

DCP 476 Working Group - Meeting 04

28 September 2026 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Chris Ong [CO]	UKPN
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Gen
Erik Baguzis [EB]	Indigo Networks
Hakan Feridun [HF]	Energunite
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark
Peter Waymont [PW]	UKPN
Philip Mark [PM]	SSE
Ryan Farrell [RF]	NPg
Shyam Doraiswamy [SD]	Ofgem
Code Administrator	
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Giao Le [GL]	SSEN
Jenny Harvey [JH]	National Grid
Jo Brown [JB]	National Grid
Rachel Prosser [RP]	National Grid

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 continue with the review and discussion of the collated Consultation responses document within the Working Group and agree next steps.

3. Review of Collated Consultation Responses

- 3.1 The Chair invited the Working Group to review and further discuss the collated Consultation responses document.
- 3.2 The key updates can be found below:
- 3.3 The Chair confirmed that at the last Working Group Meeting, members had been able to thoroughly review the responses to questions 1 - 6 of the consultation and so this meeting would focus on question 7 – 12.
- 3.4 ***Q7 – ‘Have you identified any alternative solutions?’***
- 3.5 The Chair walked through the responses to Q7 and noted the responses. It was noted that the responses received to question 7 demonstrated a need for a consistent approach to the treatment of split multi-MPAN sites and the Working Group agreed that the solution should provide clarity on both capacity allocation and residual/fixed charge treatment, whilst recognising the need to remain aligned with the customers’ connection agreement.
- 3.6 Further consideration is needed as to whether different scenarios require different treatment, particularly where a split arises unintentionally or temporarily.
- 3.7 The next stage should focus on refining the potential solution options and ensuring that any proposed approach avoids creating opportunities for gaming or inconsistent customer outcomes.

- 3.8 **Q8 – ‘Do you believe that DCP 476 interacts with DCP 328? If so, please explain how.’**
- 3.9 The Chair walked through the responses for question 8 and it was confirmed that the majority of respondents did not believe that there would be any interaction between DCP 476 and DCP 328 but it could be useful to use DCP 328 as background information for this CP.
- 3.10 **Q9 – ‘Should private networks be considered within the scope of this proposal? Please provide further detail as to why/why not.’**
- 3.11 The Chair informed the group that the majority respondents to the consultation did not believe that private networks should not be included within scope of this CP as it would add further complexity to the CP due to the breadth of different arrangements that private networks have.
- 3.12 It was also agreed that if private networks were not included within the legal text drafting for this CP, they could take the approach of the CP if they wanted too anyway. It was also confirmed that private networks are not generally included in DCUSA as they are regulated in a different way.
- 3.13 It was noted that in the Change Report for this CP the Working Group can add a note to explain that private networks were considered but it was agreed that they would be out of scope for this CP.
- 3.14 **Q10 – ‘Would implementation of any of the proposed approaches require system changes?’**
- 3.15 The Chair walked through the responses to Q10 and it was concluded that once the Working Group have finalised their solution for this CP, there would be a need to take the change to billing system providers to get a view of any potential system changes that would be required to implement this CP.
- 3.16 **Q11 – ‘Would the system changes identified above result in any material implementation costs? If so, can you share what those costs are?’**
- 3.17 The Working Group noted that the responses to question 11 and concluded that once the Working Group have a tangible solution, they will be able to determine any implementation costs once they are aware of any system updates that may be required to implement the CP.
- 3.18 **Q12 – ‘Do you have any other questions?’**
- 3.19 The Chair walked the Working Group through the responses to question 12. The group discussed the NPg response to question 12 which was asking whether the group has considered what would happen if sites were to merge again in the future. It was noted by the Working Group that this should be treated as business as usual, but it would be useful to include this process in the legal text to cover all bases.
- 3.20 The Working Group also discussed the potential impacts to DCP 424 as raised by a respondent to the consultation and were in agreement that there was no interaction with DCP 476.
- 3.21 **Conclusions**
- 3.22 Following the review of the collated Consultation responses document, the Working Group agreed that the Working Group need to decide on a tangible solution and consult DCUSA Parties again.

3.23 It was agreed that the two original solutions (Option A and Option B) had a 50:50 split for support from the consultation responses. It was agreed that a further Option C, Option D and Option E would be developed and included into the second consultation for Party response.

- Option C – Site keeps residual band, but total site fixed charge is split (i.e. billing approach); or
- Option D – Site keeps residual band, but each MPAN is charged whole fixed charge for the site; or
- Option E – Each MPAN is banded individually but may not align with the TCR (Single Site) approach.

Action 04/01: ED and PW to provide further clarity for the three different options regarding the split of the fixed charges.

3.24 One Working Group member suggested that the billing system could already cater for a better solution and so the Working Group should look into this, i.e. if the billing system can already be used to split the total charge across suppliers equally and amend the volume at a later date. If the billing system can do this and the Working Group can codify it, it was suggested that this could potentially be the best solution. PM noted that there was a DuraBill User Group Meeting on 29th September 2026 and agreed to raise the fixed charge aspect within the new DuraBill system and will provide an update to the Working Group.

Action 04/02: PM and EB to speak to the Durabill User Group members to discuss the current capabilities of the billing system.

4. Agreed Next Steps

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

- The Secretariat to schedule the next Working Group meeting (05) for 09 October 2026 at 10am to continue to discuss the potential solutions and to review the draft of the second consultation;
- PM and EB to speak to the Durabill user group regarding the capabilities of the current billing system; and
- ED and PW to provide further clarity regarding the split of the fixed charges in relation to the three different solution options.

Action 04/03: The Chair to begin to draft the second consultation document and share with the Working Group in readiness for the next Working Group meeting.

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 – 09 October 2026

- 6.1 The next Working Group meeting is scheduled for 09 October 2026 at 10am.

7. Attachments

- Attachment 1_DCP 476 Work Plan
- Attachment 2_DCP 476 Collated Consultation Responses_WG Comments v0.2
[CONFIDENTIAL]

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
03/01	The Secretariat to reach out to SSE Energy Customer Services to seek further clarification and examples of the suggested single Supplier issue.	Secretariat	Ongoing.
03/02	The Secretariat to reach out to respondent 01 [confidential] to seek further clarification around their Supplier pricing issue.	Secretariat	Ongoing.
03/03	PM to seek further clarification internally in regard to SPENs response to Q6 and feedback to the group.	Philip Mark	Ongoing.
04/01	ED and PW to provide further clarity for the three different options regarding the split of the fixed charges.	Edda Dirks and Peter Waymont	New Action
04/02	PM and EB to speak to the Durabill User Group members to discuss the current capabilities of the billing system.	Phil Mark and Erik Baguzis	New Action
04/03	The Chair to begin to draft the second consultation document and share with the Working Group in readiness for the next Working Group meeting	Andy Green	New Action

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update
03/04	The Secretariat to schedule the next Working Group meeting (04) for 28 September 2026 at 10am to continue the review of the collated Consultation document.	Secretariat	Closed.