

DCP 464 Working Group - Meeting 14

02 October 2026 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Amanda McFarlane [AMF]	Aurora
Drew Johnstone [DJ]	NPg
Ed Grimsey [EG]	BU-UK
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Generation
Erik Baguzis [EB]	Indigo
Martin Brace [MB]	UKPN
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.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

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

3. Review of Collated 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 Prior to the review of the collated RFI responses document, ED explained that ENC and IPNL have not been able to respond, and this will likely not be possible before the end of October 2026.
- 3.4 The Working Group discussed whether it would be beneficial to wait until those responses are received, or whether there is enough data gathered to-date to move forward with this change – after further discussion, members supported progressing this change with the data that has already been gathered rather than delay the progressed. It was noted that any submissions received at a later date can be incorporated.
- 3.5 **Q1** – *How many times have you submitted an application for additional capacity at the exit point with a DNO? Please categorise these into either application:*
- *to increase the number of entry/exit points on the IDNO network, or*
 - *an increase of capacity for a specific entry/exit point.*

- 3.6 The Chair informed the group that one IDNO responded with 'once' – members noted that this response needs further clarification as to which category it belongs to. Following this, the Secretariat agreed to take an action to reach out to this respondent to seek further clarification.

ACTION 14/01: The Secretariat to reach out to the respondent 'IDNO 04' to seek further clarification around their response to Q1, and which category 'once' belongs to.

- 3.7 The Chair also informed the group that as well as the listed 5 IDNO respondents, an additional 2 IDNO responses were also received; however, they stated that they did not have any instances. Although not captured within the collated RFI responses document, the Chair confirmed that the additional 2 IDNO responses will be acknowledged within the Change Report stating that they have not responded due not having any instances to refer to.
- 3.8 The Secretariat also agreed to update the collated RFI responses document to include the additional 2 IDNOs but state that they have not seen any instances and clearly articulate within the Change Report.

ACTION 14/02: The Secretariat to update the collated RFI responses document to include the additional 2 IDNO that stated that they have not seen any instances and clearly articulate this within the Change Report.

- 3.9 **Q2** – *From the numbers gathered from Q1, for each category, how many of these already had more than one entry/exit point connected to the IDNO network?*
- 3.10 The Working Group noted the responses and had no further feedback at this time.
- 3.11 **Q3** – *From the number gathered from Q2, for each category, how many of these applications required upgrade to the DNO network?*
- 3.12 The Chair informed the group that upgrades were required in 11 cases for one respondent and 1 case for another. The other respondents reported no upgrades.
- 3.13 **Q4** – *From the number gathered from Q3, how many of these were you charged for the upgrade works?*
- 3.14 The Chair informed the group that from the responses given, every upgrade case appeared to have resulted in charges, including the single case for IDNO 05. RG noted that the detailed bases of the 13 charged jobs is needed to determine whether the charges relate to the assets relevant to Option 02.
- 3.15 **Q5** – *From the instances identified from Q4, could you provide the DNO names and application/enquiry references and status, as stipulated on the relevant BCA?*
- 3.16 The Working Group noted the responses and had no further feedback at this time.
- 3.17 **Q6** – *Do you have any additional comments relating to this RFI?*
- 3.18 Members discussed how offers should be described, and it was noted that DNOs generally do not record a formal rejection reason; an offer is usually accepted or allowed to expire. The group agreed to replace 'rejected' with 'not accepted', with one reason potentially being that 'rejected' may have a specific meaning under the SLC 15.

3.19 The Chair queried whether applications listed as ‘in-progress’ should be included – TT considered them all valid where the offer decision had not yet been completed. DJ stated that the information is useful only where the DNO has issued an offer quote; applications not yet submitted or not yet quoted should not be treated as relevant evidence.

3.20 **Working Group Discussion**

3.21 Following the review of the collated RFI responses document, the Working Group agreed that a second RFI document will need to be developed and issued to DNO parties for further feedback.

3.22 The below questions can be found below:

- *Is the scope of work identical to what is shown in example 6?*
- *Are there charges relating to upgrading the assets identified as either extension or shared use in example 6?*
- *Where the answer to question 2 was yes, for the upgrade works that were carried out, how much did you, as the DNO, charge the IDNO?*
- *What was the value of the works that would be carried out under option 2?*
- *Do you have any additional comments relating to this RFI?*

3.23 The Chair agreed to take an action to capture an image of example 6 and insert it within the RFI 02 document.

ACTION 14/03: The Secretariat to insert an image of example 6 into the RFI 02 document.

3.24 MB raised a concern that some projects may be historical and that quoted values may not represent current costs. The group agreed to request the actual historical value together with the date of the quote/works, allowing the Working Group to assess later whether indexing or normalisation is needed.

3.25 TT also suggested that the group should consider what the appendix will look like and agree the desired format to receive this information for it to be collated/aggregated.

3.26 Following the above discussions, The Chair agreed to produce the final RFI 02 document and circulate to the Working Group for an offline review. RG also agreed to take an action to add fields to the existing template rather than create a separate structure. The group were happy with this approach.

ACTION 14/04: The Secretariat to produce the final RFI 02 document and circulate to the Working Group for an offline review.

ACTION 14/05: RG to add fields to the existing template rather than create a separate structure.

3.27 If the RFI 02 document is finalised offline, the Secretariat will issue the document for further feedback. If a further Working Group meeting is needed to finalise the document prior to issuing, the Secretariat will issue a meeting poll to all members.

ACTION 14/06: The Secretariat to issue the final RFI 02 document to DNO members for further feedback.

- 3.28 The Secretariat will also issue a meeting poll to the Working Group to schedule a meeting to review the collated RFI 02 responses.

ACTION 14/07: The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group to schedule a meeting to review the collated RFI 02 responses.

3.29

4. Agreed Next Steps

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

- The Secretariat to produce the final RFI 02 document and circulate to the Working Group for an offline review.
- RG to add fields to the existing template rather than create a separate structure.
- The Secretariat to issue the final RFI 02 document to DNO members for further feedback once finalised by the Working Group.
- The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group to schedule a meeting to review the collated RFI 02 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 – TBC

6.1 The next Working Group is currently TBC - a meeting poll will be issued to the Working Group for their availability.

7. Attachments

- Attachment 1_DCP 464 Work Plan

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>
14/01	The Secretariat to reach out to the respondent 'IDNO 04' to seek further clarification around their response to Q1, and which category 'once' belongs to.	Secretariat	New Action.
14/02	The Secretariat to update the collated RFI responses document to include the additional 2 IDNO that stated that they have not seen any instances and clearly articulate this within the Change Report.	Secretariat	New Action.
14/03	The Secretariat to insert an image of example 6 into the RFI 02 document.	Secretariat	New Action.
14/04	The Secretariat to produce the final RFI 02 document and circulate to the Working Group for an offline review.	Secretariat	New Action.
14/05	RG to add fields to the existing template rather than create a separate structure.	Rob Gladstone	New Action.

14/06	The Secretariat to issue the final RFI 02 document to DNO members for further feedback.	Secretariat	New Action.
14/07	The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group to schedule a meeting to review the collated RFI 02 responses.	Secretariat	New Action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.		Update	
13/01	The Secretariat to include an extra definition of 'load growth' within the glossary of the RFI.	Secretariat	Closed.
13/02	RG to make the necessary updates to the template and share with the Working Group for review.	Rob Gladstone	Closed.
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	Closed.
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	Closed.