

Competition in Connections Code of Practice Panel

7th July 2020

Final minutes

Name	Organisation
Dave Overman (DO) - Chair	GTC
Beverley Hudson (BHu)	SPEN
Brian Hoy (BH)	ENWL
Chris Roe (CR)	UCCG
Colin Jamieson (CJ)	ESPUG
Drew Johnston (DJ)	NPg
Geoff Earl (GE)	NPg
Graham Smith (GS)	HEA
Gwen MacIntyre (GM)	SSE
Jayson Whitaker (JW)	Energy Assets
Maryline Guinard (MG)	SSEN
Michael Doward (MD)	ENWL
Patrick Daly (PD)	PN Daly Ltd
Tim Hughes (TH)	WPD
Steve Rogers (SR)	UKPN

1. Welcome and introductions

The Chair welcomed members and suggested a roundtable introduction from the group.

2. Review of minutes and actions

Comments received on v1.0 and v1.1 was produced and circulated.

Only one action was taken from the April meeting, which was for DO/PD to discuss the requirement for a letter of authority. Agenda item 3 will discuss this.

3. Requirement for a letter of authority

PD stated that a draft guidance needs to be produced as a starting point. DO reviewed relevant parts of the electricity act. Both are of the same mind, while the requirements seem to be there, they are interpreted in different ways by different companies. Good to have a start point which is common guidance that everyone can follow as a point of reference. BH commented that commonality can go both ways – was there something people were not doing so that a gap can be filled? PD replied that their primary understanding was the point of connection when issued. DO concerned at the point at which an offer was made. PD issue when a point of connection is accepted, what is it attributed to - development or individual company? Questions that relate to who can

get a point of connection, when can they get it etc. DO concerned with iDNOs being able to accept points of connection for loads for which they have no appointed justification for getting. PD was concerned with if design charges have been paid and secured a point of connection, money has been paid yourself, this cannot be attributed to another third party whether that be a client or related business. Both DO and PD have had experiences where those issues have arisen and are legitimate concerns. It was felt that written guidance would help clarify the situation to have a start point to understand the risks they are entering into (commercial contract based on arrangements that can't be helped).

Action: DO/PD to produce a first draft of the guidance to circulate to CiCCoP members.

4. Panel Membership

NV stated that Ray Furrows will no longer be a CiCCoP member now. A replacement is needed and Ray suggested contacting HBF to request a suitable alternative.

PD stated this is a Developer representative. BH added that at the time of this groups conception, Ray has not been involved since. He felt there was no desperate need but happy to proceed if the group wishes to find a replacement.

Action: Panel and Deputy members to confirm their membership. ENA to update this list.

5. Date of next meeting

DO suggested 6th October 2020. Panel agreed.

Action: ENA to send round an invite for the next meeting.

#	Action
1	DO/PD to produce a first draft of the guidance to circulate to CiCCoP members.
2	Panel and Deputy members to confirm their membership. ENA to update this list.
3	ENA to send round an invite for the next meeting.