

DCUSA DCP 235 Consultation responses – collated comments

| Company | Confidential/ Anonymous | 1. Do you understand the intent of DCP 235? | Working Group Comments |
|---|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Anonymous 1 | Anonymous | Yes | Noted. |
| E.ON | Non-confidential | Yes | Noted. |
| Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | Yes, we fully understand the intent of this proposal. | Noted. |
| SP Distribution / SP Manweb | Non-confidential | Yes | Noted. |
| SSE Meterin | Non-confidential | Yes we understand the intent of the change proposal | Noted. |

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|-----|--------|
| g | ial | | |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | Yes | Noted. |

| Company | Confidential/Anonymous | 2. Are you supportive of the principles of DCP 235? | Working Group Comments |
|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Anonymous 1 | Anonymous | Yes. | Noted. |
| E.ON | Non-confidential | No. We do not support the principle. The proposal will mean smart installations will take longer, will be more costly and could impact our ability to meet smart installation targets | Noted. |
| Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | We strongly support the principles of this DCP. | Noted. |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|--|--------|
| SP Distribution / SP Manweb | Non-confidential | Yes | Noted. |
| SSE Metering | Non-confidential | We are supportive of networks holding relative detail pertaining to each of their assets | Noted. |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | Yes | Noted. |

| Company | Confidential/Anonymous | 3. Please provide details of the benefits to your organisation of having access to service termination data? | Working Group Comments |
|----------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| Anonymous 1 | Anonymous | The information collected by the implementation of DCP 235 will enable ----- to enhance its data-set for the risk assessment methodology for service terminations. The enhanced data-set means the resulting information from the risk assessment will enable ----- to more efficiently comply with its ESQCR obligations by better targeting those service terminations may require attention. | Noted. |
| E.ON | Non-confidential | There are no additional benefits to us as a supplier if DCP 235 was adopted | Noted. |
| Souther | Non- | For our organisation having access to service | Noted. The Working Group agreed to add these items to |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>n Electric Power Distribu tion plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribu tion plc</p> | <p>confident ial</p> | <p>termination data will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enable a different approach to be taken to the management of service termination assets including moving away from a reliance on inspection by other industry parties to a regime based upon risk. Not having this data will make the removal of the 'must inspect' supply licence condition (SLC 12.14) more difficult; • ensure that we can locate specific equipment types when the need arises to support our ongoing operation and maintenance activity; • support the development of asset replacement programmes; <p>better enable assessment of customer requests for increased capacity, particularly those associated with the connection of new low carbon technologies such as electric vehicles, heat pumps and micro generation. Having a core of information will help determine what further investigation is needed, leading to greater efficiency and improved customer service.</p> | <p>the cost benefit analysis.</p> |
| <p>SP Distribu tion / SP Manweb</p> | <p>Non- confident ial</p> | <p>The Smart meter customer and industry engagement is a unique opportunity to gather or update existing DNO asset information. Access to this information provides a vital one off opportunity to assess the overall condition of the service position equipment, allowing intelligent and risk mitigating investment.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| <p>SSE Meterin g</p> | <p>Non- confident ial</p> | <p>If this information was readily available, then by collaborative working with the network, we could proactively target customers for smart meter installs</p> | <p>Noted. The Working Group noted that this data is expected to be collected as part of the installation of smart meters during the mass roll-out as the</p> |

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>where directly there is a greater chance of a successful installation based on asset condition. We would also expect DNO's/IDNO's to schedule in their remedial work and provide data to suppliers notifying them that areas have been targeted and are now in a position where all issues have been resolved. Currently we do not know if we will encounter problems until we have arrived on site and it could be reasonably expected that the same conditions are present in the immediate area in similar property profiles.</p> | <p>implementation of DCP 235 will occur during the time of the roll-out.</p> |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | <p>Access to service termination data will enable us to better plan inspections and replacement programmes. We can develop a risk based approach to these. We can relate events to assets and respond to correlations accordingly.</p> <p>If collected and reported correctly it provides a firm basis for the distributor to plan going forward and such data can be used in price controls.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |

| Company | Confidential/Anonymous | 4. Please provide details of the impacts on your organisation of the meter operator collecting service termination data unless advised not to by the Distributor? | Working Group Comments |
|-------------|------------------------|---|------------------------|
| Anonymous 1 | Anonymous | <p>----- would expect to receive the data from the Meter Operator attending site and store the data, unless we had signalled we already have the data.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|------------------|--|---|
| E.ON | Non-confidential | We will incur increased installation costs. In addition there will be additional costs relating to training, system changes and storing and providing the data items | Noted. Please see previous response. |
| Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | We see this proposal as a very positive development which would assist us to collect information on service termination assets in an effective and efficient manner, with least disturbance to customers – something which we see as being particularly important and in the interests of all stakeholders. | Noted. |
| SP Distribution / SP Manweb | Non-confidential | The collected information needs to be absorbed into existing corporate systems, which will require IT adaptations to be carried out. This would not be viewed as a negative impact. | Noted. |
| SSE Metering | Non-confidential | Our field and back office systems are not currently designed to capture and deal with this type of data. In order to facilitate the robust capture and processing of this data we will have to invest in our IT technology. This will include an element of training and auditing to ensure that any information is captured correctly. Our estimates are £100k development work for our system architecture over a 6 month period. This will create a short term solution on our current system which is being phased out and replaced so in simple terms we will be spending twice on development by also adding this to | Noted. The Working Group acknowledges there are IT changes involved and noted that there is a well known MRA Change Process involved. |

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|---|--------|
| | | the enduring solution. At this time we do not yet understand how much time will be needed to complete this task on site but we are aware that this will impact our staffing levels as well as our mandate to install smart meters by 2020. If it takes 5 minutes to capture this detail when he hit mass rollout at 8k installs per day, we will need an additional 90 FTE to cover this activity. There will be an increase in exceptions requiring manual intervention and we predict this to incur an additional 11 FTE. | |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | <p>The impact is in being able to realise the benefits under question 3 in an efficient manner for a large population of sites.</p> <p>There would be an impact in terms of system changes to enable advising the MOP when not to gather the data. A simpler solution would be to provide the data each time the meter operator carried out an isolation from the service termination.</p> | Noted. |

| Company | Confidential/Anonymous | 5. Please consider and comment on whether the existing meter operator competencies are sufficient to fulfil the data items being requested or whether additional training will be required to achieve this? | Working Group Comments |
|----------------|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Anonymous 1 | Anonymous | ----- believes that the Meter Operative attending site will have sufficient competence to fulfil the data items due to their existing training. | Noted. |
| E.ON | Non-confidential | Even if we were to assess that meter operators were competent there will always be a need for additional | Noted. |

| | | | |
|---|------------------|---|--------|
| | ial | training so that we can ensure the specific data items that were requested were collected | |
| Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | <p>It is important to recognise that the data that has been requested falls well within the competency of existing meter operators.</p> <p>In order for a MOP to be able to operate any distributor equipment they must first satisfy distributors that they have appropriate controls in place to be able to fulfil their duties in a safe way. This includes ensuring that their operatives are trained and competent to manage all risks associated with operating distributor service termination equipment.</p> <p>Prior to being authorised to operate distributor equipment MOPs must first become MOCOPA parties and undergo a management assessment of their policies and procedures by the MOCOPA Registration Authority. They are also required to undergo operative site audits. Once they have successfully become registered as a MOCOPA party they must then seek consent from individual distributors on whose networks they wish to operate.</p> <p>This will typically, as a minimum, include the provision of their health and safety policy for review by the distributor. Within this policy, distributors would expect information relating to how the MOP will ensure the competence of their operatives to operate distributor service termination equipment, including details of training provision etc. Once the distributor is satisfied with the MOP's policy they will provide written authorisation for them to work on their networks. Given the "basic" nature of the service termination asset information being requested it is inconceivable given the above assessment that operatives will not already have</p> | Noted. |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---------------|
| | | <p>the skills required to provide this information. At present all meter operators are required to assess the condition of the distributor’s equipment as a fundamental part of their formal risk assessment procedures before they operate it.</p> <p>Meter operator equipment (meter tails) physically terminate inside the distributor’s service termination equipment. If they are not able to identify the equipment type they will not be able to assess any associated risk of operating the individual item of apparatus.</p> <p>The DCUSA obligations which DCP195A recently placed into DCUSA require suppliers / MOP’s to notify distributors when there are issues with their equipment. In order to comply with these requirements, suppliers and their MOP agents must already have substantial knowledge of distributor service termination equipment. If they do not have sufficient knowledge then there is an argument that they should not operate the distributor equipment.</p> <p>It is therefore unlikely that any additional meter operator training would therefore be required to identify and select from a small list of possible options the information being requested by distributors.</p> | |
| <p>SP Distribution / SP Manweb</p> | <p>Non-confidential</p> | <p>The meter installer already requires a level of competence and knowledge in order to work safely on the DNO equipment. Recognising condition and type is a key existing element of the meter operator’s skillset. Where required, minor changes to the MOCOPA SERVICE Terminations Issues Guide could be very easily provided.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|--|--|
| SSE Metering | Non-confidential | <p>We believe that the majority of the data items are within the scope of the operatives but some training will be required to ensure that a consistent understanding of descriptions results in clear, useful reporting.</p> <p>We don't believe the data set includes all of the relevant situations in their present guise. In MDU's where risers are terminated directly into the meter and there is no local isolation present, there is no way of capturing this type of set up. In addition, shared fuses appear to be targeted for removal from all recording activities whilst they are still creating scenarios for jobs to be aborted. We would welcome that the working group validates all scenarios are being captured adequately.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Working Group agreed to suggest that this information is included in the ENA guide.</p> |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | <p>Meter operatives should be competent to identify, gather and provide this data. An onsite risk assessment would need to take consideration of the assets in question.</p> <p>A briefing document would be required to provide guidance and ensure all meter operators received the communication and the process for recording the data via existing hand held units.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |

| Company | Confidential/Anonymous | 6. Please provide details of the costs and benefits of using the meter operator to gather service termination data? | Working Group Comments |
|-------------|------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Anonymous 1 | Anonymous | ----- doesn't believe that there will be any additional costs associated with the collection of the data as the Meter Operative attending site will as part of the risk assessment review the area and the service | <p>Noted.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|------------------|--|--------|
| | | <p>termination equipment to decide whether it is safe to carry out his/her duties. The proposed approach of the Meter Operative collecting the service termination data is the minimum cost solution for GB customers.</p> | |
| E.ON | Non-confidential | <p>There will be an increase in cost for our meter operators due to the increase in time and the collection of data. We are currently making an internal assessment of what these costs would be. We do not consider that there is a current benefit to us as a supplier</p> | Noted. |
| Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | <p>Given the limited level of information currently available, we have not made a full assessment of the costs involved. However, the only obvious additional costs involved are minor, arising from recording and transferring the information. Intuitively, the meter operator gathering this information when undertaking metering installation work must be the most efficient means of collecting the data for distributors.</p> <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they are already on site to undertake other work; • the complexity of making/recording and keeping an appointment has already been undertaken by an industry party; • the customer impact is reduced as a separate visit to collect the information is not required; • the time taken to record the data will be minimal and could be undertaken as part of the existing risk assessment process; | Noted. |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|--|--------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is environmentally better as there are fewer vehicles on the road and less vehicle miles travelled. <p>Alternatively should distributors collect the data themselves this would mean separate visits and additional customer inconvenience.</p> <p>This would require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specific site visits to record the required information; • making/ recording and keeping of appointments for the sole purpose of collecting service termination data; • more vehicles on the road and a greater number of vehicle miles travelled; • ultimately increased cost to be borne by customers. <p>Note that when we are on site for any other purpose we will collect a significantly more detailed amount of service termination data.</p> | |
| SP Distribution / SP Manweb | Non-confidential | <p>The DNO has two options if this opportunity is not taken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gather the information themselves over an extended period of time at no additional cost, relying on existing data, which is limited. <p>Independent data collection exercise carried out separately to the Meter operators activities which could depend on scope cost anywhere between £5 & £25 per</p> | Noted. |

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|---|---|
| | | property. | |
| SSE Metering | Non-confidential | We need to fully understand the methodology for capturing this data on our platforms to realise the full impact of development costs and final benefits. See response to question 4 for additional detail | Noted. Please refer to previous response. |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | <p>The benefit of using the meter operator is in synergy as he has to undertake a site visit for the smart roll out. Smart metering rollout presents an unprecedented opportunity to gather this data across a large population of the exit points in an efficient manner and minimises customer disturbance.</p> <p>The MOP personnel are trained and will have to pull fuses to fit meters, hence having access to key items of data.</p> <p>There will be costs in developing hand held terminal software but industry changes that impact the IT of a single class of party are quite normal.</p> <p>There should be no additional costs of travelling to site, and the time spent on site should not need to increase materially, if at all.</p> <p>The DNO will incur costs in receiving and processing this data from flows.</p> <p>Meter Operators and Suppliers would benefit from improvements in the quality management of service terminations as they are by far the biggest operator on this asset.</p> | Noted. Noted. |

| Company | Confidential/ Anonymous | 7. Recognising that the costs of this new requirement will ultimately be passed to customers, please provide your views on how any costs should be funded and how or why you have reached this conclusion? | Working Group Comments |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Anonymous 1 | Anonymous | <p>The Meter Operator collecting this data is the lowest cost solution for GB customers. As each property will be visited under the smart meter rollout there is little or no margin cost for collecting this data, as the Meter Operative attending site will need to assess the service termination equipment as part of his/her risk assessment before undertaking his/ her duties.</p> <p>Whereas if a Distributor or an agent acting on its behalf visited each property within its distribution services area to obtain the information, either before, during or after the rollout of smart meters GB customers would face the extra costs for this data collection exercise.</p> | Noted. |
| E.ON | Non-confidential | We are not clear on what the benefits of DCP 235 are for customers to warrant an increase in costs. Should this become a new requirement we would expect to see a reduction in the cost of system charges, greater than the additional costs of collection | Noted. |
| Southern Electric Power Distributors | Non-confidential | <p>We feel it is appropriate that costs should lie where they are incurred. Our reasoning behind this is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it will drive the most efficient solution; | Noted. |

| | | | |
|---|------------------|--|--------|
| tion plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the charges applied to distributors are likely to be marked up by suppliers and there is no incentive on suppliers to minimise these charges, so it is unlikely that distributor costs would be minimised; suppliers have the ability to negotiate rates with their agents and could incorporate these requirements with other routine changes in order to drive down cost. <p>the costs which are ultimately borne by customers must be minimised.</p> | |
| SP Distribution / SP Manweb | Non-confidential | The cost of collecting this one off data exercise should be consistent with existing Data transfer costs. No cost should be passed to the DNO. | Noted. |
| SSE Metering | Non-confidential | Ultimately this is the responsibility of the DNO to routinely inspect and record the condition of their assets under the ESQCR's. We believe that there should be a significant contribution from the networks to bridge their gap in knowledge of their equipment. | Noted. |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | Costs should be minimal and form part of the smart installation costs between the MOP and the supplier. The supplier has procured the MOP on a competitive basis and so has ensured a cost efficient service. Where the party incurring the costs is responsible for them the motivation to find synergies and opportunities to minimise is significant. E.g. during smart meter registration time. | Noted. |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | There is no point in the DNO visiting as well the MOP and so duplicating costs and adding to customer disruption. | |
|--|--|---|--|

| Company | Confidential/Anonymous | 8. Is the Data Transfer Network (DTN) the best mechanism for communicating this information? | Working Group Comments |
|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Anonymous 1 | Anonymous | No comment. | Noted. |
| E.ON | Non-confidential | Yes. It is already established, in use and is the most secure form of transfer | Noted. |
| Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | The DTN does offer a robust and industry proven vehicle to deliver the data. However this would require the development of a unique industry flow to be sent from meter operators to the distributors when a smart meter is installed. Once the smart metering rollout is complete the flow should be removed from the DTC. | |
| SP Distribution / SP | Non-confidential | Yes. | Noted. |

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|--|--------|
| Manweb | | | |
| SSE Metering | Non-confidential | We agree that the DTN is the most suitable vehicle to capture this. | Noted. |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | Yes. The industry is set up to use the DTN providing a consistency in operation. Any other methods of communication would provide increased costs which would need consideration against quality and efficiency of the captured information. | Noted. |

| Company | Confidential/Anonymous | 9. What is the optimal way in which the meter operator could determine that the Distributor already has service termination data for a given site? | Working Group Comments |
|--|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Anonymous 1 | Anonymous | By informing the Supplier/ Meter Operators in a dataflow that the Distributor holds the service termination data. | Noted. |
| E.ON | Non-confidential | This is a process issue that would need to be resolved if DCP 235 was recommended | Noted. |
| Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and | Non-confidential | The process must be kept simple to achieve maximum effectiveness and there are significant issues associated with collecting data at some sites but not others. The least complex and least confusing arrangement would be for MOP's to collect data from all locations. We feel that the most efficient solution would be for a | Noted. |

| | | | |
|--|------------------|---|--------|
| Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc | | <p>one off data collection exercise during the smart meter roll-out. This would ensure that all staff are aware of their obligations and the data transfer process could be kept simple.</p> <p>Note – new supplies could be excluded as the DNO will collect this data as part of the installation record.</p> | |
| SP Distribution / SP Manweb | Non-confidential | <p>There is no way that the Meter Operator could proactively determine that the Distributor already has the information, the DNO require to “flag” properties where no info is required (example would be where recent modernisation has taken place and information is already captured)</p> | Noted. |
| SSE Metering | Non-confidential | <p>As all operatives are working in an environment with mobile technology, some form of flag needs to be available for each site that can be easily recognise by the operative to confirm if this detail is required or not.</p> | Noted. |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | <p>If it is routine for the MOP to gather this data then it may add complexity to process if he has to determine whether to or not.</p> <p>A simple approach of gathering it every time would avoid human error in making the assessment of whether to do so or not. This will also enable any unforeseen differences in data over time to be investigated.</p> | Noted. |

| Compa | Confide | 10. Are there other ways that this information | Working Group Comments |
|-------|---------|--|------------------------|
|-------|---------|--|------------------------|

| ny | ntial/ Anonym ous | could be gathered and how do they compare or contrast with the proposed method? | |
|--|--------------------------|---|--------|
| Anonym ous 1 | Anonym ous | See response to question 7. The proposed method is the minimum cost solution for collecting service termination data. | Noted. |
| E.ON | Non- confident ial | DNO's should implement their own risk inspection framework. As stipulated in the HSE summary provided to SMDG MISG on the 8 th June 2015 the 'control measures that need to be adopted may be different from one supplier/ DNO/ meter operator to the next and may change with time'. As the duty is always on the duty holder we believe that DNO's should manage their own risk and provide an alternative for collection rather than introducing an additional obligation on suppliers. The current consideration by suppliers to adopt a risk based approach to inspections may also have an impact on solution | Noted. |
| Southern Electric Power Distribu tion plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribu tion plc | Non- confident ial | <p>Distributors could collect the information themselves but this would be less efficient overall, more costly and more disruptive for customers, as outlined in our response to Q6. There may also be issues regarding cost recovery as the ED1 settlement is agreed.</p> <p>Distributors could contract directly with MOPs to collect the data when on site undertaking meter changes, but this may be unacceptable to suppliers as the 'primary employer'.</p> <p>Distributors could contract with other parties but lack of industry and distributor equipment knowledge would introduce the need for additional training requirements.</p> | Noted. |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|---|--------|
| | | This would also involve specific site visits, but this would also be less efficient overall, more costly and more disruptive for customers. | |
| SP Distribution / SP Manweb | Non-confidential | Yes there are other ways to collect data, but nothing of the scale of the SM engagement. We should take the opportunity presented by the customer engagement, to capture as much info as possible to the benefit of all parties (and least cost to the customer). | Noted. |
| SSE Metering | Non-confidential | We do not believe there is a more economical method than the DTN. | Noted. |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | The MOP collecting the data offers a synergy that is not available from any other method of collecting it. This is the only method which would avoid the need for an additional visit to customer premises, the associated extra costs and further disruption / inconvenience for the customer. | |

| Company | Confidential/ Anonymous | 11. Please provide your views on the suggestion to remove Category C items from industry processes and how those items given in the Attachment which are identified as not having a map across to the service termination equipment in the proposed Data Flow should be addressed? | Working Group Comments |
|-------------|-------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Anonymous 1 | Anonymous | ----- prefers not to remove Category C information from industry processes as it provides a greater level of granularity. | Noted. |

| | | | |
|---|------------------|---|--------|
| E.ON | Non-confidential | We consider category C items should continue to be reported via D0135 meaning no changes are necessary | Noted. |
| Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | <p>Whilst there could be a case for removing all Category C issues from the existing reporting process this should only be considered if the provision of asset condition information as proposed in DCP235 is approved.</p> <p>We agree with the assessment relating to information that will be provided should DCP235 be agreed in its current form. Our view on the remaining items is as follows:</p> <p>C02 – we would like to see a means for distributors to continue to receive this information.</p> <p>C07 - we would like to see a means for distributors to continue to receive this information.</p> <p>C11 – we agree with the assessment that distributors could derive this information from other items; we are in agreement with not receiving this data.</p> <p>C16 – we are in agreement with not receiving this data</p> <p>The non C code items listed, i.e. those associated with shared fuses and neutrals are more useful to suppliers/ MOP's. Having this data may enable them to manage any associated issues in a more efficient way. Where this information may be useful to distributors is where it is used to support the development of future asset replacement programmes. It may be useful in circumstances where there are shared fuses and neutrals to retain this information elsewhere in MDD, this way it would be available to all industry parties.</p> | Noted. |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|--|--------|
| | | <p>Options for providing this information are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> retain existing C code reporting but a much slimmer list – there are advantages in this as changes required will be minimal and relate to MRA governance only; <p>develop a means to incorporate the items required within the DCP235 reporting process and remove them from existing governance. This would require both MRA and DCUSA changes.</p> | |
| SP Distribution / SP Manweb | Non-confidential | <p>There should only be a single transfer of Asset data between the parties in this area.</p> <p>The existing CAT C items are of lesser importance to a DNO understanding the basic construction and equipment type, and therefore the associated risk of the service position asset.</p> <p>The removal of the Category C issue has a longer term impact than the one off data collection exercise proposed. Formalised Service position Issue reporting should remain intact as an industry tool once the SM exercise is complete.</p> | Noted. |
| SSE Metering | Non-confidential | <p>As per question 5 we don't agree that these changes go far enough to capture all the relevant scenarios where an intervention is required by the DNO. We would prefer that an all encompassing solution was introduced before the Category C items were removed from reports. These all create a disjointed journey for the customer where non reporting can only result in no resolution taking place.</p> | Noted. |

| | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | This is an acceptable approach and a new field for reporting C02, C07, C11 and C16 could be added to the new flow. | Noted. |
| Company | Confidential/Anonymous | <p>12. Which DCUSA General Objectives does the CP better facilitate? Please provide supporting comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The development, maintenance and operation by each of the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of an efficient, coordinated, and economical Distribution System. 2. The facilitation of effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity and (so far as is consistent with that) the promotion of such competition in the sale, distribution and purchase of electricity. 3. The efficient discharge by each of the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of the obligations imposed upon them by their Distribution Licences. 4. The promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of this Agreement and the arrangements under it. 5. Compliance with the Regulation on Cross-Border Exchange in Electricity and any relevant legally binding decisions of the European Commission and/or the Agency for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators. | Working Group Comments |
| Anonym | Anonym | The CP better facilitates DCUSA General Objectives 1 | Noted. |

| | | | |
|---|------------------|---|--------|
| ous 1 | ous | and 3. As previously stated ----- believes that the data collection carried out under the smart meter rollout is the minimum cost solution for GB customers. | |
| E.ON | Non-confidential | We do not agree that that DCP 235 better facilitates DCUSA objectives. Objective 1 has been proposed but until we have fully understood costs and benefits we cannot support this. | Noted. |
| Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | We agree with the assessment of the Working Group that General Objective 1 is better facilitated, for the reasoning set out in the consultation document. | Noted. |
| SP Distribution / SP Manweb | Non-confidential | <p>1: This CP is the simplest method of collaboration between parties ensuring the service position equipment is in the best operational condition possible.</p> <p>We believe that this CP facilitates the following General Objectives:</p> <p>1 The development, maintenance and operation by each of the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of an efficient, co-ordinated, and economical Distribution System – we believe that this additional information may allow proactive remedial work to be scheduled to mitigate any</p> | Noted. |

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>impacts to the Distribution system, utilising existing information in order to ensure that this is economical</p> <p>3 – The efficient discharge by each of the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of the obligations imposed upon them by their Distribution Licences – We believe that DNO parties are able to discharge elements of their obligations by the utilisation of existing information</p> | |
| SSE Metering | Non-confidential | <p>We believe that this meets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1, We believe this is the second most relevant objective, as the DNO is finding an efficient method of discharging their responsibilities (going to visit the properties separate to Suppliers would arguably be inefficient) • 3, We believe this is the key beneficiary of the proposal <p>With regard to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2, We are neutral on this point. • 4, is questionable until we have fully considered the cost of development to meet these requirements. <p>5, We are neutral on this point</p> | |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | <p>Objective 1 – the MOP obtaining service termination data presents a cost effective way of capturing data that will enable the distributor to develop and maintain the system in an efficient and economical way.</p> | |

| Company | Confidential/ Anonymous | <p>13. Which DCUSA Charging Objectives does the CP better facilitate? Please provide supporting comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. that compliance by each DNO Party with the Charging Methodologies facilitates the discharge by the DNO Party of the obligations imposed on it under the Act and by its Distribution Licence. 2. that compliance by each DNO Party with the Charging Methodologies facilitates competition in the generation and supply of electricity and will not restrict, distort, or prevent competition in the transmission or distribution of electricity or in participation in the operation of an Interconnector (as defined in the Distribution Licences). 3. that compliance by each DNO Party with the Charging Methodologies results in charges which, so far as is reasonably practicable after taking account of implementation costs, reflect the costs incurred, or reasonably expected to be incurred, by the DNO Party in its Distribution Business. 4. that, so far as is consistent with Clauses 3.2.1 to 3.2.3, the Charging Methodologies, so far as is reasonably practicable, properly take account of developments in each DNO Party's Distribution Business. 5. that compliance by each DNO Party | Working Group Comments |
|---------|----------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | |

| | | with the Charging Methodologies facilitates compliance with the Regulation on Cross-Border Exchange in Electricity and any relevant legally binding decisions of the European Commission and/or the Agency for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators. | |
|--|--------------------------|--|--|
| Anonym ous 1 | Anonym ous | No comment. | Noted. The Working Group agree that the Charging Objectives are not impacted by this change. |
| E.ON | Non- confident ial | | Noted. |
| Souther n Electric Power Distribu tion plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribu tion plc | Non- confident ial | None are applicable. | Noted. |
| SP Distribu tion / SP Manweb | Non- confident ial | SPEN does not believe that the CP would have any impact on charging objectives | Noted. |
| SSE | Non- | | Noted. |

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------|
| Metering | confidential | | |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | There should be no charging impact. | Noted. |

| Company | Confidential/Anonymous | 14. Please provide details of any wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP | Working Group Comments |
|---|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Anonymous 1 | Anonymous | The consultation for this CP covers the known wider industry developments. | Noted. |
| E.ON | Non-confidential | The national smart meter roll out | Noted. |
| Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | The ability to amend or remove the 'must inspect' supply licence obligation (SLC12.14) could be impacted by distributors not having access to the data this CP proposes. | Noted. |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|---|--------|
| SP Distribution / SP Manweb | Non-confidential | Any opportunity to improve safety at the service position should be taken. We note however that the DECC 'Must Inspect' sub group may have an impact on this CP, the extent of this is not known at this time | Noted. |
| SSE Metering | Non-confidential | We believe they have all been referenced. We would be interested to understand the view from HSE on DNOs legally discharging their obligation in the event that a MOP inadvertently reported the condition of an asset incorrectly that was later found to be unsafe? | Noted. |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | Notwithstanding the SLC12 review the MOP has a continuing obligation under reg 3 of ESQCR to ensure their equipment is maintained and so to do so must visit the premises routinely to discharge that obligation. In doing so he will be able to report any visible defects with the distributor's equipment. | Noted. |

| Company | Confidential/ Anonymus | 15. Do you have a preference on the date that DCP 235 is implemented into the DCUSA? | Working Group Comments |
|------------|------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Anonymus 1 | Anonymus | As soon as practicable, but no later than April 2016. | Noted. |
| E.ON | Non-confidential | | |

| | | | |
|---|------------------|--|---|
| Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | <p>The proposed date is reasonable as it gives time for system development and aims to be in place before the DCC "goes live" and hence mass roll-out of smart meters commences.</p> <p>However it needs to be recognised that the implementation date will need to change if it is not possible to reach a decision before the end of 2015.</p> | Noted. |
| SP Distribution / SP Manweb | Non-confidential | In line with SM roll out. | Noted. |
| SSE Metering | Non-confidential | We would require 10 months to design, implement, test, train and roll out the changes required under this change proposal. | Noted. |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | As soon as practicable. | Noted. The Working Group agreed that the change should be implemented before Autumn 2016. |

| Company | Confidential/Anonymous | 16. Are there any alternative solutions or matters that should be considered by the Working Group? | Working Group Comments |
|---------|------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Anonym | Anonym | No comment. | Noted. |

| | | | |
|---|------------------|---|--|
| ous 1 | ous | | |
| E.ON | Non-confidential | It is not for a supplier to comment on how a DNO meets its own obligations | Noted. |
| Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | Please refer to question 9. The process must be simplified to avoid confusion between all industry parties. A 'one-off' data collection exercise whilst a smart meter is being installed would provide the most cost efficient and least disruptive solution to customers and industry parties. | Noted. |
| SP Distribution / SP Manweb | Non-confidential | We would suggest as an enhancement to Category C that Data transfers include the asset info required under CP 235. | Noted. |
| SSE Metering | Non-confidential | Please see our response to question 5 | The Working Group address this respondents comments at Q5. |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | No | Noted. |