

# Interventions Working Group Minutes

Meeting 14

18 December 2017 at 10:00

ElectraLink's Office, Northumberland House, 303-306 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7JZ.

Attendee	Representing
<b>IWG Members</b>	
Alison Scott [AS]	ENWL
Andy Clay [AC]	BEIS
David Brown [Dbr]	E.ON Energy
David Brogden [DB]	Scottish & Southern Electricity Networks
Dave Wright [DW]	Npower
Ian Dobson [ID]	EDF Energy
Jane Eccleston [JE]	ENWL
John Gray [JG]	SP Energy Networks
Paul Abreu [PA]	Energy Networks
Paul Morris [PM]	UK Power Networks
Kevin Woollard [KW] (teleconference)	British Gas
Kristian Pilling [KP]	Scottish & Southern Electricity Networks
Martin Murphy [MM]	Northern Powergrid
Michael Walls [MW] (teleconference)	Ofgem
Richard Brady [RB]	Western Power
Richard Hill [RH]	British Gas
Gus Wood [GW] (teleconference)	Gowling WLG

Secretariat	
Lauren Nicholls [LN] Chair	ElectraLink
Graham Hall [GH] Secretariat	ElectraLink
Kamran Rahman [KR] Secretariat	ElectraLink

## 1. Welcomes and Apologies

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed attendees to the Interventions Working Group meeting and noted that there were no apologies.
- 1.2 The Working Group agreed to act in accordance with the terms set out in the DCUSA “Competition Law Dos and Don’ts”.

## 2. Minutes

- 2.1 The Group approved the minutes of the last meeting, held on 16 October 2017, as an accurate record subject to the amendments suggested by AS and DB being addressed.

## 3. Outstanding Actions

- 3.1 GH walked through the open actions. The updates on all actions are provided within Attachment 1.

## 4. Operational, Safety and Reporting Issues

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

### Customer Raised Interventions

- 4.2 AS noted that the issue raised at the last meeting regarding instances when customers do not see the difference between a Supplier and a DNO remains a problem. Based on internal research, AS confirmed that there has been a rise in the number of interventions made by customer, which are managed in a different way to interventions that are reported by a Supplier. Some of the main examples include;
  - MOps phoning in an issue but not quoting a valid code. Call centre staff are assuming that the issues are Category A, but the MOps do not provide the relevant code. Further training will need to be provided to improve the awareness of this situation.
  - MOps informing customers that they need to phone in with a problem. This can be reduced as an issue if call centre staff are better trained and can inform customers and MOps of the correct way for issues to be called up.

- MOps are acknowledging Category B issues, but customers are then phoning in with the issue a day later. This is resulting in customers being called back by their DNO but not trusting that the call is valid.

4.3 AS noted that the problem will never be completely eradicated, but at present it is growing and could become unmanageable in mass roll out. It was queried whether any supporting information could be shared with the Group, to which AS confirmed.

**ACTION 14/01: AS to provide information on the increase in Customer raised interventions.**

4.4 Members noted that a notification card which is filled in by the MOp could resolve a lot of the issues. The card simply has a section for Category A situations and a section for Category B which the MOp fills in if necessary. It was suggested that the notification card would need to be verified by MOCO PA, and would need the correct wording for the MOp to be able to fill in correctly.

4.5 PA noted that a draft of the notification card could be sent to IWG for consideration.

**ACTION 14/02: PA to send draft of MOp notification card for consideration at next IWG meeting.**

## 5. Smart Meter Installs

5.1 The Chair provided an update regarding the monthly and cumulative smart meter installs for November 2017, which highlighted that 294,765 smart meters were installed in the reporting month, with the total cumulative number from January 2012 now standing at 6,504,633.

5.2 RB queried if the number of installs could be shown as percentage of the total meter points within each Grid Supply Point Group. The Chair noted that this would be possible but may require a tailored report to be provided, which would come at a cost. An action was taken for ElectraLink to confirm if the

**ACTION 14/03: ElectraLink to confirm if the number of installs could be shown as percentage of the total meter points.**

5.3 JG noted that the rise in installs is not being reflected in Scotland, where the number of installs was static.

## 6. MOp, DNO and Supplier Contact List

---

- 6.1 MM introduced the issues paper on 'Supplier and MOp contact lists', which outlined the proposal for a contacts list to be created to enable the increasing activity of meter operator work to be backed by a robust, consistent process for communicating key details of any serious incidents and as-found conditions to Suppliers. In the interests of health and safety it is vital that any such issues identified by DNO parties are communicated to the supplier in a timely manner and to the correct department/person. Parties are experiencing difficulties in knowing who to report such issues to within organisations for them to be addressed effectively and timely to reduce the impact of health and safety and customer service issues.
- 6.2 Members noted that this issue may fall under MOCOpa, which would mean that the contacts covered meter operators and not Suppliers. It was suggested that Supplier contact details and meter operative contact details would be of most use so it may be best to progress a change via DCUSA to mandate the provision of contact details (noting that this is a timely process). MM noted the suggestions and confirmed that a further update will be provided in the new year.

## 7. Communication of Interventions by Gas Suppliers and Third-Party Suppliers

---

- 7.1 KW introduced the paper on Communication of Interventions by gas Suppliers and Third-Party Suppliers, which outlined some scenarios which may arise during the roll-out whereby Suppliers may install gas smart meters where they are not the registered electricity Supplier (Gas First). It is estimated that in the region of four million Gas First installs will occur. In addition, DCP 304 (as per Agenda item 10) is proposing to allow electricity Supplier's agents to de-energise meters and carry out work where they are not the registered electricity Supplier. In both circumstances it may be necessary for either the gas Supplier's agent or the Third-Party Supplier's agent to notify the DNO of a Category A, B or C intervention as and when they come in.
- 7.2 Members noted the three potential options for when a gas Supplier identifies a Category B or Category C intervention when attempting to install a gas communications hub device. KW noted that Options A (gas Supplier to pass request to registered electricity Supplier for them to raise a D0135) and B (gas Supplier asks customer to notify their electricity Supplier when the Cat B/C intervention is required) are not the preferred options, with Option B not being regarded as offering the customer a good experience. Option C (MOp raises a D0135 direct to DNO/IDNO) was discussed by Members, with ID querying whether it was currently legitimate for a MOp to raise a D0135. KW noted that this could be changed, and queried whether the DNOs were the drivers of the system. DB noted that the D0135 would need to be amended to add another field in order to separate information issued about the gas or electricity installation.
- 7.3 A member highlighted that where Gas First installs occur and the DNO attends an installation, there may be issues with cost recovery. It was noted that once an intervention has been received, the DNO

would not check that the individual reporting the instance was from the registered Supplier. A suggestion was raised for a different process to be adhered to where the intervention is identified during a Gas First install, such that the SLA does not apply.

- 7.4 DB suggested that the matter is raised at the ENA Regulation Managers Group, which has interactions with Ofgem. For the gas Supplier to report an intervention, it was noted that the Supplier would need access to all MPANs, which would come at a cost to the business. However, with the customers permission, the gas Supplier can access the required MPAN which would raise an issue if the intervention was a misreport as currently the registered Supplier would be penalised.
- 7.5 In relation to Option C, it was discussed whether the non-appointed MOp could issue a D0135, to which KW suggested that the current Data Flow allows information to be circulated in such instances. An action was taken to determine if this is permissible, with the members agreeing that should a Data Flow change be required, the costs would need to be proportional. KW suggested that the gas MOp would still be identified as a MOp in the system in the vast majority of circumstances which would allow the flow to be sent, and thus no changes would need to be made. JG noted that this is not an issue for DNOs but for the Supplier, to which MM agreed.

**ACTION 14/04: KW to determine if a non-appointed MOp can issue a D0135 and raise the matter at IREG.**

- 7.6 KW suggested that additional sections could be used, however DB suggested that a free text solution would not work in reports to Ofgem. MM noted that Category B and Category C interventions should be treated as the same when reported. DB noted that this would be a preferred ambition but may not be achievable.
- 7.7 Members discussed Category C codes with reference to multiple meters needing to be worked on. MOps would need to be trained to perform such a job, as they could be working on multiple meters without being the appointed MOp for any of them.

## 8. DCP 302 Work Plan

- 8.1 The Chair noted that DCP297 was submitted to the November DCUSA Change Panel, after which the proposer made amendments to the proposal and asked for feedback from Members before resubmission to the December Change Panel. The Chair noted that no feedback was received.
- 8.2 Members noted that they had assumed that DCP297 was going to come back to IWG before being resubmitted, with some Members bringing feedback to the meeting for discussion. KW noted that the timetables for IWG meetings did not coalesce with the DCUSA panels which made it difficult for this to happen. KW confirmed that the comments raised had been responded to within the latest version of

the DCP297. ID noted that KW is the proposer and maintains ownership over the Change Report and its contents.

- 8.3 JG raised that the majority of members do not see DCP297 as necessary, however it was tabled in advance of discussions on the merit of the proposal being had. The fundamental opposition is to the actual need for the Change Proposal itself. ID noted that the Change Proposal has been opposed but no alternatives and or improvements have been suggested. It was raised that the remit of the IWG has changed over time, with the new focus being Change Proposals instead of discussing interventions. The Chair noted that DCUSA Panel believe that IWG is a correct forum to discuss such changes because of the expertise of the group, to which Members suggesting reviewing the Terms of Reference of the Group to ensure it remains fit for purpose at the next meeting.
- 8.4 MM noted that it would be useful if a Member populated a list of issues in order for IWG to meet and discuss without disagreeing on the principles. Members agreed that this would be a preferred option, with MM to collate a issues log and lessons learned to which Members can suggest actionsand ideas for solutions to these issues, with a view to a Working Group thereafter. DW suggested that MM contact the Association of Meter Operatives (AMO) in order to reach the broadest range of opinions, to which MM agreed.

**ACTION 14/05: MM to collate an issues log which includes lessons learned, following a communication being issued to Suppliers and DNOs for issues.**

## 9. DCP 302 Work Plan

- 9.1 The Group reviewed the Legal Text review of DCP 302 and concluded that the proposal does not need to be progressed at this stage, but could be looked at again in March 2018 once the revisions to the Service Termination Guidance Document have been made.
- 9.2 The Group agreed that the timetable for DCP 302 should be paused until March 2018.

## 10. DCP 304 Draft Change Report

- 10.1 The Chair provided a commentary of the Legal Text review of DCP 304 made by Gowling LWG to which The Group reviewed and made the following comments:
- The text should read 'metering works' instead of 'smart meter works' throughout the drafting.
  - Section 52 R.7 should be deleted as the references to meter boards are not relevant.

- The date of October 2013 in section 52 R.9 should be updated to the implementation date, with KW noting that all customers could potentially be informed that they would be notified in advance.

10.2 ID queried if a DNO would give notice if there was a shared supply. DB noted that this would not be necessary if it was an emergency situation. However, notice should always be given in all situations barring those where safety issues arise.

10.3 The Group agreed that DCP304 could progress once the Legal Text was amended in light of the comments received above.

## 11. DCP 304 Work Plan

---

11.1 The Group agreed the timetable for advancing DCP 304, noting that the proposer is awaiting internal feedback on the legal text review prior to progressing the change.

## 12. 2018 Meeting Dates

---

12.1 The Group agreed that it would be preferable to move to a monthly meeting schedule as of January 2018. The Group also requested that the day of the meetings change from Mondays to a preferred Wednesday. The Chair noted that a new meeting schedule for 2018 would be drafted, taking into account these requests

## 13. Next Steps

---

13.1 The Chair confirmed the below next steps:

- ElectraLink would look into tailoring the smart meter installs report.
- The potential issues that may arise with Gas First installs would be raised at IREG for further consideration into amending the D0135s.
- DCP 297 would be progressed to the DCUSA Panel, including the minor amendments proposed during the meeting. Please note that DCP 297 has now been issued for vote.
- DCP 302 would be put on hold pending the outcome of the review of the Service Termination Guidance document.
- DCP 304 would be progressed in line with its work plan.
- A new meeting schedule would be proposed for 2018

## 14. Any Other Business

---

- 14.1 The Chair queried whether the members had any other business to raise.
- 14.2 AS noted that a query had been received around which tools should be used when repositioning meters. Members noted that modular tools were the preferred ones to use, with one Member noting that electrical equipment should only be used for loosening cut-outs.
- 14.3 AS also noted that JE would be ENWL's representative at IWG for future meetings. The members thanked AS for her contributions to the group.
- 14.4 There were no further items of business and the Chair closed the meeting.

## 15. Next Meeting Date

---

- 15.1 The next IWG meeting will be held on a date TBD in January 2018.

## 16. Attachments

---

- Attachment 1 – Outstanding Actions