**Competition in Connections Code of Practice Panel Meeting**

**11 June 2021**

**Minutes**

Attendance:

David Overman (Chair) DO GTC  
Brian Hoy BH ENWL  
Beverly Hudson BHu SPEN   
Martyn Crocker MC UKPN  
Karl Miller KM Lloyds Register   
Colin Jamieson CJ ESP Electricity Ltd  
Martyn Crocker MC UKPN  
Grant Rogers GR WPD  
Maryline Guinard MG SSE  
Patrick Daly PD PN Daly Ltd  
Les Thomas LT Lloyds Register  
Jayson Whitaker JW Energy Assets Network  
Neeraj Vasani NV ENA

Apologies:

NPg – Clare Roberts/Leo McNiece   
E.ON UK – Chris Roe   
Lloyds Register – Bernie Woods

1. **Welcome and introductions**

The Chair welcomed the group and reminded attendees of the Competition Act requirements. KM introduced themselves as a replacement for Bernie Woods for this meeting.

1. **Review of minutes and actions**

The minutes were accepted as an accurate reflection of the previous meeting.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Action | Status | Update |
| 1 | Panel Members to notify ENA of any company changes to panel and deputy panel members. | Closed | Members emailed ENA and Panel list is now up to date. |
| 2 | BH [with ENA support] to set up a session with DNOs, IDNOs, ICPs, Ofgem and any other interested parties to discuss Ofgem’s Spring consultation | Open | Covered under agenda item 3 |
| 3 | PD to circulate draft document to the group. | Closed |  |

1. **Review of Competition in Connections**

BH explained that Ofgem attended the previous CiCCoP Panel meeting and walked through the intention of the consultation. Publication is due today but not seen yet. The approach was to arrange a separate session as a walk-through lead by either Ofgem or Brian, should the Panel find this useful. Alternatively, individuals can read the document and respond separately. The group agreed. Over and above the people on the call, would any ICE teams be considered for this call? Ofgem’s decision will be based on what has been going on in ICE over the years. BH expecting Ofgem to create an assessment of the effect of competition, based on data. This will be a targeted approach and if DNO data supports there is a lot of competition for given reasons, Ofgem may deem market segments to a pass. Ofgem will make a comparison to the 2013 position.

**Action: BH to ask Ofgem who will lead the consultation walk-through session.**

**Action: ENA to schedule a call with Ofgem for the walk-through session; once the Panel have had an opportunity to digest first.**

PD raised a point regarding using data to assess DNO performance. They assume Ofgem will be using the original data submission from 5/10 years ago as a benchmark for improvement. Taking data in isolation on the current date is not a fair reflection of DNO performance, it reflects how the market has driven competition more than DNOs. The improvement of performance of the time scale is the key measure. DO stated there are two parts to this. If you had already passed the test at the time, its whether it has gone up or stayed the same. Others who had not passed at that time, for them to pass now an improvement would have to be shown. BH commented based on the previous conversation, this is only looking at assessing the segments that did not pass in 2013.

1. **Modification Proposal – The Electricity Board Ltd**

The Chair introduced the item. The Electricity Board Ltd appear to be a construction only ICP and are asking for a modification to allow DNOs to provide them with a design service which they then build. The Chair opened this up to the group for comments.

BH can see the problem but the proposal is not clear in terms of their wants. The group agreed that there was a significant lack of clarity on what the ICP wanted from DNOs. MG stated that ICPs who are delivering LV metered connections are to hold electrical designers accreditation. Street furniture type connections, some are metered and will require electrical designer accreditation (as per NERS requirements from Lloyds). In the past, a number of ICPs have entered the market and asked to hold this NERS accreditation or approach an ICP who does. Those who have, are invested into this accreditation and the requirement to maintain it at a cost. Depending on the model of the ICP, it depends what is better for them. If the DNO now must give the design, it could become a design that is fit for all and could be more expensive in the end than what the minimum scheme should be.

GR stated from discussions, originally it came from a free design perspective. The comparison was, if a DNO gives a full offer to a customer (the proposal refers to them as a customer and not ICP) it comes with a drawing. They saw this drawing as a design. DNOs do not provide a design at that point. There is a design that is produced but not provided, which is where the confusion lies.

PD stated the form itself is not clear as to its intent. For DNOs to try and guess would be wrong. It is a fundamental question as to whether DNOs can be obliged to provide something which is a contestable activity. The proposal needs to be more detailed and heavily qualified request which is specific to its regard and intention. This has not been achieved.

BH stated there may be merit in improving the NERS scheme by allowing extra work to be done under the existing and modifying those is a valid piece of work.

The Chair suggested the Panel take a vote on whether this should be carried forward as a proposal. All eligible parties on the call voted to reject the proposal.

**Action: LT to raise the modification proposal at the next NERS meeting, to see if there is scope to revise the existing design accreditations for design eg create a new design ‘lite’ option or include simple design in the existing construction standard. Important to understand the scale of this i.e. how many connections.**

**Action: DO to speak with The Electricity Board Ltd to explain why the proposal was rejected, as well as the lack of clarity. Other Panel members to support.**

1. **AOB**
   1. **Late submissions regarding POC acceptance protocol - PD**

PD explained this is an ongoing issue as explained in their email. The Chair stated the main point of this is a section 16 issue as opposed to a Code of Practice issue. Happy to discuss but some issues around the process of how things are being given to ICPs without some of the information being passed to the DNOs. It was suggested to have this discussion offline and then put it into a format that would fit with the Code of Practice or whether it goes to Ofgem or BEIS.

**Action: DO/PD to take offline and determine if this belongs at a CiCCoP Panel meeting, Ofgem or potentially Open Networks.**

DO thanked the group for their participation and closed the meeting.

Date of next meeting 8 September 3.30pm.