

Meeting Session	Interventions Working Group
Paper Reference	IWG 20170424 10
Action	For Information

Issues Log

This paper outlines the on-going issues from the Interventions Working Group.

Open Risks

Ref	Description	Update
Feb 2016/01	<p><u>Multiple Occupancy Issues</u></p> <p>There may be situations where a network issue affects multiple MPANs. For example, if a block of three flats is grouped for a visit by the Supplier and a service termination issue is found that affects all the flats in the block. It is noted that there should be co-ordination between Suppliers and Distributors with regards to multiple occupancy incident</p>	<p>22 February 2016: the group discussed whether multiple occupancy issues are relevant to the Interventions Working Group. It was noted that this may fall within the remit of “proactive interventions” work. It was agreed that this area should be kept under review.</p> <p>18 October 2016: Noted that the Energy UK had formed an Alternative Han Co to address this. However, the Alt HAN proposals will only deal with the installation of a common Home Area Network in multi-occupancy buildings where required (noting that not every multi-</p>

		<p>occupancy building will require an Alt. HAN solution). If when needing to install additional equipment to establish a common HAN, a Network Defect is found, then clearly the DNO will be called out to address the issue to allow the installation of any additional equipment required, but this may not rectify multiple defects impacting multiple individual properties.</p> <p>13 December 2016: Noted that the Alt Han is still out for tender.</p> <p>13 February 2017: It was noted that Scottish Power have previously advised that they have a proactive approach such that where they identify an issue that is common to multiple properties in the block they will seek to address that issue for all. Other DNOs do not operate such an approach due to issues around ownership of risings and laterals.</p> <p>24 April 2017: It was reiterated that most DNOs were adopting a reactive approach to multiple occupancy issues.</p> <p>31 May 2017: An update from Energy UK was provided, which highlighted a few inaccuracies that have been corrected in previous updates. In addition, Energy UK highlighted that it is aware that some Suppliers are already removing sites from their smart meter installation eligibility classification where there is evidence of Network Defects being found in a particular postcode area i.e. it is unlikely that the supplier won't achieve a first-time smart installation based on known defects in that area that are likely to affect all properties in a street for example. Whilst appreciating the ownership/responsibility issues with risings and laterals, suppliers are hoping that DNOs could take a more pro-active approach, where a DNO carries out upgrade work to all properties impacted. There are clearly cost efficiencies for all parties in such targeted activity, rather than having to visit reactively on a piecemeal basis. Co-ordination between suppliers and DNOs would be key here so that each party could plan work accordingly. DNOs could plan their rectification activities according to resource capability/availability, and suppliers could then target those properties for smart meter installation knowing there is a stronger chance of achieving a first-time install.</p>
--	--	--

Feb 2016/02	<p><u>Meter Operators not operating metal-clad cut-outs</u></p> <p>Some MOPs do not have the training required to operate metal clad cut-outs. Where this is the case some MOPs are reporting to the DNO that the cut-out needs replacing when it does not need to be. This is causing an unnecessary draw on DNO resources.</p>	<p>22 February 2016: the group noted that it is for Network Operators to discuss these incidents directly with the relevant Supplier where they come across them. The DNO also has the recourse to recover the cost from the Supplier.</p> <p>It was suggested that it would be useful for all DNOs to have a document on cut-outs similar to the one provided by ENWL.</p> <p>18 October 2016: Noted that two MOPs are in the process of retraining their operatives to use metal-clad cut-outs.</p> <p>13 December 2016: IWG agreed to leave as on-going. For the DNO document, it was noted that there had been no progression and as certain content of the ENWL document was not agreed by all attendees, it was thought that individual documents could be created for each company.</p> <p>24 April 2017: This item was discussed at length under the Operational, Safety and Reporting issues agenda item, with the conclusion being that not operating metal-clad cut-outs will prevent customers receiving a smart meter. A reason behind metal-clad cut-outs not being operated was noted to be a lack of installer experience and training, to which the members agreed that due to the number of variations it would be hard to train installers on all of the types.</p> <p>31 May 2017: The members considered this item and noted that a number of Meter Operators had been quizzed on the service termination guidance document, most of which were not aware of its existence. Due to the importance of service termination issues being corrected reporting, it was agreed that this issue would be raised at the next STIG meeting for further consideration.</p>
----------------	--	--

Feb 2016/04	<p><u>Joint Visits for Meter Board Moves</u></p> <p>In situations where the DNO will be replacing a meter board, should the DNO and Supplier have a joint visit to ensure that the meter board is suitably located for the smart meter install?</p>	<p>22 February 2016: It was noted that meter boards and meter boxes are on the ENA Business as Usual lists and so could be addressed under this group. The Working Group agreed to add this to the Interventions Working Group Issues list too.</p> <p>18 Oct 2016: Resolved by the implementation of DCP 253.</p> <p>13 Dec 2016: Members discussed that the DCP partly answers this issue and discussed whether this should remain or move under BAU. It was noted Suppliers are meant to use best endeavors to resolve the issues, rather than passing to the DNO, who are not funded to replace meter boards.</p> <p>24 April 2017: It was confirmed that the meter board is owned by the customer and that a cost is associated for DNOs to go to site to replace the boards. It was suggested that Suppliers could provide separate meter boards and inform the DNO. A member raised that a BAU Working Group had been convened under the Energy UK and ENA to consider BAU processes that will be changed following smart rollout, noting that the issue of meter boards could be discussed here.</p>
----------------	---	--

Closed Risks

Ref	Description	Update
Feb 2016/03	<p><u>Defect reporting by some Meter Operators from head office, not by Meter Operator onsite</u></p> <p>There is anecdotal evidence suggesting that Category A Incidents are on occasions being phoned in from an office, rather than by the MOP on the site. This limits the</p>	<p>22 Feb 2016: It was noted that Distributors should be addressing these issues directly with the relevant organisations.</p> <p>An action was taken for DNOs to return to the group with any evidence that would show that this is not just anecdotal.</p>

	<p>ability of the Distributor to gather information on the instance from the MOP and may be adding a delay to the reporting of the incident.</p>	<p>18 Oct 2016: The Group noted this is still an issue and that the reports are being received in the late afternoon, which may indicate that a Supplier is holding the reports and sending them in batches. A member highlighted that some MOPs practice is to send the reports once they are back in their office.</p> <p>13 Dec 2016: IWG agreed to close this risk.</p>
<p>July 2016/01</p>	<p><u>Building Rising or Laterals</u></p> <p>When on site, it may not be clear if the rising and laterals are owned by the Distributor or a Building Network Operator (BNO). It can also be hard to recognise who the building owner is, in order to receive their details.</p>	<p>26 July 2016: It was noted that DNO's can only take it on a site by site basis, and while certain policies have been updated over time, the only policy that applies is the one that was rolled out at the time of instalment. It was agreed that DNOs should discuss at the next STIG meeting whether they can provide guidance for their areas that would point MOPs in the right direction with regards to ownership of private rising or laterals.</p> <p>18 Oct 2016: Progress will be made at the ENA and the ENA will report back its findings at the next IWG meeting.</p> <p>13 Feb 2017: the IWG agreed to close this risk as four DNOs have published their policies and the remaining two are in the process of reviewing theirs.</p>
<p>Feb 2017/01</p>	<p><u>Failure to Get the MOCOPA Scope Amendment</u></p> <p>The group agreed to monitor work that is being undertaken to allow Meter Operators to work on specific instances where they are not appointed by the Supplier (e.g. shared fuses). It was noted that this links to DIF 39.</p>	<p>24 April 2017: The Group agreed to close this action and the scope of MOCOPA had been amended to allow Meter Operators to work on specific instances where they are not appointed by the Supplier.</p>