

DCF DUoSA Consolidation Group

Minutes

Thursday 30 June 2005; 10.00am

Ofgem Offices, 9 Millbank, London SW1P 3GE

Attendees

Mike Harding (MH) – Laing Energy
Mark Field (MF) – npower
Chris Allanson (CA) – NEDL YEDL
Roger Barnard (RB) – edfenergy
John Hill (JH)– Central Networks
Mark Manley (MM)– Centrica
Lilian Macloud (LM)– NGC
John Lucas (JL) - ELEXON

David Tolley (DT) – rwenpower
Ron Slade (RS)– edfenergy
Steve Mackay (SM)– Ofgem
Dipen Gadhia (DG)– Ofgem
David Edward (DE)– Ofgem
Peter Waymont (PW)- edfenergy
Amanda Rose (AR)- npower
David Lane (DL) – Clear Energy

Opening Remarks

MH opened the meeting and set out the agenda for the meeting. He noted the absence of the United Utilities and Scottish & Southern Energy representatives, who had previously been regular attendees of the meeting.

The group confirmed that it was content to continue along the lines of the proposed agenda.

MM asked when the work which was the remit of the consolidation group could be undertaken.

DE responded that the work had already begun, and although there were certain elements which could not be progressed until after a CLM had been undertaken, and which would depend on the result of a vote on such an instrument, there were a number of areas on which work should be progressed now.

Report on DUoSA Clause 3 subgroup

MF reported there had not been much co-operation from the DNO members of this sub group to progress this work.

RS reported that he had raised this issue with the COG and it was currently being discussed between the DNOs. Following these discussions he may be in a better position to reflect the view of the DNO community, which he considered he was not in at the moment and therefore could not contribute effectively to this sub group.

MF asked whether the DNOs would find it useful if representatives of supply companies joined those discussions.

RS replied that he hoped to involve other interested groups as soon as possible, and commented that the reason why he had not yet done so was because he felt there may yet be alterations required from a DNO perspective, but wanted to confirm whether other DNOs shared his views before communicating them to other parties.

MF offered suggested drafting to amend clause 3.6 produced by npower.

RS agreed to take this back to the COG.

MH asked what needed to be done and wondered if an indicative timescale would be of use to the group.

RB suggested that a development timescale would be very useful, noting that if the group should move onto the next stage of development (whatever from that might take) in Autumn, timely progression should be ensured.

It was agreed that RS would communicate such a timetable to Ofgem and that Ofgem would circulate this to members of the group.

Distributed Generation sub-group

RB commented that he was aware the relevant DG orientated drafting had been completed and sent to Wragge & Co for legal review. He considered that the length of time being taken to progress this issue was far too long.

RS commented that the reason nothing had been circulated as yet was because the drafting was not fit to be discussed by the group.

RB suggested that it would probably be beneficial to have input from all the parties as early as possible and from this perspective thought that the circulation of the drafting, whether completed or not, would be appropriate.

CA commented that although he sympathised with RBs approach he saw no value in sending something out if it was fundamentally wrong.

DL suggested that a timetable would be beneficial, similar to that suggested in the context of the work being progressed as a result of the DUoSA clause 3 subgroup.

RB commented that Wragge & Co have been actioned to undertake this drafting work for the last two months. He noted that he had no idea what had been happening during this time or what progress had been made. He considered that the group should have been given more information.

DE commented that, as had been agreed in earlier meetings, the COG should feed back their work to the consolidation group, even if that was to highlight the unsuitability of the existing drafting and to indicate what steps were being undertaken to address the situation and to provide a timescale along which a solution would be developed.

CA suggested that there may be a need to bridge a gap in communications. He suggested the COG should report its progress to the regulatory managers group who would then report to Ofgem with a view that the information should be circulated to members of the group.

MH noted that this information should include a timetable for development of the issues involved.

It was agreed that information, including a timetable, would be sent to Ofgem and that Ofgem would circulate this to members of the group.

Credit Cover

MH reported to the group that the work in this area had been largely completed by the credit cover sub group and handed over to the COG, which had received a quote for legal drafting. He suggested that the next step would be the progression of the drafting to a team of solicitors.

RB commented that if this was the case, it should be possible to conclude this workstream at the end of July.

MH again suggested that there should be a timetable for development.

It was agreed that information, including a timetable, would be sent to Ofgem and that Ofgem would circulate this to members of the group.

Prioritisation of Issues

The group completed the prioritisation of the matters contained in the Issues Register.

Grouping of the Issues

Having completed the prioritisation of the issues the consolidation group then drew these issues together into a number of categories:

Housekeeping,
Connection,
Charging,
Distributed Generation,
Credit Cover,
Matters which ought not to be progressed at the current time.

Ownership of issue requiring resolution

The chairman of the consolidation group then asked which members of the group wished to be involved in the resolution of each category. A number of volunteers were found and a group co-ordinator was assigned. It was agreed that in the coming weeks these groups would devise suggested solutions to the relevant issues and produce papers for discussion at the next meeting of the consolidation group.

Next Steps

It was agreed that the next meeting of the consolidation group would be held in Ofgem's London offices at 10am on 28 July and that papers should be sent to Ofgem on or before 25 July. Ofgem committed to circulating these papers to members of the group in order that they might be scrutinised prior to the meeting on the 28th.