

DCP 443 Working Group - Meeting 17

30 June 2026 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Alex Lam [AL]	NGED
Charles Mott [CM]	SSE
Chris Barker [CB]	ENWL
Chris Ong [CO]	UKPN
Donna Jamieson [DJ]	IDCSL
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Gen
Georgia Preece [GP]	NPg
Michael Hewitson [MH]	Trident Utilities
Peter Waymont [PW]	UKPN
Rachel Wallace [RW]	BU-UK
Code Administrator	
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Kara Burke [KB]	NPg
Mark Bellman [MB]	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 and Open Actions

- 1.4 The Chair shared the previous minutes 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.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair explained that the purpose of this meeting is to review the draft Consultation within the Working Group and agree next steps.

3. Recap of DCP 443 Previous Discussions

- 3.1 The Chair provided a recap of the DCP 443 previous discussions to the Working Group prior to reviewing any documentation.
- 3.2 The Chair reminded the group that one solution looks at applying a multiplier to the excess capacity charge (i.e., two times the normal capacity). There were some challenges raised around this solution within the previous Consultation, specifically around cost reflectivity. Another challenge with this solution was presented whereby someone could exceed capacity and end up paying less (although rare, this scenario could still occur).
- 3.3 The other solution discussed within the group looked at developing models which a number of members have helped with and tested within the Working Group.
- 3.4 The Chair noted that there were some suggestions that a potential solution would be that the peak maximum demand, once one had exceeded, is taken forward as the capacity over the period of 12-months. Concerns were also raised around this suggestion as to whether 12-months is a significant enough period of time to send the right pricing signals or to encourage the right Customer behaviour (i.e., extend this to 18/24-month period).
- 3.5 In regard to the modelling solution, CB provided further details to the group. CB stated the initial solution was to add the whole network cost to the excess capacity; the residual charge was amended to ensure the same amount was recovered overall across the model.

- 3.6 Following this, discussions were held with a modelling Consultation, who proposed a secondary approach by removing the excess capacity from the original 500 MW model in the CDCM to get a cost reflective set of signals before the excess capacity; then, modelling the excess capacities before, and calculating the residual as normal with no adjustment needed (as the steps prior to this are all cost reflective). A number of members have been able to test this model and were happy with the outcome.
- 3.7 The Chair reminded the group that legal text has already been drafted for the original solution (multiplier solution), but members previously agreed that it would be beneficial to seek industry feedback via a Consultation on the alternate solutions (modelling solutions) prior to drafting legal text for these.
- 3.8 DCP 466 'Tariff Band to Follow Capacity' Discussions
- 3.9 The Chair informed the group that DCP 466 looks at how tariff bands are calculated to ensure that tariff bands for half-hourly settlement sites are aligned to the Customer's capacity – i.e., assessing and changing the tariff bands whenever a capacity change is agreed.
- 3.10 The Chair confirmed that DCP 466 was issued out for voting on 21 May 2026 and the recommendation from industry was to approve this change. This is now currently with the Authority (Ofgem) awaiting their decision.
- 3.11 PW queried the interaction between DCP 443 and DCP 466 and stated that Customers would still go through the process of seeking an increase in their capacity, the Authority decision would decide whether the tariff band would change as a result of that. This CP is looking at how excess capacity is charged.
- 3.12 ED agreed with PW, and queried where the link between DCP 443 and DCP 466 was initially raised, as the previous Consultation responses did not make any references to DCP 466 – the Chair confirmed that the potential interaction was raised at the recent DCUSA Stakeholder Engagement Day (held on 16 June 2026) and again during the DCUSA Change Proposal Update session (held on 29 June 2026).
- 3.13 If the Authority decide to approve and implement DCP 466, ED queried whether there is an additional incentive for a Customer to exceed their capacity on the basis that this could potentially be a cheaper option compared to increasing their MIC and having a band review sooner than it currently would be now.
- 3.14 PW added that within the DCP 466 discussions, the banding has a bigger impact because of the transmission charges rather than the distribution charges and would be a greater incentive to not exceed capacity.
- 3.15 Following the above discussions, the Working Group agreed that the banding element is separate to how the capacity is set and believe that DCP 466 has no direct impact on DCP 443.

4. Review Draft Consultation

- 4.1 The Chair presented the draft Consultation document live on screen for the Working Group to review and discuss.

- 4.2 The key updates can be found below:
- 4.3 ED mentioned that it may be worth considering the recent update in terminology in relation to what used to be called 'excluded services' and has now been renamed to 'direct enumerated services'. PW challenged the above and stated that exceeded capacity is not a service that is provided. Following this, it was agreed to leave the terminology as it currently is, but reconsider updating it when the draft Consultation 2 document is in its final stages.
- 4.4 In regard to the options, CB explained that the difference between the two options is that Option A is effectively an extra charge that is outside of the current CDCM model; whereas, Option B is a charge within the CDCM model, which is fully accounted for by the calculation of the residual charge.
- 4.5 CB explained that both Option A and Option B models are similar, however, where they differ is with the treatment of the residual charge.
- 4.6 PW does not believe the way the current drafting of both Option A/B (modelling alternate solutions) is clear as it may cause confusion with the original multiplier solution. PW suggested that all of the proposed solutions need to be made clear, with a description of each and the relevant questions underneath each solution.
- 4.7 The Working Group reviewed the previous meeting minutes to clarify what options were landed on previously to take forward – the minutes referenced Option A (multiplier approach), Option B (differential approach) and a potential Option C (cost-reflective approach). CB noted that the intention of Option C is that it is cost-reflective; it is based on an assessment of costs incurred by Customers under the 500 MW model, the same way as all the other charges in the CDCM.
- 4.8 Following the above discussions, the Working Group agreed that next steps need to clearly outline how many, and what options, are being Consulted on. Once this has been clarified, explanatory wording needs to be added to describe each of the options and what they are aiming to do and how.
- 4.9 The Secretariat agreed to make the necessary amendments to the 'How' Section and Section 7 of the draft Consultation and circulate an updated version to the Working Group for review.

ACTION 17/01: The Secretariat to make the necessary updated to the 'How' Section and Section 7 of the draft Consultation and circulate to the Working Group for review.

4.10 Voting Round for Options to Progress to Consultation

- 4.11 The Chair held a formal vote for preferred options to progress to Consultation. The voting outcomes can be found below:

4.12 **Modelling Solutions Vote**

- Progressing both modelling solutions →
- Progressing second modelling solution (CEPA TNEI) only → 7 votes
- Abstaining → 2 votes

4.13 **Non-Modelling Solutions Vote**

- Not progressing non-modelled solutions (12-month/multiplier) → 1 vote
- Progressing non-modelled solutions (12-month/multiplier) → 5 votes
- Abstained → 3 votes

4.14 PW noted that the draft legal text will need to be removed from the draft Consultation as it is may not be the preferred option; once a better understanding of the preferred option is sought, the draft legal text can be added into the document. The Working Group agreed with this approach. The Secretariat also agreed to remove the DCUSA Objectives and wider implications and impacts from the draft Consultation until a preferred solution has been landed on.

ACTION 17/02: The Secretariat to remove the draft legal text, DCUSA Objectives and wider implications and impacts from the draft Consultation document.

4.15 Following this, the Secretariat agreed to redraft the Consultation and issue to the Working Group for review offline. The Secretariat also agreed to issue a meeting poll (following the updated draft Consultation) to the Working Group for their availability for the next meeting.

ACTION 17/03: The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group for the next meeting (WG 18).

5. Next Steps and Work Plan

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

- The Secretariat to update the draft Consultation document and issue to the Working Group for review offline.
- The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group for their availability for the next meeting.

6. Any Other Business

6.1 The Chair asked the group whether there were any other items of business to discuss, to which nothing was raised.

7. Next Meeting Date – TBC

7.1 The Chair confirmed the next Working Group meeting is currently TBC. The Secretariat agreed to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group for the next meeting in due course.

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
16/03	The Secretariat to issue the Consultation to wider industry.	Secretariat	Ongoing. <i>Still in development.</i>
17/01	The Secretariat to make the necessary updated to the 'How' Section and Section 7 of the draft Consultation and circulate to the Working Group for review.	Secretariat	New Action.
17/02	The Secretariat to remove the draft legal text, DCUSA Objectives and wider implications and impacts from the draft Consultation document.	Secretariat	New Action.
17/03	The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group for the next meeting (WG 18).	Secretariat	New Action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update
11/01	The Secretariat to draft a new Consultation and send to the Working Group for review.	Secretariat	Closed.
15/01	The Secretariat and Working Group members to review the regulations to see if option 1 solution would be possible and review at the next meeting.	Secretariat / Working Group	Closed.
15/03	The Secretariat to circulate the draft Consultation 2 with the Working Group for review.	Secretariat	Closed.
16/01	Working Group members to test the model (specifically their DNO area) for any concerns, and feedback to the group.	Working Group	Closed.
16/02	The Secretariat to circulate the draft Consultation to the Working Group for review offline.	Secretariat	Closed.
16/04	The Secretariat to issue a doodle poll for next Working Group meeting.	Secretariat	Closed.