1. List of attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>Sheffield County Council</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gareth Pritchard</td>
<td>A.S.L.E.C</td>
<td>Contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Mortlock</td>
<td>UPL</td>
<td>ICP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Boyce</td>
<td>Utility Customer Service Management</td>
<td>ICP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Fitzsimmons</td>
<td>Connect Utilities</td>
<td>ICP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Magrath</td>
<td>EDF</td>
<td>DNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Hughes</td>
<td>WPD</td>
<td>DNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Blackford</td>
<td>Scottish Power</td>
<td>DNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Turner</td>
<td>CE UK</td>
<td>DNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Hoy</td>
<td>ENW</td>
<td>DNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Smith</td>
<td>SSE</td>
<td>DNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Hodson</td>
<td>Central Networks</td>
<td>DNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Spreadbury</td>
<td>MEUC</td>
<td>Customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Farrow</td>
<td>House Builders Federation</td>
<td>Customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Clare</td>
<td>VBC Associates</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Raymond</td>
<td>Premier Energy</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Bolland</td>
<td>Amey</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Overman</td>
<td>GTC/ENC</td>
<td>IDNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surjit Kumar</td>
<td>Ofwat</td>
<td>Ofwat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Morgan</td>
<td>Ofgem</td>
<td>Regulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dora Guzeleva</td>
<td>Ofgem</td>
<td>Regulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Kitsawat</td>
<td>Ofgem</td>
<td>Regulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Langford</td>
<td>Ofgem</td>
<td>Regulator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Apologies

Apologies were received from Alan Hoyle and Bob Weaver.

3. ENA working group

3.1. RM began by providing some background on the ENA working group. RM explained that the ECSG had previously discussed the aspirations of third party providers to extend contestability in the connections market to closing joints and processing their own points of connection. RM explained that given that the ECSG was committed to taking forward the DPCR 5 connections related issues, Ofgem agreed to approach the ENA for it to consider whether there were significant safety related issues that would prevent contestability being opened up in this way.

3.2. RM added that subsequent feedback from ENA’s SHE committee indicated that there were no obvious safety issues that would prevent these proposals being considered. However, the ENA’s SHE and Engineering committees questioned whether they are in a position to discuss the scope of extending contestability in connections, as they believed that this should be an issue for the ECSG. RM explained that the ECSG now needed to
agree on the scope of this working group by reviewing the terms of reference and relaying a steer in this respect back to the ENA.

3.3. There was a lengthy group discussion on the various issues that must be considered to extend contestability in connections, particularly around technical difficulties associated with making POCs contestable. It was agreed that the ENA working group should focus on considering the practical and technical issues, safety, and risks involved for extending contestability to LV and HV jointing on the mains. It was further agreed that the ECSG should establish a subgroup to discuss further the benefits and issues arising from making POCs contestable. When these workstreams had concluded their work, ECSG would then need to consider the overall benefits, risks and issues in considering any extention of contestability.

**Actions**

Ofgem to send a note to the ENA with an overview of the ECSG discussion and provide a steer to the ENA on how to proceed.

MS to amend the Terms of Reference for the ENA working group and circulate for comment.

KH, NF, and DO to compile a Terms of Reference for the proposed ECSG subgroup on contestable POCs and circulate to ECSG for comment.

**4. Bond and security arrangements**

4.1. RM explained that Ofgem had received complaints around DNOs’ bond and security requirements as set out in their adoption agreements. Ofgem added that it decided to consult on this matter in light of the fact that security arrangements were put in place to support the establishment of competition and to protect DNOs from the potential for defective works. However, since sometime has now passed since competition was first introduced, Ofgem considered it timely to review this matter. A letter was sent to DNOs inviting responses on their approach to bond and security arrangements, in order to evaluate whether the existing security arrangements are still fit for purpose, and to agree a way forward. AS noted that from a customer’s viewpoint, the responses received from DNOs indicated a high level of inconsistency around the value and timeframe of the security required.

4.2. There was a group discussion around whether security arrangements are still required, and why. RM discussed the various responses provided and explained that a number of independents had also expressed their willingness to comment on the issues outlined in Ofgem’s letter. A number of DNOs emphasised that security arrangements are not necessarily required to rectify faulty workmanship, however, they act as a mechanism to protect themselves from financial risk if an ICP goes bust. Customers agreed that this was reasonable but that the security arrangements should be fair, transparent, simple, and consistent. Following further discussion, it was agreed that ICPs through the MCCG would collaborate on a proposal for on-going security arrangements and circulate their proposals to the ECSG. The ECSG also discussed the possibility of developing a central repository for security arrangements, similar to how ABTA operates. ICPs would also consider this arrangement during their deliberations.

**Actions**

ICPs to meet through the MCCG to develop their proposals for security arrangements in relation to adoption agreements and circulate to the ECSG.

**5. Inspection and Monitoring regime**
5.1. RM began by noting that this work commenced sometime ago. In response to a letter from Ofgem concerning DNOs’ approach to inspection and monitoring, DNOs set out their positions on their inspection and monitoring regimes and specifically whether they are complying with Ofgem’s guidance. Responses were collated into a summary by Ofgem and circulated to ECSG. RM added that Ofgem agreed to discuss this issue in the ECSG. RM noted that a number of ECSG members were not in a position to discuss this matter and had not reviewed the summary of responses that was previously circulated by Ofgem. The ECSG agreed that Ofgem would re-circulate the summary of responses, along with a link to the relevant decision document, and invite comments.

**Actions**

- **Ofgem to circulate the summary of responses to the I&M consultation letter and a link to the decision document on I&M regimes, and invite comments.**

6. **SLC 15 Audits**

6.1. RL explained that the licence states that licensees must by 30 June each year undertake an audit relating to its provision during the previous regulatory year of SLC 15 services. Licensees must then inform the Authority of the nature and scope of the audit. They must also provide the Authority with the results of the audit.

6.2. RL noted that, based on the range of audit submissions received for 2007-08, Ofgem identified a number of best practice principles for SLC 15 submissions. RL added that after reviewing DNOs’ 2008-09 submissions there is still a wide range in the quality of audit reports received. Therefore, RL explained that it was appropriate for Ofgem to set out best practice. RL indicated that she would circulate to ECSG the best practice guidelines via email and provide specific feedback to each DNOs how their submission compared to these guidelines.

6.3. RL added that some DNOs have not submitted the results of their audit. SLC 15.9(e) states that licensees must provide Ofgem with the results of their audits by 30 June each year. RL added that she intends to contact those DNOs whose audit results remain outstanding.

**Actions**

- **RL to circulate best practice guidelines for SLC 15 audit arrangements and provide specific feedback to each DNOs on how their submission compared to these guidelines.**

- **RL to contact DNOs who have not yet provided Ofgem with the results of their SLC 15 audit.**

7. **SLC19**

7.1. RL explained that SLC 19 relates to non-discrimination in providing services for Use of System and connections. RL noted that for the period 2008/09 Ofgem requested that licensees complete a questionnaire to report their compliance with respect to connections. These were subsequently published on the Ofgem website. Comments on the completed questionnaires were invited from ECSG members but only one set of comments were received. The questionnaires did not highlight any breaches of SLC19 but Ofgem understands that the questions asked can be improved. Ofgem intends to review the reporting method before the next reporting submission in June 2010, and welcomes feedback on possible improvements.

**Actions**
RL to circulate link to the completed questionnaires on Ofgem’s website.

ECSG to provide comments on completed questionnaires, and suggestions on how to improve SLC 19 returns.

8. Disconnections – Presentation by Jason Raymond

Slides available.

Actions

- Ofgem to circulate JR’s presentation.
- Ofgem to circulate contact details for an appropriate forum involving suppliers, so that concerns regarding disconnections can be discussed.
- NM to develop and share EDF’s proposals on facilitating disconnections.

9. Land transfers for connection schemes

9.1. RM explained that this issue relates to concerns brought to Ofgem’s attention where, for example, a development with an existing DNO substation may require relocating and a new plot of land is being obtained by the DNO at little or no cost, however, to release the existing piece of land, some DNOs are charging for this at full cost. RM stated that Ofgem would like to understand each DNO’s position in this respect and therefore requests that DNOs set out their approach and rationale on land transfer schemes for connections. It is also requested that DNOs provide a link to their methodology/relevant information on their website. NF asked DNOs to confirm whether they charge for land transfer costs upfront or whether they charge at the end of the job. It was agreed that this point could be addressed in DNOs’ statement of their position.

Actions

- DNOs to confirm to Ofgem their approach and rationale on land transfer schemes including whether they charge for land transfer costs upfront or at the end of a connections job.
- DNOs to send Ofgem a link to this information (if available) on their website or whether their policy is published in any other DNO document.

10. Update on DPCR5 subgroups

10.1. LN gave an overview of the subgroup 1 meeting and actions from the 24th September meeting. LN stated that the initial consultation on the legal drafting that will support DPCR 5 is scheduled for 19 October. LN added that there will be further consultations on the licence changes before the statutory consultation takes place. LN added that there are two more subgroup 1 meetings planned before the publication of Final Proposals. LN summarised briefly the outstanding actions that need to be addressed before Final Proposals. That is, treatment of margins for direct and indirect costs, how the unregulated margin will work, unmetered issues, and the margin for EHV. Subgroup 1 is on track to cover off these issues in the remaining two meetings planned for the 14th and 29th of October.

10.2. RM gave an overview of the subgroup 2 meeting and noted that there are still quite a lot of detailed issues for subgroup 2 to work through. RM added that the group should make progress on the Accuracy Price Review Scheme and that DNOs had circulated their position on a number of aspects of the standards. RM added that the sub-group may require an extra meeting to prepare for Final Proposals. RM added that the legal drafting
working group is due to circulate a draft version of the connections standards and that Ofgem would circulate this to sub group 2 along with an issues log that details a number of outstanding issues.

**Actions**

**Ofgem to circulate to sub-group 2 the draft SI to subgroup members.**

**PK to circulate agenda for subgroup 2 meeting on 14 October, and include an issues log of outstanding actions that need to cover off prior to Final Proposals.**

### 11. Changes to roles and responsibilities in the connections team

11.1. RM explained recent changes to roles and responsibilities in the connections team. RM and PK are to focus on connections policy issues, while RL is responsible for compliance and determinations. DG has oversight for connections and gas distribution policy.

11.2. DG made a brief presentation to ECSG to highlight the focus of the team’s work going forward, and to provide additional detail on the changes in the team.

**Actions**

**PK to circulate a copy of DG’s presentation to ECSG members, along with a link to the IMED/IMGD legislation.**

### 12. Date of next meeting: Tuesday 12 January 2010
SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Ofgem to send a note to the ENA with an overview of the ECSG discussion and provide a steer to the ENA on how to proceed.

MS to amend the Terms of Reference for the ENA working group and circulate for comment.

KH, NF, and DO to compile a Terms of Reference for the proposed ECSG subgroup on contestable POCs and circulate to ECSG for comment.

ICPs to meet through the MCCG to develop their proposals for security arrangements in relation to adoption agreements and circulate to the ECSG.

Ofgem to circulate the summary of responses to the I&M consultation letter and a link to the decision document on I&M regimes, and invite comments.

RL to circulate best practice guidelines for SLC 15 audit arrangements and provide specific feedback to each DNOs on how their submission compared to these guidelines.

RL to contact DNOs who have not yet provided Ofgem with the results of their audit.

RL to circulate link to the completed questionnaires on Ofgem’s website.

Everyone to provide comments on completed questionnaires, and suggestions on how to improve SLC 19 returns.

Ofgem to circulate JR’s presentation.

Ofgem to circulate contact details for an appropriate forum involving suppliers, so that concerns regarding disconnections can be discussed.

NM to develop and share EDF’s proposals on facilitating disconnections.

DNOs to confirm to Ofgem their approach and rationale on land transfer schemes including whether they charge for land transfer costs upfront or at the end of a connections job.

DNOs to send Ofgem a link to this information (if available) on their website or whether their policy is published in any other DNO document.

Ofgem to circulate to sub-group 2 the draft SI to subgroup members.

PK to circulate agenda for subgroup 2 meeting on 14 October, and include an issues log of outstanding actions that need to cover off prior to Final Proposals.

PK to circulate a copy of DG’s presentation to ECSG members, along with a link to the IMED/IMGD legislation.