# DCP 443 Working Group - Meeting 22

03 November 2026 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

| Attendee | Company |
|---|---|
| **Working Group Members** | |
| Alex Lam [AL] | NGED |
| Charles Mott [CM] | SSE |
| Chris Barker [CB] | ENWL |
| Chris Ong [CO] | UKPN |
| Ed Grimsey [EG] | BU-UK |
| Edda Dirks [ED] | SSE Gen |
| Erik Baguzis [EB] | Indigo |
| Karl Maryon [KM] | Drax |
| Michael Hewitson [MH] | Trident |
| Nik Wills [NW] | Stark |
| Pamela Howe [PH] | NPg |
| Peter Waymont [PW] | UKPN |
| Rachel Wallace [RW] | BU-UK |
| **Code Administrator** | |
| Andy Green [AG] (Chair) | ElectraLink |
| Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat) | ElectraLink |
| **Apologies** | |
| Kara Burke [KB] | NPg |

## 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.

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 purpose of this meeting is to review the collated Consultation 02 responses document within the Working Group and agree next steps.

## 3. Review Collated Consultation 02 Responses Document

3.1 The Chair presented the collated Consultation responses document live on screen for the Working Group to review and discuss.

3.2 The key updates can be found below:

**Q1 – 'Option A: 12-Month Maximum Approach'**

3.3 Members considered whether applying excess capacity charges over 12 months would provide a sufficient incentive for Customers to remain within their Maximum Import Capacity (MIC).

3.4 One respondent supported a stronger signal than the current arrangements but highlighted that persistent exceeders might treat the charge as an operating cost. Customers might also seek to reduce their MIC and residual band while continuing to use their previous capacity. CB considered the approach an improvement on the current monthly arrangements, but not a complete solution for every Customer.

3.5 EB clarified that reducing MIC did not automatically reduce a Customer's residual band. A separate application under the exceptional circumstances arrangements was required, including a significant capacity reduction and other criteria. Members noted that this provided a safeguard against gaming, although it did not establish that the risk was eliminated.

3.6 EG explained that Option A did not introduce a differential between the standard and excess capacity charge rates. A Customer consistently exceeding could therefore continue to pay for that level of use without the additional differential envisaged under the other options. One respondent suggested considering a graduated multiplier or other mechanism for repeated or sustained exceedance.

3.7 PW suggested that residual banding could reflect the higher of contracted capacity and actual demand, including where an exceedance crossed a band boundary. The Chair noted that whether this should form part of DCP 443, or require a separate Change Proposal, would need further consideration.

3.8 One respondent highlighted implementation complexity and the need to explain the 12-month charging mechanism to Customers. AL clarified that this concerned both incorporation into the model and communication by distributors and suppliers. PW advised that a similar approach had operated between 1994 and 2010 without questions of understanding.

3.9 Another respondent raised concerns about invoice transparency, the continuing charges following a single exceedance, and correction of erroneous peaks under the shorter Market-wide Half-Hourly Settlement (MHHS) reconciliation window (four months). CB observed the continuing effect of an error under Option A from a charge confined to the month of exceedance under the other options. PW noted that the financial impact would also depend on the differential applied.

3.10 Other respondents questioned the cost-reflective basis of linking a single exceedance to charges in subsequent months. One respondent requested scenario analysis comparing the costs of exceedance with increasing MIC, including possible residual band changes. Another respondent considered that the approach could have a greater impact on infrequent than persistent exceeders. An additional respondent supported Option A on the basis of previous experience and the alignment with the period restricting further capacity changes.

3.11 ED requested further consideration of the MHHS correction window and its implications for a 12-month charge. Following this, the Secretariat agreed to capture the considerations required for Option A.

**ACTION 22/01: The Secretariat to capture the issues requiring further consideration for Option A, including the shorter reconciliation window, strength of the price signal and cost reflectivity, alongside the benefits identified from previous use.**

**Q2 – 'Option B: Fixed Multiplier Approach'**

3.12 Respondents proposed different multiplier levels or declined to specify a value without further evidence. One respondent suggested approximately twice the standard capacity charge as a starting point, while recognising that the interaction with residual bands could still make exceedance cheaper for some Customers.

3.13 The same respondent also proposed a scalable multiplier increasing with the magnitude of exceedance. EG asked members whether this had previously been considered - members did not

recall an earlier discussion. EB supported further consideration of a stronger signal linked to the magnitude or frequency of exceedance.

3.14 CB distinguished the excess capacity costs addressed by the CP from gaming of residual bands, and noted that a pence-per-kVA charge already increased the amount payable as exceedance increased. PW clarified that the suggestion was to increase the rate itself with the volume or proportion of exceedance. He favoured a mathematical approach rather than additional bands and cautioned that a frequency-based approach would reintroduce reliance on historical events. The Chair noted some support for exploring a sliding scale, but no design was agreed.

3.15 Another respondent considered the multiplier simple to communicate but inherently subjective and not directly linked to network costs. Other responses also questioned its cost reflectivity. An additional respondent requested comparisons across typical scenarios and all three options.

3.16 One respondent preferred a model-calculated differential but considered a multiplier a possible interim solution if Option C could not be developed. PH clarified that NPg's former approach had operated monthly rather than using a 12-month exceedance charge. Its reference to restoring a previous cost signal was therefore not support for Option A.

3.17 One respondent cited a multiplier of 1.5 as broadly consistent with historic averages, with an average of 1.8 for LV site-specific customers. PW queried the use of a simple average and whether 1.5 would be sufficiently material. One respondent suggested approximately 1.8 by reference to older models, while another respondent supported twice the capacity charge.

3.18 The Chair summarised that no comparable concerns had been raised about customer understanding or implementation of Option B. Cost reflectivity remained unresolved, and the suggested sliding scale would be considered further alongside the other options. No multiplier was selected.

**Q3 – 'Option C: Cost Reflectivity of the Model-Integrated Approach'**

3.19 One respondent questioned whether the worked example demonstrated improved cost reflectivity, highlighting redistribution between tariff groups and increased generation credits. CB explained that the approach retained the CDCM's 500 MW modelling basis but adjusted volume forecasts to move costs towards the excess capacity charge. He considered the wider impacts modest, while recognising that other tariffs would be affected.

3.20 Another respondent considered Option C to have the greatest potential for a cost-reflective solution, subject to further testing across DNO regions. The Chair explained that additional model development and analysis, with specialist input, would be required if the option progressed.

3.21 AL clarified their concern (presented within the collated responses) about redistribution and possible double counting. CB explained that an earlier version had added amounts to excess capacity charges without changing other forward-looking signals. The revised approach reduced unit volume forecasts to remove costs before reallocating them to excess capacity. The intention was to retain the cost-reflective basis while changing the tariff element through which costs were recovered. AL acknowledged the explanation but the wider concern about cost reflectivity remained relevant.

3.22 One respondent considered that the volume adjustment occurred too early in the model, affecting other Customer groups, generation credits and IDNO discounts. CB advised that some movement in other tariffs was inherent in changing volume forecasts. Examples of particularly large changes would need examination; smaller changes might be acceptable, subject to review.

3.23 Supporting responses considered the approach consistent with the existing CDCM framework, subject to transparent and validated assumptions. One respondent requested commentary from the charging model contractors or another suitable neutral expert. Another respondent considered Option C more cost reflective than the alternatives but remained uncertain how closely charges represented actual costs.

3.24 An additional respondent questioned outcomes across DNO regions and the implications of negative residuals. CB distinguished residual charges from forward-looking economic charges and considered the former outside the scope of this change. He recalled earlier analysis across DNO regions and suggested confirming the outcomes through impact analysis with TNEI if Option C progressed.

3.25 The Chair concluded that there was support for further exploration of Option C, but materially more analysis and assurance would be needed before it could be put forward for voting.

**Q4 – 'Option C: Strength of the Price Signal'**

3.26 Responses generally recognised that a differential could strengthen the signal but differed on whether sufficient evidence had been provided across customer groups and DNO regions. One respondent referred to illustrative charges approximately two to three times the standard capacity charge and supported keeping the charge linked to the month of exceedance. Other respondents considered that a model-derived, cost-reflective charge should itself provide the appropriate signal rather than requiring a separate behavioural test.

3.27 One respondent requested analysis of typical exceedance scenarios to compare Options A, B and C. ED suggested using historical exceedance data to identify representative Customer types and behaviours. The Chair agreed to check whether relevant analysis had already been completed under DCP 443 (or other CPs).

**ACTION 22/02: The Secretariat agreed to check whether relevant analysis (using historical data to identify representative Customer types and behaviours) had already been completed under DCP 443 (or other CPs).**

3.28 ED explained that the proposed comparison should assess the costs of exceeding against increasing MIC and any resulting band changes, to establish whether exceedance remained the cheaper outcome. PW distinguished that comparison from assessing whether the charge alone would discourage the behaviour, while accepting that applying the three options to an identical example was achievable.

3.29 The Chair explained that the Consultation had sought views on the concepts before detailed legal drafting and further development. The Chair also confirmed that additional analysis would be undertaken following the Consultation, with the Working Group agreeing its scope once the

approaches to develop had been considered. ED noted that comparative evidence would also assist selection between the options.

**ACTION 22/03: The Working Group to agree the scope of further comparative scenario and impact analysis following consideration of the approaches to develop.**

3.30 One respondent highlighted the influence of residual banding on Customer behaviour and current requests to reduce bands and charges. Another respondent remained concerned that Option C would not produce a sufficiently strong signal in every region. The Chair reiterated the need to examine redistribution and unintended impacts, including those on domestic customers, and the value of CEPA and TNEI input if the option progressed.

**Q5 – 'Option C: Other Comments on the Approach'**

3.31 Two respondents questioned the basis for increased aggregated demand charges and generation credits alongside reductions for some customers directly subject to capacity charges. Another respondent considered Option C the most suitable approach if the wider impacts could be reduced.

3.32 Responses noted that the method redistributed costs within the model rather than introducing an external multiplier. Supporting comments recognised that excess capacity costs might differ from normal network activity, although quantifying that distinction on an integrated network was difficult.

3.33 One respondent requested that the impacts on aggregated tariffs, which were not subject to capacity charges, be analysed and fully described in the next iteration of the documentation. The Chair confirmed that these effects and the Working Group's response would need documenting, whether Option C progressed or was discounted. The issues remained subject to further consideration rather than an agreed justification for the wider tariff movements.

**Q6 – 'Benefits of Calculating the Differential within the Model'**

3.34 Respondents identified potential benefits including closer alignment with the charging methodology, reduced reliance on an arbitrary multiplier, greater transparency and the ability to reflect differences in network cost assumptions over time and between charging groups. These benefits were conditional on the resulting charges being explainable, justified and appropriately validated.

3.35 One respondent reiterated its request for independent specialist commentary rather than concluding that the intended benefits had been demonstrated. Another respondent considered the main distinction to be calculating the charge within the model, noting that Option B would also need incorporating into model outputs to produce the schedule of charges. The same respondent did not support Option C at this stage.

3.36 The Chair noted cost reflectivity and transparency as recurring potential benefits, but no final comparison with a fixed or scalable multiplier was agreed.

**Q7 – 'Option C Model Design and Guidance'**

3.37 Respondents requested further explanation of the model outputs, including changes between tariff categories, increased generation credits and the relative LV and HV excess capacity charges. One respondent asked whether the observed effects were specific to the ENWL model or would occur across other DNO regions. Another respondent reiterated its concern about the location of the volume adjustment.

3.38 Supporting responses recognised that simplifying assumptions about avoided costs were unavoidable but requested clear documentation, validation and assurance. Specialist commentary, reproducible assumptions and testing across DNO regions and tariff categories were identified as important considerations. One respondent considered the guidance sufficient to explain how the charge was calculated.

3.39 The Chair summarised that the scale, cause and justification of movements in domestic and non-domestic aggregated tariffs would require further examination if Option C progressed. Any conclusion that impacts were insignificant would also need explaining.

**Q8 – 'Alternative Differential Approaches'**

3.40 One respondent reiterated the suggestion of a graduated differential linked to the magnitude or frequency of exceedance. The Chair considered this potentially a variation of the multiplier approach rather than a wholly separate option and confirmed that it remained a topic for further discussion.

3.41 Other responses identified direct assessment of costs caused by excess capacity as a theoretical alternative but considered this difficult because demand was combined on shared network assets. The Chair recalled that the first Consultation had sought evidence on these costs, without establishing a readily quantifiable cost base.

**Q9 – 'Prefferred Option'**

| Respondent | A | B | C |
|---|---|---|---|
| Respondent 1 | | | |
| Respondent 2 | ✓ | | ✓ |
| Respondent 3 | | ✓ | |
| Respondent 4 | | | ✓ |
| Respondent 5 | | | ✓ |
| Respondent 6 | | | ✓ |
| Respondent 7 | | | |
| Respondent 8 | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Respondent 9 | | | ✓ |
| Respondent 10 | ✓ | | |
| **Total ticks** | **2** | **1** | **5** |

3.42 The Chair reviewed respondents' preferences. Two respondents supported Option A, five supported Option C and one preferred Option B. These figures include one respondent who supported both Options A and C, subject to further work. Of those supporting Option C, one preferred it only if the wider impacts on other customer groups could be addressed and would consider Option B as an interim solution. Two respondents needed more evidence before expressing a preference.

3.43 The Chair observed that all three options had some support and proposed a table showing the responses and party categories.

**ACTION 22/04: The Secretariat to produce a table showing the responses and party categories.**

**Q10 – 'Additional Advantages and Disadvantages'**

3.44 Respondents reiterated the potential for gaming under Option A, the subjectivity and variable effectiveness of Option B, and the complexity, redistribution risks and validation requirements associated with Option C.

3.45 One respondent raised further Option A concerns about monthly invoice transparency and the possibility that reactive power changes could cause exceedance before a Customer identified an equipment or power factor issue. A charge based on an earlier peak might obscure the current source of an exceedance.

3.46 PH clarified that their description of initial invoicing and credit-and-rebill runs concerned existing DUoS billing arrangements, not a proposed implementation of the 12-month method. Rebilling occurred where relevant data changed rather than automatically. PW accepted this clarification and noted that existing processes should not, in themselves, prevent future changes. The Chair confirmed that future billing arrangements would require discussion if Option A progressed.

3.47 Members revisited correction of erroneous peaks under the shorter MHHS window. PW noted that data errors affected other approaches too and referred to discussion of a possible additional settlement run.

3.48 Following the above discussions, the Chair agreed to update the advantages and disadvantages table to incorporate the additional points raised within the responses.

**ACTION 22/05: The Secretariat to update the advantages and disadvantages table to incorporate the additional points raised within the responses.**

**Q11 – 'Billing System Changes and Implementation'**

3.49 Responses generally indicated greater billing system changes for Option A, including retaining and applying maximum demand over 12 months. It is expected for Option A to take longest, Option B to require relatively limited tariff updates, and Option C to fall between the two because of model and process changes.

3.50 Other respondents expected little or no change to core billing systems for Options B and C, subject to final specifications, because an excess capacity charge field already existed. The Chair noted that the responses broadly aligned with the Working Group's earlier assumptions.

3.51 Members discussed whether a remaining 12-month charge would transfer to a new tenant. PW explained that system requirements would depend on whether the charge continued regardless of tenancy or ended on a change of tenant. The Chair identified tenancy changes, MIC changes and corrected data as matters requiring explicit rules if Option A progressed.

3.52 One respondent highlighted the need to consider IDNO billing systems as well as DNO systems.

**Q12 – 'Other Points for Consideration'**

3.53 Responses reiterated the need to explain Option C's distributional outcomes, document assumptions and provide comparative scenario analysis. The Chair proposed bringing existing and relevant analysis together in a single shared location to make it easier for members to review.

**ACTION 22/06: The Secretariat to collate existing DCP 443 analysis into a single folder and share with Working Group members offline.**

3.54 The group noted that one respondent (SSE Energy Supply) had responded to Question 12 as having no further comments. This was subsequently identified as an omission from the collation after the meeting closed (further details can found within the relevant section of the meeting minutes).

**Q13 – 'Separate Treatment of Excess Capacity Revenue'**

3.55 Most responses did not support treating excess capacity revenue as excluded, additional or otherwise outside normal recovered revenue. Reasons included its relationship with allowed network costs, the ability to forecast it, consumer protection and the risk of double recovery or an unintended windfall.

3.56 One respondent stated that the revenue represented approximately 0.2% of its recovered revenue, and considered changes disproportionate even if the forecast were materially inaccurate. Other responses questioned separating the revenue when associated expenditure could not be robustly disaggregated from the price control cost base.

3.57 One respondent recognised that although Customers should not exceed MIC, exceedance occurred in practice and could be estimated from past years. It considered that the regulatory changes needed were likely disproportionate.

3.58 Another respondent supported separate treatment, considering excess capacity to represent uncontracted and unpredictable use beyond planned network requirements. It argued that charges

should fall on the exceeding customer rather than changing charges for others. The Chair acknowledged the distinction but also noted the concerns raised by other respondents.

**Q14 – 'Current Distribution Licence Provisions'**

3.59 Most respondents who offered a view considered that the current licence did not permit separate treatment and that an explicit licence modification would be required. One respondent referred to the exclusion of use of system charges from Directly Remunerated Services (DRS) and the absence of a relevant category in Appendix 1 to Special Condition 9.7.

3.60 One respondent considered that a miscellaneous DRS category could apply if the charge were no longer part of DUoS. Another respondent had not undertaken a legal assessment but supported retaining normal recovered revenue treatment. The Chair summarised the current view that licence changes would be necessary.

**Q15 – 'Licence Changes and other Regulatory Requirements'**

3.61 Responses identified possible changes to DRS definitions, the definition of use of system charges, or the introduction of an explicit additional revenue category. Alternatives included a revenue reopener or adjustment mechanism supported by evidence of DNO costs.

3.62 One respondent suggested that, if forecasting treatment changed, actual revenue should still feed into normal reconciliation rather than being retained outside allowed revenue arrangements. Other responses highlighted the need to identify associated costs, overheads and any permitted margin, and prevent recovery of the same costs through other DUoS charges.

3.63 The responses identified consequential changes to the price control, financial model, regulatory accounting, reporting and assurance. Ofgem engagement, impact assessment, Consultation and the applicable licence modification process would be required. The Chair noted that delivery was unlikely to be quick and could require alignment with a future price control.

**Q16 – 'Concerns about Separate Revenue Treatment'**

3.64 Concerns included higher overall Customer charges, weaker reconciliation of forecast and actual revenue, double recovery, unintended financial benefits and additional regulatory and billing complexity. One respondent questioned proportionality given the small share of revenue involved.

3.65 Responses also highlighted the scale of price control and licence changes. One response suggested implementation could take more than five years, while another referred to a future price control process. These were respondents' assessments rather than an agreed delivery timetable. One respondent did not identify concerns.

**Q17 – 'Potential Benefits of Separate Revenue Treatment'**

3.66 Most responses did not identify a clear benefit sufficient to outweigh the complexity and risks. Potential benefits discussed included greater transparency or a stronger incentive to manage excess capacity, but these were dependent on evidence and robust identification of associated costs.

3.67 One respondent favoured addressing forecasting only, while keeping actual revenue in normal reconciliation. Another considered that separate treatment would reduce price-setting uncertainty and improve cost reflectivity.

**Q18 – 'Any other Comments'**

3.68 Responses reiterated support for an effective, proportionate and explainable signal, further development and assurance of Option C, and consideration of repeated exceedance and gaming risks.

3.69 One respondent supported retaining the flexibility under DCUSA clauses 12.3 to 12.5 and queried whether exceedance was measured instantaneously or over a 30-minute period. It also raised remedies for repeated or sustained exceedance and associated network impacts.

3.70 Another respondent anticipated a further consultation to consider draft legal text and an EDCM solution.

**Working Group Discussions – Next Steps**

3.71 Following the review of the collated Consultation 02 responses, the Chair proposed preparing a summary of the responses and the issues requiring further consideration, including cost reflectivity, modelling consequences and the concerns associated with each option. Members would then reconvene to consider whether the issues could be addressed, identify any barriers and determine which options should progress or be discounted.

**ACTION 22/07: The Secretariat to prepare a summary of the responses and the issues requiring further consideration, including cost reflectivity, modelling consequences and the concerns associated with each option.**

## 4. Post-Meeting Clarification – SSE Energy Supply Response

4.1 Following closure of the main meeting, The Chair, ED and MK revisited the SSE Energy Supply response. MK confirmed that the original submission contained an answer to Question 12 which had not been included in the collated responses document; the other questions were blank.

4.2 The Chair agreed that the collation should be updated and recirculated immediately, explaining that the omitted material related to Question 12 only. ED requested that it also be raised at the start of the next meeting so members could comment before the substantive consideration of which solutions to progress. The Chair agreed with this approach.

**ACTION 22/08: The Secretariat to update the current collated Consultation 02 responses with the missing SSE Energy Supply response to Q12 and recirculate to the group offline.**

## 5. Agreed Next Steps

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

- The Secretariat to update the current collated Consultation 02 responses with the missing SSE Energy Supply response to Q12 and recirculate to the group offline.
- The Secretariat to prepare a summary of the responses and the issues requiring further consideration, including cost reflectivity, modelling consequences and the concerns associated with each option.

## 6. Any Other Business

6.1 No further business was raised.

6.2 The Chair thanked members for their contributions and closed the meeting.

## 7. Next Meeting Date – 17 November 2026

7.1 The Chair confirmed the next Working Group meeting is scheduled for 17 November 2026 at 1pm.

## 8. Attachments

- Attachment 1_DCP 443 Work Plan

## APPENDIX A

## New and Open Actions

| Action Ref. | Action | Owner | Update |
|---|---|---|---|
| **22/01** | The Secretariat to capture the issues requiring further consideration for Option A, including the shorter reconciliation window, strength of the price signal and cost reflectivity, alongside the benefits identified from previous use. | Secretariat | **New Action.** |
| **22/02** | The Secretariat agreed to check whether relevant analysis (using historical data to identify representative Customer types and behaviours) had already been completed under DCP 443 (or other CPs). | Secretariat | **New Action.** |
| **22/03** | The Working Group to agree the scope of further comparative scenario and impact analysis following consideration of the approaches to develop. | Working Group | **New Action.** |
| **22/04** | The Secretariat to produce a table showing the responses and party categories. | Secretariat | **New Action.** |
| **22/05** | The Secretariat to update the advantages and disadvantages table to incorporate the additional points raised within the responses. | Secretariat | **New Action.** |
| **22/06** | The Secretariat to collate existing DCP 443 analysis into a single folder and share with Working Group members offline. | Secretariat | **New Action.** |
| **22/07** | The Secretariat to prepare a summary of the responses and the issues requiring further consideration, including cost reflectivity, | Secretariat | **New Action.** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | modelling consequences and the concerns associated with each option. | | |
| **22/08** | The Secretariat to update the current collated Consultation 02 responses with the missing SSE Energy Supply response to Q12 and recirculate to the group offline. | Secretariat | **New Action.** |

## Closed Actions

| Action Ref. | | | Update |
|---|---|---|---|
| **16/03** | The Secretariat to issue the Consultation to wider industry. | Secretariat | **Closed.** |
| **21/01** | The Secretariat to make amendments to the Consultation 02 document to ensure that the Consultation 01 and RFI questions are visually distinguished from the Consultation 02 questions. | Secretariat | **Closed.** |
| **21/02** | The Secretariat to include the spreadsheet of the excess capacity test model (as shown in Attachment 6) as an attachment to the Consultation 02 document. | Secretariat | **Closed.** |
| **21/03** | The Secretariat to correct any numbering errors throughout the Consultation 02 document, update formatting changes and update the attachment list. | Secretariat | **Closed.** |
| **21/04** | The Secretariat to circulate a clean version of the Consultation 02 document, along with the updated model, to members for a final offline review. | Secretariat | **Closed.** |
| **21/05** | The Secretariat to issue the final Consultation 02 document to wider industry for feedback on 18 September 2026. | Secretariat | **Closed.**<br><br>*Consultation 02 document issued on 18 September 2026 with a response deadline of 09 October 2026.* |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **21/06** | The Secretariat to issue a meeting poll to the Working Group schedule the next meeting to review the collated Consultation 02 responses. | Secretariat | **Closed.** |