

DCP 476 Working Group - Meeting 02

18 August 2026 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Chris Ong [CO]	UKPN
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark
Clair Richards [CR]	National Grid
Donna Jamieson [DJ]	Idcsl
Ed Grimsey [EG]	BUUK
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Gen
Giao Le [GL]	SSEN
Amanda McFarlane [AM]	Aurora Utilities
Laide Adekanle [LA]	SPEN
Lorna Murray [LM]	SPEN
Shyam Doraiswamy [SD]	Ofgem
Ethan Seagar [ES]	BU-UK
Philip Mark [PM]	SSE
Code Administrator	
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Jo Brown [JB]	National Grid
Komal Brown [KB]	SPEN
Jenny Harvey [JH]	National Grid
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.

Actions

- 1.4 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 and discuss the draft consultation document within the Working Group and agree next steps.

3. Overview of DCP 476 Draft Consultation Document

- 3.1 The Chair took the group through the consultation document section by section.
- 3.2 ED stated that the document provided a strong starting point but suggested that the two issues described in Section 3 should be reordered, as the wider issue concerning the treatment of a multi-MPAN site should be presented first, then the more specific allocation issue following from it.
- 3.3 CO agreed that the existing order reflected how the text had initially been written rather than the clearest explanation for respondents. The group agreed to restructure this part of the document and improve the link between the two issues.
- 3.4 The Working Group also clarified that DCP 476 was primarily concerned with sites where separate MPANs may be supplied by different suppliers. CO explained that, in these circumstances, fixed charges and capacity need to be allocated across more than one billing account, which can lead to inconsistent treatment. Working Group members agreed that the consultation should make this distinction clearly so that respondents did not confuse the proposal with conventional multi-MPAN arrangements supplied by a single supplier.

- 3.5 LM questioned whether phrases such as “percentage allocated” and “usage” properly described the issue. It was noted that “usage” could be read as energy consumption rather than the allocation of capacity. CO explained that, where no specific allocation is provided, billing systems may divide capacity across the relevant MPANs, but agreed that the terminology could be clearer. The Working Group agreed that the consultation document should use capacity-based terms consistently and avoid wording that could give respondents the wrong impression about how the allocation is determined.
- 3.6 CO walked Working Group members through the worked examples, which used LV and HV scenarios to illustrate how the approaches might affect charges. The examples indicated that the differences between the options could be less material than first anticipated in the scenarios modelled.
- 3.7 LM suggested that a variance column might make the effect easier to understand. The Working Group agreed this would be of benefit, but Working Group members noted that placing too much emphasis on savings or differences could encourage respondents to focus on commercial outcomes rather than the objective of achieving a consistent charging approach.
- 3.8 It was emphasised that the proposal was intended to provide clarity and consistency, rather than deliberately redistribute costs. The Working Group therefore preferred to retain the examples as total-cost illustrations, supported by clearer wording. The Working Group also agreed that the document should state that the examples primarily illustrated DUoS impacts and did not fully demonstrate any wider TNUoS effects, which may be relevant to larger sites.
- 3.9 The Working Group discussed whether private networks should be included within this CP. The Chair noted that the issue had been discussed at the first Working Group for this CP and referred to the experience of DCP 328.
- 3.10 CO was concerned that bringing private networks fully within DCP 476 could significantly widen the scope of the change and introduce complexities beyond the initial intent of this proposal.
- 3.11 ED acknowledged the risk of broadening the scope but highlighted that some private networks could be viewed as single sites with multiple MPANs, meaning the consultation should not ignore the issue entirely.
- 3.12 The Working Group reached a compromise and agreed the consultation document would explain the potential relevance of private networks and ask a question to gather industry views, while highlighting the proposer’s view that private networks should remain outside the scope of DCP 476.
- 3.13 Most Working Group members supported excluding private networks from the immediate scope but agreed to still ask a question on private networks so that a final position could be informed by consultation responses.
- 3.14 The Working Group considered whether draft legal text should accompany the consultation. CO stated that detailed drafting would be premature while the consultation was still seeking views on the preferred solution. The vast majority of the Working Group agreed and concluded that legal text should be developed after the responses had been reviewed and they had identified responders preferred approach.

- 3.15 The Chair also sought views on the proposed 15-working-day consultation period. Members considered this appropriate, provided that the revised document was circulated for a short final review before issue. In closing, Andy summarised the agreed amendments. The Working Group considered the consultation to be close to completion, subject to the restructuring, terminology changes, revised questions and supporting clarification discussed during the meeting.

ACTION 01/01: CO to produce a number of examples that illustrate potential solutions for the Working Group to review.

4. Agreed Next Steps

- 4.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
- AG to update the consultation document and share with the Working Group with the intention of this being formally issued to industry 21 August 2026.
 - The Secretariat to schedule the next Working Group meeting for 21 September 2026 to review the Consultation responses.

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 – 21 September 2026

- 6.1 The next Working Group meeting is scheduled for 21 September 2026 at 10am.

1. Attachments

- Attachment 1_DCP 476 Work Plan

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
02/01	Update the consultation document to reflect the Working Group's agreed drafting changes and circulate the revised consultation for final Working Group review.	Secretariat	New Action.
01/02	Revise the worked examples, option descriptions and supporting explanation	Chris Ong	New Action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update
01/01	CO to produce a number of examples that illustrate potential solutions for the Working Group to review.	Chris Ong	Closed
01/02	The Secretariat to schedule the next Working Group meeting for 18 August 2026 to finalise the draft Consultation document.	Secretariat	Closed