this change once it goes to Ofgem, could be that they decide that if there is little to no impact, leading to a decision of no change. RG continued to state that if no changes are made, there is a risk of disadvantaging other DUoS Customers as they will pick up IDNO costs.
- 4.4 Following this, members agreed that rather than limit the data request (within the RFI) to two years, the further back the data is available, the more of a case the Working Group can build to show the potential impacts.
- 4.5 RG clarified that as this is an RFI (and not a Consultation), the Working Group need to be clear on what is specifically being asked for.
- 4.6 The Working Group discussed and agreed that it would not be beneficial to include the draft legal text as an attachment to the RFI as it is not relevant to the questions that are being asked; however, members agreed it would be useful to include the previous Consultation questions as an attachment to the RFI to allow respondents to cross-reference.
- 4.7 In terms of respondents to the RFI, both ED and ACL agreed to discuss this to the INA (Independent Networks Association) Forum to enable IDNOs to be aware of the data being requested for this change.

ACTION 10/04: ACL/EG to discuss the DCP 464 RFI at the INA Forum to enable IDNOs to be aware of the data being requested for this change.

- 4.8 The agreed RFI questions can be found below:
 1. How many times have you submitted a request for additional capacity at the exit point with a DNO? Please group these by justification for that increase that falls into one of these categories-
 - number of entry/exit points is increasing on the IDNO network and
 - increase of capacity for a specific entry/exit point.
 2. From the number gathered from question 1, for each category, how many of these had more than one entry/exit point connected to the IDNO network?
 3. From the numbers gathered from question 2, for each category, how many of these applications did you get something different than no work, so works were required, and out of these, how

many were classified as extension asset and you were charged something? Please provide that charge if one was incurred.

4. From the instances identified from question 3, what are the DNO application/enquiry reference as normally stipulated on the relevant BCA? Please provide the DNO licence for these instances.
5. Any additional comments relating to this RFI?

4.9 Following the above RFI questions, members noted that all five are questions for IDNOs specifically, and the Chair queried whether there were any DNO-based questions – members discussed this, and agreed that it may be better to issue a second RFI to DNOs after the first one, but this is dependant on the responses received by the IDNOs.

4.10 The Secretariat agreed to take an action to produce a draft RFI and circulate to the Working Group for review.

ACTION 10/05: The Secretariat to produce a draft RFI document and circulate to the Working Group for review.

4.11 The group also agreed that it would be beneficial to schedule an additional 1-hour meeting to have a final review of the draft RFI prior to issuing out to wider industry for feedback – this meeting has been scheduled for 03 July 2026 at 11am-12pm.

ACTION 10/06: The Secretariat to schedule the next Working Group meeting for 03 July 2026 for a final review of the draft RFI document prior to issuing to wider industry.

5. Agreed Next Steps

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

- The Secretariat to discuss with GW (Gowling) the deletion of the reference to ‘load growth’ within paragraph 1.36 in the draft Legal Text for Option 01.
- ACL/EG to discuss the DCP 464 RFI at the INA Forum to enable IDNOs to be aware of the data being requested for this change.
- The Secretariat to produce a draft RFI document and circulate to the Working Group for review.
- The Secretariat to schedule the next Working Group meeting for 03 July 2026 for a final review of the draft RFI document prior to issuing to wider industry.

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 – 03 July 2026

7.1 The next Working Group will be held on 03 July 2026 at 11am.

8. Attachments

- Attachment 1_DCP 464 Work Plan

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
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>The group discussed this and agreed that this would still be beneficial to produce, but potentially in a different way. This action will be revisited when reviewing the Change Report.</i>
10/01	The Secretariat to update the diagrams within the current version of the draft Change Report.	Secretariat	New Action.
10/02	The Secretariat to discuss with GW (Gowling) the deletion of the reference to 'load growth' within paragraph 1.36 in the draft Legal Text for Option 01	Secretariat	New Action.
10/03	ACL/EG to speak internally to colleagues to seek whether financial values could be provided in response to Q7 of the Consultation.	Anne-Claire Leydier / Ed Grimsey	New Action.
10/04	ACL/EG to discuss the DCP 464 RFI at the INA Forum to enable IDNOs to be aware of the data being requested for this change.	Anne-Claire Leydier / Ed Grimsey	New Action.
10/05	The Secretariat to produce a draft RFI document and circulate to the Working Group for review.	Secretariat	New Action.
10/06	The Secretariat to schedule the next Working Group meeting for 03 July 2026 for a final review of the draft RFI document prior to issuing to wider industry.	Secretariat	New Action.

Action Ref.			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	Closed.
08/08	RG to circulate the updated diagrams to the Working Group for review.	Rob Gladstone / Working Group	Closed. <i>New action following this being closed.</i>
08/09	The Secretariat to provide the updated diagrams to Gus with the draft legal text for review once the Working Group have reviewed them.	Secretariat	Closed.
09/01	GW to produce a version of draft legal text that is in line with option 1 for the Working Group to review.	GW	Closed.
09/02	The Secretariat to include an agenda item for the next Working Group meeting to further discuss the impacts of CMP 460 and DCP 461.	Secretariat	Closed.
09/03	The Secretariat to produce a draft Change Report for the Working Group to review.	Secretariat	Closed.