

DCP 464 Working Group - Meeting 12

13 July 2026 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Alex Pentecost [AP]	Eclipse
Anne-Claire Leydier [ACL]	UKPN
Donna Jamieson [DJa]	Idcsl
Drew Johnstone [DJo]	NPg
Ed Grimsey [EG]	BUUK
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Generation
Erik Baguzis [EB]	Indigo
Louise Robinson [LR]	ESP
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark
Ollie Easterbrook [OE]	National Grid
Owen Black [OB]	SPEN
Rob Gladstone [RG]	SSE
Tracey Taylor [TT]	SP ENW
Code Administrator	
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Ephie Chalakateva [EC]	National Grid
Martin Brace [MB]	UKPN

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.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

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

3. Review of Draft RFI Document

- 3.1 The Chair presented the most recent track changed version of the RFI document live on screen for the Working Group to review and further discuss.
- 3.2 The key points can be found below:
- 3.3 In regard to paragraph 2.3, RG suggested replacing the reference 'reinforcement' to upgrades to a DNO network for an existing IDNO network' as reinforcement is defined as upgrades of the shared use network, and the question is whether this is shared use or not. Members agreed to this change and the Chair agreed to cross-check the entire document as update as necessary offline.

ACTION 12/01: The Secretariat to cross-check the RFI document and update all references of 'reinforcement' to 'upgrades to a DNO network for an existing IDNO network' offline.

- 3.4 In regard to the last bullet point under paragraph 2.3, DJo suggested that wording should be added to explain the financial impact on DUoS Customer bills.
- 3.5 A number of members discussed the current paragraph 2.6 and debated whether it should remain within the RFI or be removed. ED suggested that the wording does not appear to be in scope of this RFI as the aim of the RFI is to assess the impacts on DUoS charges and Customer bills, and the current wording does not seem to be relevant to this. ACL disagreed stating that there is value in keeping this paragraph as depending on the cost that has been quoted, the outcome might have been different.

- 3.6 Following this, DJo stated that if there has been a scenario where there would have been an impact on DUoS, but has been disregarded because of those costs, then this would be in scope as this is also the intent of the change.
- 3.7 ED suggested that if the wording in paragraph 2.6 is to remain, the purpose of the RFI is now twofold, and the purpose of the RFI should be amended to allow for this to be in scope. Members were happy with this approach, and the Chair made the necessary updates live on screen.
- 3.8 Continuing the discussion around paragraph 2.6, members discussed whether wording should be added to ask whether the cost of the upgrade works was what prevented it going ahead, or whether it was another reason (noting that ‘another reason’ does not need to be further explained). ACL reminded the group that a connection application may be triggered by a Customer of the network and may not have been informed of why the application did not progress.
- 3.9 DJo queried whether DNOs would be able to attain the reasons for the applications not progressing if this was currently unknown – ACL stated that they were unsure, however, suggested that this could be asked within the RFI itself. DJo reiterated that it would be beneficial to try and capture as many examples that are within scope as possible to truly understand the cost impacts.
- 3.10 Following this, members suggested creating a table as an attachment that would allow the respondent to input whether the reason for applications not progressing is down to cost or ‘other’. Doing this will allow the Working Group to filter those applications that are within scope.
- 3.11 ACL provided the below columns that could be included within the template:

IDNO project reference
DNO
Application reference
DNO offer made date
Reason for application to DNO
number of entry/exitpoint on IDNO network
DNO charges? Yes/no
classified as extension asset? Yes or no

- 3.12 Incorporating the above suggestions, RG agreed to take an action to produce this template for the Working Group for review during the next meeting.

ACTION 12/02: RG to produce a template to include as an attachment to the RFI regarding the reasons for applications not progressing.

- 3.13 ED suggested it may be worth the group adding a placeholder to discuss adding a brief recap of the two options within the RFI document. Members agreed with this approach, and the Chair lifted this from the Consultation document into Annex A of the RFI and added a reference to this within paragraph 2.3.
- 3.14 The Working Group agreed to amend paragraph 3.1 to state ‘The DCUSA is seeking the following information from IDNO Parties’.

- 3.15 In regard to question 3 of the RFI, ED queried whether the group are asking the right question as asking about extension asset charges does not seem clear – RG clarified that from a DNO perspective, these would be considered as extension assets rather than shared network assets. RG suggested making this question simpler and remove the element of requesting the cost for the work up front – the Working Group were happy with this suggestion.
- 3.16 Following the review of the draft RFI questions, the group agreed that it may be more beneficial to produce the template first as this may shape how the questions are presented.

4. Agreed Next Steps

- 4.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
- The Secretariat to cross-check the RFI document and update all references of 'reinforcement' to 'upgrades to a DNO network for an existing IDNO network' offline.
 - RG to produce a template to include as an attachment to the RFI regarding the reasons for applications not progressing.

5. Any Other Business

- 5.1 The Chair asked the group whether there were any other items of business to discuss.
- 5.2 There were no other items raised.

6. Date of Next Meeting – 20 July 2026

- 6.1 The next Working Group will be held on 20 July 2026 at 1pm.

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>
10/02	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	Ongoing. <i>Waiting for responses from RFI before actioning.</i>
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	Ongoing. <i>ED and ACL confirmed that this has been asked internally, however, still awaiting a response.</i>
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	Ongoing. <i>ED confirmed that this will be discussed at the INA Forum held on 14 July.</i>

11/01	The Secretariat to share an updated version of the RFI document that reflects the discussions held via SharePoint so Working Group members are all able to edit the same version	Secretariat	Ongoing. <i>The Chair informed the group of a current IT issue with SharePoint – this will be actioned once the issue is resolved.</i>
12/01	The Secretariat to cross-check the RFI document and update all references of 'reinforcement' to 'upgrades to a DNO network for an existing IDNO network' offline.	Secretariat	New Action.
12/02	RG to produce a template to include as an attachment to the RFI regarding the reasons for applications not progressing.	Rob Gladstone	New Action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.		Update	
10/01	The Secretariat to update the diagrams within the current version of the draft Change Report.	Secretariat	Closed.