Meeting Session	DCUSA Panel (Open Session)
Paper Reference	Panel_2026_1021_05_Housekeeping Log
Action	For Information

Housekeeping Log Summary Paper

1. Synopsis

1.1 The DCUSA Panel has indicated a number of areas within the DCUSA that requires housekeeping changes. This paper summarises the progression of those actions and asks the Panel to approve new additions to the log and instruct the Secretariat on the next steps. The detail of the housekeeping amendments and their progression to date is recorded in the housekeeping log which acts as Appendix 1 to this paper.

2. Identified Housekeeping Item(s)

2.1 The Secretariat notes that between the previous Panel meeting and the drafting of this paper, no new housekeeping items have been identified by a Party or by the Secretariat.

2.2 The Secretariat notes that, as agreed during the October 2026 Panel meeting, housekeeping items 138 'Arithmetic Error in Schedule 22 Examples 12 and 28' has been added to the Housekeeping Amendments Log.

3. Recommendations

3.1 The Panel is invited to:

- **NOTE** the contents of the paper.

4. Attachments

- None

Dylan Townsend
Governance Delivery Manager

Appendix 1 - DCUSA Housekeeping Amendments Log

No.	Title	Summary of Issue	Originator	Raised on	Status
116	Consequential changes as a result of Distribution Code Review Panel (DCRP) DCRP/18/03 – 'Revision of Engineering Recommendation (EREC) P2 – Security of Supply' and that DCRP/MP/19/02 - EREP 130 Issue 3 'Revision of Engineering Report (EREP) 130 - Guidance on the application of P2, Security of Supply'	On 14 June 2019, the Authority approved[1] the Distribution Code Review Panel (DCRP) DCRP/18/03 – 'Revision of Engineering Recommendation (EREC) P2 – Security of Supply'. The modification changes the Energy Networks Association (ENA) Engineering Recommendation (ER) P2/6 and consequential changes to the Distribution Code. The changes proposed to ER P2/6 formally incorporate Distributed Energy Resources and allow the contribution of these resources to be considered in the assessment of group demand and therefore the security of supply arrangements. The changes mean that the ER number will be updated to ER P2/7 with associated changes to the Distribution Code where it references ER P2/6. However, it should be noted that DCRP/MP/19/02 - EREP 130 Issue 3 'Revision of Engineering Report (EREP) 130 - Guidance on the application of P2, Security of Supply' has also been approved[2] by the Authority. EREP 130 is a guidance document which details how the requirements of EREC P2 planning standard shall be met. As a result of the change to EREC P2, EREP 130 has been rewritten to recognise changes in resources connected to distribution networks and align with EREC P2/7. This new revision is EREP 130 Issue 3. EREP 130 is an Annex 2 document to the Distribution Code, which does not require Authority approval for it to be amended but Authority approval is required for any consequential changes to the Distribution Code, which was the intent of DCRP/MP/19/02. This does have flow on impacts for DCUSA as ER P2/6 is referenced within the document. It may also have far wider impacts considering the intent is for EREC P2 to become the standard defining the security of supply that is to be achieved, whilst EREP 130 should be a document describing how that security of supply should be achieved. The emphasis of the new document is focused on how to assess the demand that needs to be secured and the security contribution offered by Distributed Generation (DG), Demand Side Response (DSR), and Electricity Storage (ES) when making a conformance assessment against the EREC P2/7 security of supply standard. The main changes in this revision are to: ● Align EREP 130 with EREC P2/7; ● Provide new guidance on assessing the contribution to security from, and the latent demand associated with, Distributed Generation, Demand Side Response schemes and Electricity Storage; ● Update the F factors for assessing the contribution to security from Distributed Generation, using recent data from DG, based on work carried out for ENA by Imperial College London as detailed in Appendix 4; ● Differentiate between the contribution to security from DG, DSR and ES which is contracted with a Distribution Network Operator (DNO) and that which is not; and ● Restructure the document to improve the flow of the guidance, based on a revised step-by-step flow diagram (see Figure 1 EREP 130 Issue 3, Appendix 2).	Secretariat	21 April 2021	Needs attn

[1] https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications-and-updates/dcrp1803-revision-engineering-recommendation-erec-p2-security-supply

[2] https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications-and-updates/dcrpmp1902-revision-engineering-report-erep-130-guidance-application-p2-security-supply

No.	Title	Summary of Issue	Originator	Raised on	Status
		The DCUSA has a number of references to P2/6 and a change proposal that is currently with Ofgem (DCP 313 'Eligibility Criteria for EDCM Generation Credits') awaiting their consent which also has references to P2/6. The change however is not a straightforward one. It is not as simple as changing the reference from P2/6 to P2/7. P2/7 is a slimmed down version of P2/6 with some of the information potentially moving to the Engineering Report 130 (EREP 130, previously known as ETR 130). **UPDATE 15 February 2023:** On 06 February 2023, the DCode issued a communication related to the fact that EREC P2 Issue 8 has been released. It was noted that this new version now includes amended text from the DCode modification, DCRP/MP/22/03 (Revising the security of supply to high voltage feeders between 1 and 10MW, in certain situations). Alongside the above a separate communication was issued related to the fact that EREP 130 Issue 4 has been released, this new version now includes amended text from the DCode modification, DCRP/MP/22/04 (Revising the security of supply to high voltage feeders between 1 and 10MW, in certain situations).			
138	Arithmetic Error in Schedule 22 Examples 12 and 28	It has been identified that two of the examples in Schedule 22 of the DCUSA, which illustrate how costs will generally be deemed to be payable by customers. In both instances this has arisen due to the total costs not being correctly added together. However, these errors do not materially detract from the examples as in both cases they were intended to show that the incurred costs would be passed on in full to the customer and not apportioned in any way. The examples are copied in full, below, with incorrectly calculated figures highlighted in red and proposed replacements in green. **Example 12: A new Generation Connection with Fault Level-Triggered Reinforcement.** **Purpose: To demonstrate how the Fault Level CAF calculation is applied.** A Customer wishes to connect a new generator with a Required Capacity for export purposes of 6MW. The connection of the generator requires the installation of 500m of 11kV cable and 1500m of overhead line between a new circuit breaker, added to the 11kV extensible switchgear panel at an existing primary substation and a new substation at the Customer's Premises. These assets are treated as Extension Assets. The connection of the generator necessitates Reinforcement works to replace the 11kV switchgear at the existing primary substation with switchgear of a higher fault level rating. **Reinforcement:** Fault Level CAF calculation: The numerator in the CAF calculation is based upon the Fault Level contribution from the Customer's new generator connection, in this example, 24MVA. The denominator is based upon the New Fault Level Capacity; in this Example the Fault Level capacity of the new 11kV switchboard, 315MVA. The Connection Charge for this Scheme is calculated as follows:	DESNZ (Matthew Ryan Tucker)	18 September 2026	

No.	Title	Summary of Issue	Originator	Raised on	Status

Reinforcement:	Cost	Apportionment	Customer Contribution
Replacement 11kV switchboard (excluding Customer's sole use circuit breaker)	£800,000	3x (24/315) x 100% = 22.9%	£182,857
Total Reinforcement Cost	**£800,000**		**£182,857**
Extension Assets:	**Cost**	**Apportionment**	**Customer Contribution**
Installation of a 500m 11kV cable	£150,000	n/a	£150,000
Installation of a 1500m 11kV overhead line	£120,000	n/a	£120,000
11kV circuit breaker at Customer substation	£25,000	n/a	£25,000
Total Extension Asset Cost	**£325,000**		**£325,000**
Total cost of the work	**= £800,000 + £325,000**	**= £1,125,000**	
Total Connection Charge to Customer	**= £182,857 + £325,000**	**= £507,857**	

Extension Assets:	Cost	Apportionment	Customer Contribution
Installation of a 500m 11kV cable	£150,000	n/a	£150,000
Installation of a 1500m 11kV overhead line	£120,000	n/a	£120,000
11kV circuit breaker at Customer substation	£25,000	n/a	£25,000
Total Extension Asset Cost	**£295,000**		**£295,000**

Total cost of the work	= £800,000 + £295,000	**= £1,095,000**
Total Connection Charge to Customer	= £182,857 + £295,000	**= £477,857**

Example 28: A new Generation Connection with Fault Level Triggered Reinforcement and transmission works.

Purpose: To show the treatment of Reinforcement costs at more than one voltage level above the POC and the cost of transmission works for a Generation Connection.

A Customer requests a 50MW connection for a new 33kV generator (a Generation Connection) and the 75MVA Fault Level contribution from the generator necessitates Reinforcement works to replace the 132kV switchgear at the existing grid supply point with switchgear of a higher fault level rating. The Fault Level contribution also requires upgrades to the transmission system to replace the 132kV transformer tails and associated switchgear. New 33kV Extension Assets from the existing 33kV system will be required to connect the generator.

Reinforcement

In this example the Reinforcement is at the voltage level above the POC and fully funded by the DNO.

Transmission

The Connection Charge for this Scheme is calculated as follows:

Transmission Works:	**Cost**	**Apportionment**	**Customer Contribution**
Replace the 132kV transformer tails and associated switchgear	£5,000,000	N/A	£5,000,000
Total Transmission Cost	**£5,000,000**		**£5,000,000**

No.	Title	Summary of Issue	Originator	Raised on	Status

Reinforcement:	Cost	Apportionment	Customer Contribution
Replacement 132kV switchboard (excluding Customer's sole use circuit breaker)	£10,000,000	N/A	£0
Total Reinforcement Cost	**£10,000,000**		**£0**

Extension Assets:	Cost	Apportionment	Customer Contribution
Installation of a 500m 33kV cable	£40,000	N/A	£40,000
33kV circuit breaker at Customer substation	£25,000	N/A	£25,000
Total Extension Asset Cost	**£75,000**		**£75,000**

Total cost of the work	= £5,000,000 + £10,000,000 + £75,000	= **£15,075,000**
Total Connection Charge to Customer	= £5,000,000 + £75,000	= **£5,075,000**

This same principle would apply in Scotland where there is no 132kV Distribution System and the connection Customer would pay for any transmission works they trigger.

Extension Assets:	Cost	Apportionment	Customer Contribution
Installation of a 500m 33kV cable	£40,000	N/A	£40,000
33kV circuit breaker at Customer substation	£25,000	N/A	£25,000

No.	Title	Summary of Issue	Originator	Raised on	Status
		Total Extension Asset Cost **£65,000** **£65,000** **Total cost of the work** = £5,000,000 + £10,000,000 + £65,000 **= £15,065,000** **Total Connection Charge to Customer** = £5,000,000 + £65,000 **= £5,065,000**			
139	TBC	Placeholder			