

# Interventions Working Group (IWG) Minutes

Meeting 18

09 May 2018 at 10:00

ElectraLink, Northumberland House, 303-306 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7JZ

Attendee	Representing
<b>IWG Members</b>	
Adam Dudzinski [AD]	BEIS
Andy Clay [AC]	BEIS
David Brogden [DB]	Scottish & Southern Electricity Networks
David Brown [Dbr]	E.ON Energy
Dave Wright [DW]	Npower
Jane Eccleston [JE]	ENWL
John Gray [JG]	SP Energy Networks
Lee Ireland [LI]	British Gas
Mark Hogan [MH]	Ofgem
Martin Murphy [MM]	Northern Powergrid
Paul Abreu [PA]	Energy Networks
Paul Morris [PM]	UK Power Networks
Richard Brady [RB]	Western Power
Richard Hill [RH]	British Gas
<b>Secretariat</b>	
Darta Valtere [DV] Chair	ElectraLink
Graham Hall [GH] Secretariat	ElectraLink

## 1. Welcomes and Apologies

---

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed attendees to the IWG meeting.
- 1.2 The Working Group agreed to act in accordance with the terms set out in the DCUSA “Competition Law Do’s and Don’ts”.

## 2. Minutes

---

- 2.1 The Group approved the minutes of the last meeting, held on 22 March 2017, as an accurate record.

## 3. Outstanding Actions

---

- 3.1 GH walked through the open actions. The updates on all actions are provided within Attachment 1.
- 3.2 Action 13/01 (IWG to write to Suppliers to ask their installers not to call in defects that they have installed) - the Group agreed that this Action should remain open, with the Action title being renamed to state that this should only reflect Category B situations.
- 3.3 Action 15/01 (KW to provide forecast on Gas First install volume estimates from British Gas) - RH noted that British Gas were phasing in training at present. It was agreed that Kevin Woolard would provide an update at the next IWG in June 2018.
- 3.4 Action 17/04 (DNOs to look into types of cut-outs associated with voltage reports) - it was noted that although the numbers reported were not excessive, the issues do exist, and so it was agreed to keep this Action as ongoing.
- 3.5 Action 17/06 (Group to share volumes of MOps leaving site after Category A situations from 22 February to end of April at IWG 18) it was noted that some Suppliers have made the decision since 22 February to stay on site for all Category A situations. The Group agreed that compiling data on this was difficult. MM noted that Workstream 3 (BEIS workshop) would focus on this issue, therefore the Action could be closed.

## 4. Operational, Safety and Reporting Issues

---

- 4.1 The Chair asked members to share any operational, safety or reporting issues.

### Incorrect reporting of A07’s

- 4.2 MM noted that internal data has shown that incorrect reporting of A07’s is a continuing issue. DG noted that if Meter Operatives (MOps) were not competent in this regard they should have their

authorisation suspended. The Supplier members confirmed that once a report was received, the Operative was taken off the road immediately.

- 4.3 The Group discussed potential 'rest periods' of between two to five days for Operatives who mis-report Category A situations in order for the relevant investigations to be held.
- 4.4 DW queried if the minutes of IWG minutes were reaching MOPs effectively. JG noted that the worst issues are caused by smaller MOPs, however IWG is a DNO and Supplier forum and it is the group's responsibility to disseminate information to MOPs and to other forums such as STIG and MOCOPA.
- 4.5 The Group agreed that an Association of Meter Operators (AMO) representative should be invited to a future IWG meeting to discuss the issues, and future updates could be sent to Small Supplier Meter Forums in the potential form of a DCUSA IWG newsletter. DW agreed to contact Geoff Huckerby of AMO about attending IWG in June 2018.

**ACTION 18/01:** DW to contact Geoff Huckerby of AMO with invitation to attend IWG in June 2018.

**ACTION 18/02:** ElectraLink to investigate potential for future IWG newsletter or updates to Small Supplier Forums

#### Exposed copper

- 4.6 DW noted that an explicit agreement needs to be made as to what can be deemed acceptable or unacceptable levels of exposed copper, so that reporting is conducted consistently across the board. DW gave an example of a hole being big enough to see a live wire but not big enough to fit a finger in. The issue was reported but the DNO did not consider it dangerous.

#### Reporting of Category B situations

- 4.7 The Group noted that there are examples of differences between what is being reported on site and what is being concluded in call centres and offices. The Group agreed that the operative on site should be the judge of the situation being reported and noted that it would be beneficial for everyone to ensure that controls are in place to reflect this.

#### AMO Meeting

- 4.8 RH noted that at the last AMO meeting it was discussed that there was a lack of a generic glossary for cut-outs between DNOs, Suppliers and MOPs. It was proposed that there would be a 'load dump' of the images that could be made available to be provided in a glossary. DW noted that this would enable everyone to then gauge different safety levels of cut-outs and how to tackle them.
- 4.9 Members were advised to send images to the AMO via email if they wished to.

**ACTION 18/03:** Members to send images of cut-outs to [amo@gemserv.com](mailto:amo@gemserv.com) to be included in an AMO glossary.

## Asbestos in fuses

- 4.10 RH advised that testing had been conducted and asbestos had been detected in some older cartridge fuses. RH added that whilst the asbestos was contained it would potentially be dangerous in terms of environmental and transportation impact. RH added that an update will be provided when more information is available.

## 5. Smart Meter Installs

- 5.1 GH provided an update on monthly and cumulative smart meter installs for April 2018, which highlighted that 329,288 smart meters were installed in the reported month, and the total cumulative number (from January 2012) is now standing at 7,890,387.

## 6. Ofgem Update – Gas First Installs

- 6.1 MH sought comments on Gas First Installs from the Group.
- 6.2 PA noted that smaller suppliers are not yet up to speed on licence obligations in terms of operational issues. MH queried whether this was due to lack of communication. PA advised that smaller MOPs are not being managed or assessed thoroughly by their clients, which has resulted in smaller MOPs being less structured in comparison to those connected to larger Suppliers.
- 6.3 DB noted that it was surprising to hear that British Gas may have already started Gas First installations, because if there was a Category A or B situation detected on a Gas First installation, it is likely that the meter would have to be removed. This would result in the customer having to go from Gas First to Gas dumb because the meters are one-use items.
- 6.4 DG noted that this was primarily a Supplier issue. DB opposed by saying it was an industry-wide issue as it involves several safety and liability issues. RH noted that it had not yet been confirmed if British Gas had started Gas First installations and would seek clarification. RH added, however, that training had begun, which the Group agreed was likely to be the case with several Suppliers.
- 6.5 DB requested that Suppliers indicate to the Group if they are installing Gas First within 5 working days, as this was potentially a major regulatory issue.

### *Post-meeting note from British Gas*

*If British Gas encounters a service termination issue (Cat A) whilst attempting a Gas First install we will telephone the DNO to report this. If British Gas encounters a Cat B intervention issue we will abort the*

*job. We are continuing to work with the Gas First IWG sub-group to put together a mechanism to enable Gas Supplier's to report Cat B interventions directly to the relevant DNO. The approved DCUSA change DCP 127 introduced the legal permissions for a gas supplier to de-energise the customers electricity supply in order to install a communication's hub to enable the gas smart meter to communicate. As part of this change the working group put together a guidance note which clarified a number of questions regarding how Gas First will operate. I understand that a DNO has raised some questions relating to this guidance note which we will respond to.*

**ACTION 18/04:** ElectraLink to request that all Suppliers indicate if they are installing Gas First.

## 7. Category A Situations (MOp Left Site)

---

7.1 The Group agreed that this Agenda item had been discussed earlier.

## 8. DCP 297 Update

---

8.1 The Chair noted that DCP 297 (Network Interventions SLA Enhancement) is still with the Authority, with a decision set to be announced imminently.

## 9. DCP 302 Work Plan

---

9.1 The Proposer suggested that DCP 302 should remain open for the time being, which the Group agreed with. The Group agreed that it would be beneficial to keep DCP 302 open for the time being before any conclusions or amendments are agreed upon at the BEIS workshop.

## 10. DCP 304 Work Plan

---

10.1 The Group agreed the timetable for advancing DCP 304, noting that it will progress to the DCUSA Panel for vote in May 2018.

## 11. Any Other Business

---

11.1 The Chair queried whether members had any other business to raise. There were no items.

## 12. Next Steps

---

12.1 The Chair confirmed the below next steps:

- DW to contact Geoff Huckerby of AMO in relation to June IWG meeting
- ElectraLink to investigate potential for IWG Newsletter

- All Suppliers to indicate if they are installing Gas First by Wednesday 16 May

### 13. Operational Issues Workstreams

13.1 The Chair noted that all four operational issues workstreams would be discussed by the Group.

#### Workstream 1 – Accurate reporting of defects

- 13.2 DB suggested that definitive, unambiguous principles were needed around Category A situations, in terms of whether to stay on site or whether it was safe to leave.
- 13.3 AC noted that this was about training, adding that when someone starts training they would wish to know when they should stay on site and when it was safe to leave. DBr noted that this was important, but it was also necessary for that person to know whether to report the situation as a Category A or B.
- 13.4 DG noted that in some cases MOPs were looking for whether a code could apply to the situation they found themselves in rather than deciphering if the situation was an emergency or not. JE suggested that a glossary would be beneficial for this reason.
- 13.5 DG noted that it would be difficult to discuss MOPs training without MOPs being present. DB suggested that a 'decision tree' would be helpful, with the Group agreeing. DW noted that MOPs are looking down a list of options to see which one matches their issues, with Category A situations the first that they see, which leads to those being chosen more often.
- 13.6 JG queried what the specific questions should be issued to installers. PM noted that some Suppliers use 90 second videos and animations in their training. DB added that a typical installer gets trained for half a day in the classroom, then workshop and BEIS issues followed by more classroom based training, concluding with a practical MOCOPA test.
- 13.7 MM suggested that the actual training was the main issue. JE suggested that an induction day could be beneficial for new installers. The Group agreed to email DBr about training issues that they had.

**ACTION 18/05:** Group to email DBr with training issues that they have discovered, relating to Workstream 1

#### Workstream 2 – DNO triage capability

- 13.8 DG queried if the goal of this workstream was to attempt to filter out mis-reporting. PM confirmed that it was, with RB adding that it was important to ensure that all the basics were improved from call scripts in call centres through to correct procedures.

- 13.9 MM noted that NPG data showed that only a minority of MOPs were staying on site following the report of a Category A situation. DB noted that it was important that the call centre staff had the correct information to ask the right questions to ensure that the report was being correctly logged.
- 13.10 MM noted that the principles of the 4 workstreams needed to be agreed upon, with a timescale in place so that people would agree to give their commitment to the agenda. MM suggested that a six month timescale could be used to see what had improved within that timeframe. MM used the example of DCPs that have stalled near the end of the process because a certain organisation had changed their mind.
- 13.11 PM suggested that a structured session for DNOs could be arranged to discuss this further.

#### Workstream 3 – Improving DNO efficiency and the customer journey

- 13.12 MM noted that DCP 302 has been placed on hold for the time being, and one of the issues was to ensure that organisations accepted their liabilities. MM noted that the DCUSA Panel would only okay derogations for new members, with PM adding that derogations are only temporary text changes.

**ACTION 18/06:** ElectraLink to find out if DCUSA derogations are permanent

- 13.13 DB queried if the DNO would be liable if they made decisions, but things went badly further down the line in the future. MM noted that the Group needed to state what they found acceptable so that clarity could be given at the workshop on 20 June.
- 13.14 MM suggested that the Group report back with what organisations will and will not accept, with DCP 302 still an option if need be. MM added that the last person on site is ultimately responsible, and that the only way to ensure correct methods of responsibility is to stay on site.

#### Workstream 4 – Improving communication between Suppliers, DNOs and Meter Operators

- 13.15 DW queried what data was being gathered by Suppliers and what could be done with it to aid DNOs. DW added that this would allow bi-laterals to then decide where agreements and disagreements exist.
- 13.16 DG provided the example of Suppliers only providing a landline contact number which made it hard to contact customers. DG noted that the best Suppliers provide a mobile number around 60% of the time with the worst Supplier only providing one around 15% of the time.
- 13.17 DB requested that Suppliers give more information in relation to B07 reports. DB added that there are five or six different scenarios that could cause a B07, and information in the free text box would alleviate some confusion. DW agreed that this could be done.

13.18 MM noted that the Group needed to give their thoughts and contributions to the workstream leads by the end of May, with the leads then taking the process forward. The Group confirmed that the streams would be led and seconded by the following.

- Workstream 1 – DBr and JG
- Workstream 2 – PM and LI
- Workstream 3 – MM and LI
- Workstream 4 – DW and DB

## 14. Next Meeting Date

---

14.1 The next IWG meeting is scheduled for 13 June 2018 at ElectraLink's offices.

## 15. Attachments

---

- Attachment 1 – Outstanding Actions