

DCP 469 Working Group Meeting 10

08 October 2026 at 13:00 – via Microsoft Teams

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Tim Aldridge [TA] (Observer)	Ofgem
Chris Barker [CB]	Electricity North West Limited
Tony Collings [TC]	Ecotricity Group Limited
Edda Dirks [ED]	SSE Energy Supply Limited
Ryan Farrell [RF]	Northern Powergrid Limited
Ed Grimsey [EG]	BUUK Infrastructure Limited
John Harmer [JH]	Waters Wye Associates Limited
James Knight [JK]	Centrica plc
Charles Mott [CM]	SSE Energy Supplier
Lorna Murray [LM]	Scottish Power Energy Networks Holdings Limited
Chris Ong [CO]	UK Power Networks Holdings Limited
Emma Robinson [ER]	E.ON Energy Solutions Limited
Louise Robinson [LR]	ESP Electricity Limited
Lee Stone [LS]	E.ON UK Limited
Harvey Takhar [HT]	National Energy System Operator Limited
Peter Waymont [PW]	Eastern Power Networks Plc
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark Connect Limited
Dave Wornell [DW]	National Grid Electricity Distribution PLC
Code Administrator	
Richard Colwill [RC] – CHAIR	ElectraLink
George Kestner [GK] – Technical Secretariat	ElectraLink

Apologies	Company
Emma Clarke [EC]	SSEN
Melissa Kendal [MK]	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 and Open Actions

- 1.4 The Chair shared the previous minutes and there were no further comments/feedback. These minutes were approved.
- 1.5 The Chair provided the updates on the current open actions; these can be found within the Appendix.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair explained that the purposes of the meeting were to: continue to review the collated Consultation Responses; to review the 6-Month Analysis and decide whether to take an alternative timeframe solution forward; to discuss whether or not changes to the Schedule 16 Time Band changes should be progressed as part of this Change Proposal; and to agree next steps.

3. Consultation Summary – Agree text for Change Report

- 3.1 The Working Group reviewed and agreed the text that had been circulated prior to the meeting in relation to summarising the consultation responses for the Change Report.

4. Review 6-Month Analysis – Decision on whether to take forward alternative solution

- 4.1 The Working Group discussed the initial DNO analysis comparing a six-month DUoS notice period with the current 15-month arrangement. DNO representatives broadly agreed that a six-month notice period would reduce volatility when compared to the current arrangements, although not to the same extent as the proposed two-month solution. It was noted that a six-month option would still leave uncertainties, particularly during price control transitions, but considered it sufficiently credible to warrant further industry consideration.

- 4.2 During the discussion, Ofgem highlighted that if alternative notice periods were to be considered, the Working Group should be able to explain why a particular period had been selected over other possible options. This led to further discussion regarding available data points and whether another intermediate option should also be examined. DNO members advised that additional analysis could be undertaken using May data, allowing a comparison based on an approximately ten-month notice period. The Working Group agreed that extending the analysis to include a ten-month option would provide a broader evidence base and help stakeholders understand the trade-offs between the current 15-month, proposed 10-month, 6-month and 2-month approaches.
- 4.3 The Working Group agreed that the additional six and ten-month analysis should be completed and included within a follow-up consultation. The intention is not to revisit previously consulted issues but to specifically seek industry views on whether either alternative provides a more appropriate balance between notice, volatility and forecasting certainty.
- 4.4 It was noted that DNO representatives and the Secretariat will work together on how best to present the volatility analysis and associated findings within the consultation document. This will include considering how previous risk premium analysis undertaken for the two-month solution can be applied consistently across all notice period options.

Action 10/01: DNO members to produce additional analysis for reducing notice period to 10 months.

Action 10/02: Secretariat to include this analysis in follow up consultation.

5. Review of Consultation Responses Summary

- 5.1 The Secretariat presented the draft consultation response summary produced following the recent consultation. The Working Group agreed that the consultation response summary provides a useful explanation of why further work is being undertaken and should therefore form the introductory section of the follow-up consultation. Members noted that a common theme emerging from consultation responses was the question of why only a two-month solution had been considered and agreed that the additional six- and ten-month analysis directly addresses that feedback.

Action 10/03: Utilise this summary in the follow up consultation.

6. Schedule 16 Time-Band Changes

- 6.1 The Working Group revisited whether the proposed changes to Schedule 16 time-band notification arrangements should remain within the scope of DCP 469. Views remained mixed. Several members expressed the view that time-band notice periods raise wider issues relating to supplier pricing, time-of-use signals and future market arrangements that may justify consideration through a standalone change proposal. Others highlighted that the issue remains linked to notice period arrangements and therefore should not automatically be removed from scope.
- 6.2 Members discussed potential interactions with DCP 477 and noted that both changes may have implications for time-band notice arrangements, although the exact relationship would depend on the final solution progressed under DCP 477. Ofgem and Working Group members discussed whether the interaction was direct or simply a consequence of notice period changes occurring under both proposals.
- 6.3 Given the differing views, the Working Group agreed that a final decision should not yet be made. Instead, the follow-up consultation will include a specific section setting out the potential advantages

and disadvantages of retaining the Schedule 16 time-band changes within DCP 469 versus progressing them separately under a future change proposal. This will allow stakeholders to provide views before the Working Group determines the final scope of DCP 469.

Action 10/04: CO to draft consultation commentary regarding the Schedule 16 time-band change issue, including the potential benefits and risks of retaining it within DCP 469.

- 6.4 CO agreed to prepare draft consultation text outlining the considerations associated with retaining or removing the Schedule 16 time-band changes from DCP 469.

7. Agree Next Steps

- 7.1 The Working Group AGREED the following next steps:

- DNO members to complete additional analysis on the impacts of both six-month and ten-month notice periods.
- DNO representatives and the Secretariat to work together on how best to present the volatility analysis and associated findings within the consultation document. This will include considering how previous risk premium analysis undertaken for the two-month solution can be applied consistently across all notice period options.
- CO to draft consultation commentary regarding the Schedule 16 time-band change issue, including the potential benefits and risks of retaining it within DCP 469.
- Following completion of the above actions, the Secretariat will prepare a first draft of the follow-up consultation and circulate it to Working Group members for review.
- The Secretariat will then determine whether the consultation can be agreed offline or whether a further Working Group meeting is required to finalise and approve the document before issuance. Members indicated that a further meeting is likely to be required.
- Members also noted that timing the consultation after Ofgem's expected ED3 revenue determination may provide additional certainty and context for respondents.

8. Any Other Business

- 8.1 No items of 'Other Business' were raised.

Next Meeting – TBC

Appendix 1 – Actions Log

New and Open Actions

Ref	Action	Owner	Update
01/01	The Secretariat to gather further information around CMP 286/287 for future Working Group discussions.	Secretariat	Ongoing.
10/01	DNO members to produce additional analysis for reducing the notice period to 10 months.	DNO Members	New action.
10/02	Secretariat to include the additional analysis in the follow-up consultation.	Secretariat	New action.
10/03	Utilise the consultation response summary in the follow-up consultation.	Secretariat	New action.
10/04	Draft consultation commentary on the Schedule 16 time-band change issue, including the potential benefits and risks of retaining it within DCP 469.	Chris Ong	New action.

Closed Actions

Ref	Update
06/06	The Secretariat to consider targeted consultation distribution to Citizens Advice, the Energy Intensive Users Group and any suitable bodies representing small commercial customers Secretariat / Working Group <i>The Chair informed the group that a response was received with thanks for the invitation, however, a confirmation to attend has not yet been received and the response deadline date has now been extended. The Working Group will be updated once this has been confirmed.</i>

			Update: Other parties had been contacted but had not responded. CLOSED
09/01	The Secretariat to take an action to complete the Collated Consultation Responses document with the relevant summaries so that the evidence provided can then be included within the draft Change Report.	Secretariat	Update: Some additional comments had been received, which were tabled for review later in the meeting. CLOSED
09/02	DW to circulate the 6-month calculation and methodology to the Secretariat, who will then issue to the Working Group for review offline.	Dave Wornell	Update: This was circulated ahead of meeting 10 and tabled for discussion in the meeting. CLOSED
09/03	DNO members to reproduce/review the 6-month analysis, including the volatility and risk-premium inputs, prior to the next meeting.	DNO Members	Update: This was discussed at meeting 10. CLOSED