

Interventions Working Group Minutes

Meeting Name	Interventions Working Group
Meeting Number	01
Date	22 February 2016
Time	10:00
Venue	ElectraLink Ltd., Grafton House, Ground Floor, 2-3 Golden Square, London, W1F 9HR

Attendee	Company
Simon Brooke [SB] (Chair)	ENWL
Andy Baker [AB]	EDF Energy
Dave Brogden [DB]	SSEPD
David Brown [DBr]	Eon Energy
Gordon McKenzie [GM] (teleconference)	Scottish Power Energy Networks
John Gray [JG] (teleconference)	Scottish Power Energy Networks
Kevin Woollard [KW]	British Gas
Martin Murphy [MM]	Northern Powergrid
Mike Ross [MR]	SSE
Paul Morris [PM]	UKPN
Paul Smith [PS]	AMO
Richard Hill [RH]	British Gas
Richard Le Gros [RL]	ENA
Rosalind Timperley [RT]	ElectraLink

Apologies	Company
Andy Clay [AC]	DECC
Paul Abreu [PA]	ENA

1 ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 RT welcomed attendees to the first Interventions Working Group meeting.
- 1.2 The Working Group agreed to act in accordance with the terms set out in the DCUSA "Competition Law Dos and Don'ts".
- 1.3 SB was appointed as Chair of the Working Group.

2 OPEN ACTIONS FROM DCP 195A REVIEW GROUP AND ISSG

- 2.1 It was noted that the Interventions Working Group had been created by merging the DCP 195A Review Group and the electricity elements of the Operational Delivery Group (ODG) Interventions Solutions Sub Group (ISSG). The group reviewed the open actions from these two groups and agreed that these should be carried over to the Interventions Working Group.

- 2.2 Updates on all actions, including those opened during the meeting, are provided in Appendix A.

3 REVIEW OF TERMS OF REFERENCE

- 3.1 Attendees reviewed the Interventions Working Group Terms of Reference (ToRs) and suggested that the following amendment be made to the ToRs:
- Additional bullet points should be added to section 2.3 to ensure that the knowledge and expertise of the group can be used to provide guidance to other industry groups;
 - With regards to monitoring Service Level Agreement (SLA) performance, the ToRs should be updated to specify that there is an assumption that Supplier and DNO specific data will be anonymised unless otherwise agreed by the group; and
 - Additional text should be added clarifying that the group may vary the frequency with which it meets.
- 3.2 The updated ToRs, with the amendments proposed by the group shown as tracked changes, are provided as Attachment 1. ElectraLink took an action to seek the approval of the DCUSA Panel for the revisions to the ToRs.

Action 01/01: ElectraLink

- 3.3 The Working Group reviewed a diagram showing the Smart Metering Transition Groups (see slide 5 of Attachment 2). It was noted that there is going to be a need for the Interventions Group to share information with the Operations Group (which is an industry led group defined within transitional governance). It was agreed that guidance should be sought from the DCUSA Panel on what is the most appropriate way for the Interventions Working Group to share and receive direction from the Operations Group. For instance, should directions from the Operations Group and vice versa be fed through the DCUSA Panel, so that the Panel can determine if it is appropriate.

Action 01/02: ElectraLink

4 DISCUSSION ON PARAGRAPH 2.3 OF THE TORS

- 4.1 It was noted that paragraph 2.3 of the ToRs states the areas that the group is responsible for keeping under review. The group walked through each of the bullet points in paragraph 2.3 and considered how the group would keep them under review.
- 4.2 With regards to bullet point 3¹, it was suggested that Working Group members share with the group where they have implemented an improvement to processes or common issues that they are experiencing. In response, was agreed that the Working Group should have a standing agenda item on "*Operational Issues, Highlights and Lowlights*". Prior to each meeting, Working Group members will be asked to submit any items they would like to present with regards to this item based on their smart meter install experiences.

Action 01/03: ElectraLink

5 SUPPLIER PRESENTATIONS ON BEST PRACTICE WHEN MAKING CUSTOMER APPOINTMENTS

- 5.1 DBr presented on his organisation's best practice approach to scheduling customer appointments. It was highlighted that when contacting customers to invite them to book an

¹ "Ensure arrangements are in place for the ongoing monitoring and review of the effectiveness of these arrangements and the identification of improvement opportunities"

appointment for a smart meter install, his organisation is achieving a 30% success rate through using e-mails, postcards and letters.

- 5.2 It was noted that the response rate is interesting given that within the DCUSA there is a requirement on DNOs to make best endeavours to book an appointment within 10 Working Days where there is a Category B network issue.
- 5.3 DBr noted that in terms of getting customers to respond, wording along the lines of *"safety and accuracy of bills"* achieves the best response rates. It was cautioned that the wording used needs to get the customers attention without causing undue alarm.
- 5.4 DB highlighted that Suppliers are informed where a Distributor has made an appointment with the customer via a data flow. There is, therefore, the potential for Suppliers to attend at the same time to install the smart meter. However, as Suppliers are unsure whether the network defect will be rectified during this visit, they are rarely using the Distributor appointment information when scheduling customer visits.

6 DISCUSSION ON INTERPRETATION OF 'BEST ENDEAVOURS' WITH REGARDS TO MAKING AN APPOINTMENT

- 6.1 Members discussed what should be considered 'Best Endeavours' with regards to DNOs making customer appointments. It was noted that guidance on how this term should be interpreted had been sought from Ofgem previously but Ofgem declined to define the term. It was observed that the DNOs are on the whole following the same approach.
- 6.2 KW noted that with regards to the SLA to make an appointment within 10 Working Days, some DNOs are achieving a 90% rate whilst others have a rate of 30% to 40%. It was observed that these differences may be due to differences in how the legal text has been interpreted.
- 6.3 The group considered whether it would be preferable to measure the SLA against the percentage of appointments made, or whether it should be the percentage of customers that the DNO has made reasonable endeavours to make an appointment with. It was noted that when the DCP 195A legal text was drafted the intention was to monitor reasonable endeavours.
- 6.4 It was suggested that DNOs should discuss at the next Service Termination Issues Group (STIG) meeting how they are measuring their performance against the SLA to determine whether they are using a consistent approach. At this meeting the DNOs should also confirm whether they are happy for their performance against all SLAs to be shared anonymously with the Interventions Working Group.

Action 01/04: DNOs

7 REVIEW OF DCP 250 OUTCOME AND NEXT STEPS

- 7.1 PM explained that the timing of the DCUSA Supplier Rollout Forecasts had been amended to align with DECC's reporting. This had the impact of reducing the level of granular forecast data provided to DNOs. To address this DCP 250 'Supplier Rollout Template' had sought to amend the timing of the Supplier Rollout Forecasts to provide DNOs with six months of rollout data by post code outcode, however, this proposal was rejected. A PowerPoint presentation showing the timing of the reports is provided as Attachment 3 (see slide 2 of Attachment 3).
- 7.2 It was noted that Suppliers had rejected DCP 250 for a number of reasons, including concerns that the quality of the postcode outcode data would be reduced if it is forecast too far in advance.
- 7.3 It was noted that DNOs require sufficient information to ensure that they have their resourcing levels correct across the country, in order to address network issues that are identified during

the rollout. If the resource level is incorrect or in the wrong location, then this will have an impact on Suppliers.

- 7.4 PM also highlighted that when the Supplier Rollout plans are aggregated, there are 20% more smart meters foreseen to be installed than there are customers, suggesting that the reporting data is inaccurate. SB noted that accuracy of the reporting has improved since the previous quarter.
- 7.5 JG suggested that it would be preferable for the rollout plans to be centrally aggregated, rather than each DNO aggregating them individually. To be impartial and fair, this should be a third party rather than a DNO. In response, it was suggested that if the quality of the data is an issue then this will not be resolved by central aggregation.
- 7.6 In terms of taking forward the issue with the timeliness of the data, the group reviewed the reasons given by Suppliers for rejecting DCP 250 as documented in the DCP 250 Change Declaration, noting that these reasons included:
- The further the forecast is projected the less reliable the data will be; and
 - Suppliers would like the DCUSA, SPAA and DECC report submission dates to be aligned.
- 7.7 The group considered a number of options that could be taken forward; these are set out in Slide 2 of Attachment 3. It was noted that these options would not remove Suppliers concerns around the accuracy of the forecast data.
- 7.8 It was agreed that DNOs should discuss at the next STIG meeting how concerned they are by the potential inaccuracy of the Supplier Forecast granular data if the reporting dates were to be amended.

Action 01/05: DNOs

- 7.9 Supplier attendees took an action to consider at what point the quality of the granular forecast data drops off to the point that they would not wish for DNOs to rely on it.

Action 01/06: Suppliers

8 DISCUSSION ON PRODUCING AN INDUSTRY WIDE PROCESS FOR CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH THE MOP CAN LEAVE THE SITE OF A CATEGORY A SITUATION

- 8.1 It was explained that this agenda item links to DCP 244 'MOP Leaving Site for Category A Situations'. This CP has been placed on hold until an industry wide process defining the circumstances in which the MOP can leave the site of a Category A Situation has been produced. It was suggested that at present in the majority of Category A situations, the MOP leaves the site before the Distributor arrives.
- 8.2 PM presented a slide on Category A incidences in UKPN's areas split by Asset Condition Code (see Slide 4 of Attachment 3). In the slides, the MOCOPA guidance on what the MOP should do for each Asset Condition Code is also included. It was noted that within the MOCOPA guidance the MOP can choose whether to stay or leave for the majority of situations.
- 8.3 The Working Group discussed a number of options as to how the SLAs and response times for Category A Situations could be changed, including:
- Redefining what is classed as dangerous, such that if the MOP can make the situation safe and leave site then the situation is not a Category A Situation.

- Amending the Category A Situation DNO response time, so that the timescales vary by Asset Condition Code; this would enable DNOs to better manage their resources.
- Amending the response time such that if the Meter Operator is on site the DNO response time is 3 to 4 hours and if the MOP is not on site the response time is 5 days.
- Distributors could provide spare cut out covers to MOPs which would remove the need for the Distributor to attend site for certain Category A Situations. In response, it was noted that the DNO could not recover the cost of the consumable under this approach as there would not have been an intervention. Recovering the cost could potentially be discussed with Ofgem.

8.4 As a next step it was agreed that DNOs should form a collective view as to what changes they would like to see made to the current Category A Situation approach and give guidance to MOCOPA on this.

Action 01/07: DNOs

8.5 PS took an action to feed the Working Group's discussions back to MOCOPA Review Panel Workgroup and seek the Workgroup's views. It was noted that this is an open meeting which anyone can attend.

Action 01/08: PS

8.6 PM took an action to prepare proposed legal drafting that would exempt DNOs from the three-hour response timescale where the MOP does not stay on site.

Action 01/09: PS

8.7 It was also agreed that DNOs should each prepare data showing the percentage of Category A Situations encountered by Asset Condition Code. This should cover the four-month period up to February 2016.

Action 01/10: DNOs

9 IMPLICATIONS OF SOME METER OPERATORS NOT OPERATING METAL-CLAD CUT-OUTS

- 9.1 It was explained that 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.
- 9.2 SB noted that reviewing the percentage of Category A Incidents by Asset Condition Code would be helpful in understanding the extent of this issue.
- 9.3 It was cautioned that some customers are being told that the Supplier is waiting for the Distributor to replace the cut out before they can fit a Smart meter. However, as the replacement of cut-outs is a Category C incident there are no associated SLAs for this replacement. This is impacting on the customer experience.
- 9.4 It was noted that metal clad cut-outs often have asbestos meter boards. Also, some meters are unsafe to be worked on and thus for these types it is right that the DNO is contacted.
- 9.5 PS suggested that it would be reasonable to expect that Suppliers should have, within their metering capabilities, staff with the ability to operate meters that are safe to be worked on.
- 9.6 It was 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.

- 9.7 PM suggested that it would be useful for all DNOs to have a document on cut-outs similar to the one provided by ENWL. SB took an action to circulate this document to the Working Group members.

Action 01/11: DNOs

10 DISCUSSION ON DEFECT REPORTING BY SOME METER OPERATORS FROM HEAD OFFICE, NOT BY METER OPERATOR ONSITE

- 10.1 It was highlighted that anecdotal evidence was 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 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.
- 10.2 It was noted that Distributors should be addressing these issues directly with the relevant organisations.
- 10.3 An action was taken for DNOs to return to the group with any evidence that would show that this is not just anecdotal.

Action 01/12: DNOs

11 WORK PLAN

- 11.1 It was agreed that ElectraLink should produce an issues log for review by the group.

Action 01/13: ElectraLink

12 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Meter Boards

- 12.1 PM asked whether 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? This would be a quick win in terms of the customer experience. It was noted that the Supplier would be required to act in accordance with the SMICoP in their communications with the customer.
- 12.2 It was highlighted 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.

Supplier Contacts

- 12.3 PM asked whether Suppliers could share a direct phone number that would enable the Distributor to contact those within the Supply business that are scheduling visits.
- 12.4 In addition, could Suppliers provide emergency contact numbers so that Distributors have somebody that they can contact at the Supply business in the event of an on-site emergency.
- 12.5 PM took an action to provide additional details on what these numbers will be used for. Based on this information, ElectraLink will e-mail DCUSA contract managers requesting phone numbers to pass to the Distributors.

Action 01/14: PM and ElectraLink

Supplier Rollout Templates

- 12.6 DB noted that some Supplier rollout templates were late and some Suppliers had edited the template, making it difficult to collate the results. It was suggested that it would be useful to have a dashboard showing Suppliers' performance in terms of timeliness and accuracy of the template.
- 12.7 RG took an action to add this to STIG agenda and bring back STIG comments to the Working Group.

Action 01/15: RG

13 NEXT MEETING

- 13.1 The next meeting is scheduled for 10:00 on Tuesday, 26 April 2016 at ElectraLink's office.
- 13.2 RT took an action to circulate proposed dates for all 2016 meetings, with meetings scheduled for three months apart.

Action 01/16: ElectraLink

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF ACTIONS**NEW AND OPEN ACTIONS**

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
DCP 195A 03/01	Discuss the Working Group's views on the proposed options for changing the Supplier roll out reporting dates with DECC. And seek agreement from DECC that they would be happy to move their reporting dates to align with the proposed revised dates.	PM	On-going
DCP 195A 03/03	Check whether a DCUSA change should be raised to make the smart meter install field introduced by DTC CP3457 mandatory	DB	On-going. It was noted that this is an MRA related matter.
DCP 195A 04/01	All DNOs and IDNOs should send their Category A contact number to ElectraLink for circulation to DCUSA Contract Managers. ElectraLink also took an action to contact those Distributors that are not on the call to request that they provide their contact numbers.	DNOs, IDNOs, ElectraLink	The Distributor emergency phone numbers have been circulated to DCUSA contract managers. PS agreed to remind MOCOPA members to use the updated numbers.
DCP 195A 04/02	Contact Suppliers that were not present at the meeting to ask their view on the best way to address the ambiguity between the legal text and the DCP 195A Network SLA reporting template included in the DCUSA.	KW	On-going. It was noted that this could be picked up as part of a general review of reporting. It was agreed that the agenda for the next meeting should include an agenda item on reviewing the Agenda item for next month
DCP 195A 04/03	Provide your view on whether you are happy for an aggregated version of the DECC SMETs 1 and SMETS 2 rollout report to be shared with Distributors.	Suppliers	DNO attendees noted that having an aggregated view at a GSP level would be very useful. In response, it was noted that Suppliers may not be reporting by GSP group. It was suggested that Andy Clay from DECC should contract the Supplier representatives that provide the reports to DECC to seek their permission. SB agreed to contact Andy to suggest he seek approval from the Suppliers that send in the reports.
01/01	Seek DCUSA Panel approval for the proposed revisions to the Working Group Terms of Reference.	ElectraLink	

01/02	Seek guidance from the DCUSA Panel on what is the most appropriate way for the Interventions Working Group to share and receive direction from the Operations Group.	ElectraLink	
01/03	Include a standing agenda item on “Operational Issues, Highlights and Lowlights”. Prior to each meeting, Working Group members should be asked to submit any items they would like to present with regards to this item based on their smart meter install experiences.	ElectraLink	
01/04	At the next STIG meeting, discuss how performance against the SLAs is being measured to ensure that DNOs are using a consistent approach.	DNOs	
01/05	Discuss at the next STIG meeting how concerned DNOs are by the potential inaccuracy of the Supplier Forecast granular data if the reporting dates were to be amended.	DNOs	
01/06	Consider at what point the quality of the Supplier Forecast granular forecast data drops off to the point that you would not wish for DNOs to rely on it.	Suppliers	
01/07	DNOs to form a collective view as to what changes they would like to see made to the current Category A Situation approach and give guidance to MOCOPA on this.	DNOs	
01/08	Feed the Intervention Working Group’s discussions back to MOCOPA Review Panel Workgroup and seek the Workgroup’s views.	PM	
01/09	Prepare proposed legal drafting that would exempt DNOs from the three-hour response timescale where the MOP does not stay on site.	PM	
01/10	Prepare data showing the percentage of Category A Situations encountered by Asset Condition Code. This should cover the four-month period up to February 2016.	DNOs	
01/11	Circulate ENWL’s guidance document on cut-outs to Working Group members.	SB	
01/12	Return to the Working Group with evidence to support the suggestion that Category A Incidents are on occasions		

	being phoned in from an office, rather than by the MOP on the site.		
01/13	Prepare an issues log for review by the group	ElectraLink	
01/14	PM to provide details to ElectraLink on how the direct telephone numbers he would like to request from Suppliers will be used. Based on this information, ElectraLink to email Supplier Parties requesting that the provide phone numbers to pass to Distributors	PM and ElectraLink	
01/15	Suggest to the STIG that a dashboard is prepared showing Suppliers' performance in terms of timeliness and accuracy of the rollout forecasts.	RG	
01/16	Circulate proposed dates for all 2016 Intervention Working Group meetings	ElectraLink	

ACTIONS CLOSED AT THE MEETING

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
02/04	Keep multiple occupancy issues under review	All	22 Feb 2016: the group discussed whether multiple occupancy issues are relevant to the Interventions Working Group. It was noted that it may fall within the remit of "proactive interventions" work. It was agreed that this area should be kept under review. This item has been closed as it has been added to the Interventions Group Issues Log
03/02	Raise multiple occupancy issues with the ODG	PM	Closed
03/05	Share the outcome of the ODG discussions regarding Action 03/02 with the Working Group via email.	PM	Closed
ISSG 01	Supplier Representatives to present on best practice	Suppliers	Closed