

## **Minutes**

# EoC sub-group minutes – Continuation of 20 July 2011 meeting on 31 August 2011

Working Group established to enable the implementation of the recommendations of the ENA's Connections Working Group report 'Proposed Extension of Contestability for Competition in Connections'.

From
Date and time of
Meeting
Location

Rebecca Langford 31 August 2011 15:00-16:00 Teleconference

#### 1. Present

James Veaney (JV) (chair)	Ofgem	Regulator
Rebecca Langford (RL)	Ofgem	Regulator
David Ball (DB)	ENWL	DNO
Gary Barnes	Scottish Power	DNO
Jeff Eggleston (JE)	CE Electric	DNO
Martin Gillick (MG)	SSE	DNO
Neil Magrath (NM)	UKPN	DNO
Paul Norton (PN)	CE Electric	DNO
Paul Smith (PS)	WPD	DNO
Dave Overman (DO)	GTC	IDNO
Mike Cahill (MC)	Lloyds Register	Lloyds Register
Steve Bolland	Amey	UCCG

#### 2. Absent

Brian Hoy (BH) - ENW Chris Bean (CB) - MCCG Patrick Daly (PD) - PN Daly

#### 3. The process for extending contestability

- 3.1. JV explained that the purpose of the teleconference, as agreed at the 20 July 2011 meeting, was to discuss the process for extending contestability.
- 3.2. The group discussed some slides circulated by Ofgem prior to the meeting (available on the Ofgem website) <sup>1</sup> and broadly agreed with Ofgem's approach for consultation. RL explained that Ofgem expected that the consultation would be published in December and the group discussed whether this timing was appropriate.
- 3.3. One DNO asked whether DNOs would be prevented from moving from trials to business as usual if they wanted to do so before Ofgem had made its in principle decision. RL explained that if a DNO wished to move earlier they should discuss the best way forward with Ofgem.
- 3.4. SB raised concerns that publication in December may not allow enough time for wider trials (eg, HV, overhead lines etc) to take place prior to the consultation. RL explained that (as discussed at the 20 July 2011 meeting) it may be necessary to take a phased approach to the extension of contestability to avoid delays in making other work that had already been trialled contestable.

 $<sup>^{1} \ \</sup>underline{\text{http://www.ofgem.gov.uk/Pages/MoreInformation.aspx?docid=7\&refer=NETWORKS/CONNECTNS/ELECCONNSTEERGRP/SUBGROUPS/EOC} \\$ 

- 3.5. A DNO suggested that Ofgem should consider the affect that extending contestability will have on the DNOs regulatory reporting. They highlighted that it may mean that the contestable/non-contestable split is no longer consistent across the DNOs.
- 3.6. In considering 'what is an effective trial', RL explained that Ofgem expected those involved in trials to develop some common criteria for assessing whether a trial had been a success. DO and SB agreed to gather views from the MCCG and UCCG and to discuss these with the DNOs. It was expected that common criteria would be agreed prior to the next meeting of the sub-group.

ACTION	OWNER
DO and SB to work with the MCCG, UCCG and DNOs to develop common criteria for measuring trial success prior to the next meeting of the sub-group.	Dave Overman

### 4. Date of next meeting

4.1. It was agreed that the next meeting would be held in early October.