

DCP 464 Working Group - Meeting 13

20 July 2026 at 13:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Amanda McFarlane [AMF]	Aurora
Drew Johnstone [DJ]	NPg
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Generation
Erik Baguzis [EB]	Indigo
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
Tracey Taylor [TT]	SP ENW
Code Administrator	
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink

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 10/04 - LR confirmed that this was raised at the INA. The INA members were happy but asked for an extra definition of 'load growth' within the glossary. The Secretariat agreed to take a look at this when reviewing the RFI.

ACTION 13/01: The Secretariat to include an extra definition of 'load growth' within the glossary of the RFI.

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. Discuss/Review Template [RG]

- 3.1 The Chair invited RG to present the produced template live on screen for the Working Group to review and further discuss.
- 3.2 The key points can be found below:
- 3.3 RG explained to the group that the template is split into three sections, including conditional formatting to flag inconsistencies in project numbers and ensure the correct number of rows are completed, aiming to streamline data collection and minimise confusion.
- 3.4 ED raised concerns around the clarity of shading and auto-comments within the template, suggesting tweaks to make instructions more explicit. RG was happy to make the amendments to make this clearer.

- 3.5 LR and DJ discussed the need for a clear definition of 'load growth' within the template, referencing relevant charging methodology paragraphs. The group agreed to include a reference to Schedule 22, paragraph 1.38, and to clarify terminology.
- 3.6 Following the above suggestions, RG agreed to take an action to make the necessary updates to the template and share with the Working Group for review.

ACTION 13/02: RG to make the necessary updates to the template and share with the Working Group for review.

4. Review of Draft RFI Document

- 4.1 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.
- 4.2 The key points can be found below:
- 4.3 The group debated the use of 'reinforcement' versus 'upgrade' within the document, agreeing to retain 'reinforcement' in specific contexts to maintain clarity and legal accuracy.
- 4.4 In regard to paragraph 2.4, ED suggested reordering the four bullet points and list them in timeline order. Members were happy with this suggestion, and the Chair made the amendments live.
- 4.5 Members also discussed and agreed to clarify the definition of general load growth by referencing DCUSA Schedule 22, paragraph 1.38.
- 4.6 In regard to paragraph 4.3, DJ suggested adding wording to state that this is where example 6 applies. Members agreed to include wording that states 'The options discussed in this RFI only apply to example 6...'
- 4.7 Members suggested simplifying the wording of the questions and using bullet points for clarity, leading to a group consensus on replacing 'request' with 'application' and aligning the language used within both the template and the RFI document.
- 4.8 It was also agreed to include subheadings within the RFI document (i.e., Section 1/Section 2/Section) to make it clear which part of the template the questions are related to.
- 4.9 RG queried whether additional text should be included within the RFI document (for example, within question 5) that explains the additional column that has been added to the template, as there is not currently any explanation for this piece of information being asked for. Following this, members agreed to include '.DNO names, application/enquiry references and status' within the current question 5, as this leads into the template without the need of adding an explanatory paragraph.
- 4.10 Members discussed the respondents to the RFI – it was agreed to issue the RFI and template to IDNOs only, however, additional communications will be issued to wider industry to inform them that the RFI has been
- 4.11 It was also agreed to issue the RFI for a period of 20 Working Days (4-week period) rather than the standard 15 Working Days (3-week period sent to IDNOs, with the aim of a second RFI to be issued to DNOs following the responses from the IDNOs.) due to the holiday period.

- 4.12 Following the above discussions, the Secretariat agreed to circulate a clean version of both the RFI document and template to the Working Group for final review before issuing to wider industry for feedback.

ACTION 13/03: The Secretariat to circulate a clean version of both the RFI document and template to the Working Group for final review before issuing to wider industry for feedback.

5. Agreed Next Steps

- 5.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
- The Secretariat to include an extra definition of 'load growth' within the glossary of the RFI.
 - RG to make the necessary updates to the template and share with the Working Group for review.
 - The Secretariat to circulate a clean version of both the RFI document and template to the Working Group for final review before issuing to wider industry for feedback.
 - The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group for their availability once the RFI has been issued to wider industry for feedback to review the collated responses.

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 is currently TBC. A meeting invite will be issued to the Working Group for their availability once the RFI has been issued to wider industry for feedback to review the collated responses.

ACTION 13/04: The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group for their availability once the RFI has been issued to wider industry for feedback to review the collated responses.

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>
13/01	The Secretariat to include an extra definition of 'load growth' within the glossary of the RFI.	Secretariat	New Action.
13/02	RG to make the necessary updates to the template and share with the Working Group for review.	Rob Gladstone	New Action.
13/03	The Secretariat to circulate a clean version of both the RFI document and template to the Working Group for final review before issuing to wider industry for feedback.	Secretariat	New Action.
13/04	The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group for their availability once the RFI has been issued to wider industry for feedback to review the collated responses.	Secretariat	New Action.

Action Ref.			Update
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	Closed.
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	Closed. <i>LR confirmed that this was raised at the INA. The INA members were happy but asked for an extra definition of 'load growth' within the glossary. The Secretariat agreed to take a look at this when reviewing the RFI.</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	Closed.
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	Closed.
12/02	RG to produce a template to include as an attachment to the RFI regarding the reasons for applications not progressing.	Rob Gladstone	Closed.