

# COMPETITION IN CONNECTIONS CODE OF PRACTICE

#### **G39 Self-Authorisation Modification Working Group**

Teleconference Minutes 10am, Friday 9<sup>th</sup> November 2018

#### Attendees:

Chris Roe	CR	UCCG/EON
Maryline Guinard	MG	SSEN
Graham Smith	GS	UCCG/HEA
Jayson Whittaker	JW	Energy Assets
Mike Doward	MD	ENWL
Tom Watson	TW	ENA

#### 1. Welcome and introductions

TW reminded the group of the requirements of the Competition Act (no objections raised), and provided an introduction, outlining the aims of the meeting – to review the responses to the recent consultation – and the next steps for the working group's activities.

## 2. Review consultation responses

The group moved on to discuss the consultation responses, noting that the majority were in agreement with the proposals. Noted that the SSEN response refers to the ENA response. Group noted there is an argument that G39 should not even be in the Code of Practice – rather HERS document instead. ENW have put forward a particular wording, which SSEN would prefer to be more generic. Noted that working group does not have to agree unanimously – certain proportion agreed/disagreed; decision on wording could be left to Panel.

MD explained the rationale behind ENW's response. Rather than add extra clause and renumber the whole document, it seemed easier to incorporate the last paragraph into the second bullet.

The group discussed the ENA response to the consultation, with TW noting that there had been an expression of interest from David Spillett at ENA in meeting the group to discuss. The group considered whether this would be the best way forward and agreed a meeting would be the quickest way to ensure all of the points raised by ENA are addressed. Some scepticism expressed around whether the ENA response fully understands what the working group is trying to achieve. Noted that ENA claims to be responding on behalf of DNOs but this does not appear to be the case given variation in consultation responses from networks.

Action ENA

Set up meeting between the working group and ENA SHE Committee

The group discussed the implications of meeting the ENA SHE Committee with regard to meeting deadlines for the December Panel meeting. They concluded the best approach would be to work towards a 5<sup>th</sup> December deadline for putting a report to the Panel with recognition that this may not be achieved. The outcome of the discussion with ENA can then be added to this document. MD agreed to make a start; TW will send report in its current



state. If the deadline is missed TW, will prepare a second interim report for the December Panel meeting.

Action MD First draft of recommendations report for Panel

The group considered the logistics of meeting SHE Committee representatives: numbers, dates, names etc. TW to invite Michael Scowcroft from Scottish Power. Important ENA meeting is cross-section between DNOs and ICPs; also to get valid points raised by ENA, e.g. about cut-outs, into response document.

### 3. Identify future actions

#	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OWNER	STATUS
1	9 Nov 2018	Set up meeting between the working group and ENA SHE Committee	TW	
2	9 Nov 2018	First draft of recommendations report for Panel	MD	

### 4. Future meeting dates

No firm dates agreed – to be decided after the ENA meeting.