Distribution Charging Methodologies Development Group ("DCMDG") - Meeting 104

15 October 2026 at 10:00 via Microsoft Teams

Attendees	Company
Ahna Taylor [AT]	SSE
Alex Pentecost [AP]	Eclipse
Amanda McFarlane [AMF]	Aurora
Cass Bothwell [CB]	Scottish Power
Charles Mott [CM]	SSE
Chou Hon Leong [CHL]	Ofgem
Chris Barker [CBa]	SP ENW
Daniel Hickman [DH]	NESO
Dave Wornell [DW]	National Grid
Diandra Orodan [DO]	BU-UK
Dimuthu Wijetunga [DW]	Shell
Donna Jamieson [DJ]	Idscl
Emma Robinson [ER]	EON
Erik Baguzis [EB]	Indigo
Georgia Preece [GP]	Centrica
Gordon Frazer [GF]	NESO
Itunu Akin-Olawale [IAO]	SP ENW
Jack Purchase [JP]	National Grid
John Harmer [JH]	Waters Wye
Karl Maryon [KM]	Drax
Kavya Kavya [KK]	Brook Green
Lee Stone [LS]	EON
Mark Fletcher [MF]	Shell
Meg Wong [MW]	Stark
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark
Pamela Howe [PH]	NPg
Phil Ransford [PR]	St-Clements
Ryan Farrell [RF]	NPg
Seun Adedapo [SA]	National Grid
Secretariat	
Mel Kendal [MK] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Andrew Malley [AM]	Ofgem
Chris Ong [CO]	UKPN
Craig Booth [CB]	ElectraLink
Ed Grimsey [EG]	BUUK

1. Administration

Recording

1.1 The purpose of this recording is purely to aid the Technical Secretariat in producing an accurate report of the meeting. The recording will be deleted after the minutes are approved.

Competition Law Guidance

1.2 The Working Group reviewed the "Competition Law Guidance" and it was noted that all members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.

Draft Minutes

1.3 Attendees reviewed the draft minutes from the previous meeting.

1.4 No further feedback was received, and the previous minutes were approved.

2. DCMDG Forward Work Plan and Issues Log

2.1 The group reviewed the DCMDG Forward Work Plan and Issues Log; the latest updates can be found in attachment 1.

Action Updates

2.2 Action 96/01 – The Chair informed the group that this action will stay open until a decision has been reached. RF mentioned that a decision is to be expected on 22 October 2026.

2.3 Action 96/02 - The Chair confirmed that there has yet to be any further updates.

2.4 Action 97/05 - The Chair noted that this is an ongoing item and shall remain open.

2.5 Action 103/01 - The Chair informed the group that UKPN had raised a Change Proposal, expected to be presented at the October DCUSA Panel meeting, to provide a permanent solution to the backdating limitation.

2.6 LS noted that the reconciliation window had already reduced to seven months from 01 October 2026, with a further reduction to four months requiring alignment. RF suggested that the arrangements should track the prevailing settlement timetable rather than specify a fixed date or period.

2.7 Members also suggested linking the provisions to the relevant MHHS milestone. The Chair agreed to review the proposal and, subject to Panel approval, liaise with LS and RF on questions for the first Working Group meeting.

Action 104/01	The Secretariat to review the UKPN Change Proposal against the current and forthcoming settlement reconciliation windows and, subject to Panel approval, liaise with LS and RF to identify key questions for the first Working Group meeting.

2.8 Action 103/02 - The Chair advised that no confirmed decision date had been received following the previously reported delay (DCO 466). November had been indicated, but an update would be sought at the October DCUSA Panel meeting.

2.9 Action 103/03 - The Chair reported that a Supplier failing to meet its Milestone 15 migration obligations could be prevented from registering new metering systems until those obligations were completed. The Chair referred to a BSC modification approved by Ofgem in April 2026. The action was agreed to be closed.

DCMDG Issue 16 – 'Site count provision for TNUoS tariff setting ahead of new price controls' [New Issue]

2.10 The Chair invited DH to present DCMDG Issue 16 to the group for further discussion.

2.11 The key updates can be found below:

2.12 DH explained that P402 data normally supported forecasts of site numbers within residual charging bands. At the start of a price control, however, the anonymised data used to set band thresholds could be approximately two years old by the time tariffs were set.

2.13 It also represented a January snapshot rather than the two-year average used to allocate individual sites. Differences between forecast and actual band populations had resulted in material under-recovery of revenue for Transmission Owners.

2.14 DH sought actual band-level site counts following re-banding ahead of the next transmission price control, commencing in April 2031. DW highlighted the existing annual forecasts used for distribution tariff setting, including site counts and consumption, but DH explained that actual allocation data would provide a more reliable starting point. LS expressed the need to cover all voltage levels, including EDCM sites.

2.15 RF suggested providing NESO with the allocation information already issued to Suppliers. DH confirmed that NESO did not currently receive this and that a GB-wide view would address most of the issue. Members discussed adding a summary count by band to the existing spreadsheet rather than requiring NESO to aggregate individual MPAN records. DH supported this approach.

2.16 Members considered whether the additional circulation could be agreed without changing the DCUSA. Although the Chair noted that an informal arrangement appeared possible, LS and the Chair favoured codifying the obligation to avoid it being lost through personnel changes or future code consolidation. DH agreed with this approach.

2.17 The Chair proposed progressing a non-urgent, self-governance Change Proposal, potentially to the November Panel and the February standard release. The group noted that these timings were indicative. DH also noted that the information would not be required until Summer 2029.

Action 104/02	The Secretariat to review the relevant DCUSA provisions and progress a Change Proposal to require allocation information to be provided to NESO, including consideration of a summary site count by band.

3. Ofgem Update

3.1 The Chair invited CHL to provide an Ofgem update.

3.2 The key points can be found below:

3.3 CHL advised that Ofgem plans to publish its consultation on DCP 412 'Allocation of banding for TCR Charges for 'Peaky' Final Demand Customers' on 16 October 2026, subject to no changes to the schedule.

3.4 LS requested an update on the DCP 466 'Tariff Band to Follow Capacity' decision timetable. The Chair highlighted continued interest from industry and Customers, and the volume of enquiries received. CHL advised that the latest internal position was that work had been paused pending resources and agreed to seek an update from TA the following week. No revised decision date was confirmed.

Action 104/03	Ofgem to seek an update internally on the DCP 466 decision timetable. The Secretariat to provide any confirmed timing to DCMDG members once received.

3.5 KK queried when a decision was expected on the ED3 notice-period options Consultation, which had closed in August 2026. RF reiterated his understanding that publication was expected on 22 October 2026. CHL state that no delay was planned and that the decision remained on schedule. The Chair confirmed that progress would continue to be monitored through the existing actions.

3.6 The group noted the Ofgem update.

4. Any Other Business

4.1 The Chair asked if there were any other items of business to discuss.

4.2 **DCP 414/P432 Migration – Data Templates and Customer Contact Details**

4.3 JP reported that migration submissions were being received in different spreadsheet formats, complicating updates to DNO records. JP requested use of the DCUSA template. RF reported similar variation, including submissions through SDEP and email. LS noted that the template had been issued as guidance after the modification rather than being a codified requirement.

4.4 JP also explained that contact information for multi-site customers often identified individual premises rather than the head office or person responsible for energy arrangements. This could prevent correspondence reaching the appropriate recipient. LS noted that the template requested site addresses but agreed to investigate whether additional head-office details could be provided on an ad hoc basis.

Action 104/04	LS to discuss internally whether head-office or central customer contact details can be provided to NGED on an ad hoc basis for relevant migration submissions.

4.5 During the discussion, members also considered differing interpretations of the requirements introduced by DCP 458. Some members advised that DCP 458 allows capacity values to be calculated and applied without obtaining a new Connection Agreement, while JP noted that NGED had been working on the basis that Connection Agreements would still be required. JP agreed to consider the points raised and determine whether any further clarification is required.

Action 104/05	JP to review the discussion on DCP 458 and confirm whether any further clarification on the Connection Agreement requirements is needed.

4.6 **REP900 Data Quality**

4.7 LS signposted an issue raised for the SIG concerning inconsistencies and quality issues in REP900 files used for DUoS billing, reportedly predominantly relating to IDNO data.

4.8 LS also highlighted a potential link with an existing change concerning Supplier loading issues. The Chair confirmed that the issue would be considered at the forthcoming SIG meeting and agreed that the issue paper should accompany these meeting minutes (DCMDG 104) so that interested members could follow or join that discussion.

Action 104/06	The Secretariat to attach the REP900 issue paper to the DCMDG 104 minutes for members' information ahead of the forthcoming SIG discussion.

4.9 **Cost Information Review Pack (CIRP) Publication and Quality Checks**

4.10 Members discussed concerns regarding the quality of some published CIRPs, including instances where templates had not been fully updated prior to publication. It was noted that similar concerns had been raised previously and members discussed whether additional quality assurance checks could be implemented before publication. Members also noted challenges associated with receiving updated CIRP templates shortly before publication deadlines. Further discussion on the issue is expected at a forthcoming CIRP meeting.

5. Agenda Items for the Next Meeting

5.1 The Chair explained that there we no specific items for the agenda, however the progress of the actions would be assessed and an agenda produced with these in mind.

6. DNO ("Distribution Network Operator") Operational Matters

6.1 The Chair asked if there were any DNO Matters to be raised.

6.2 RF highlighted that a prospective increase in the DNO share of DCC costs from 6% to 40% had been reflected in 2027/28 tariffs. The latest indicative charging statement, iteration 3, instead showed a share of approximately 21%, compared with 6% in the preceding iteration.

6.3 RF emphasised that the figures remained indicative and could change again before final charges were issued. RF noted the implications for the next tariff-setting round and whether the existing 40% assumption should be retained or reduced. Members were asked to keep the developing position under review; no revised assumption or new formal action was agreed.

6.4 No matters were raised.

7. Date of Next Meeting

7.1 The next DCMDG meeting will be held on 19 November 2026 via Microsoft Teams.

8. Attachments

8.1 Attachment 1_DCMDG Action Log & Forward Work Plan

8.2 Attachment 2_SIG REP900 Issue Paper