

# DCP 204 Working Group Minutes

---

<b>Meeting Name</b>	DCP 204 Working Group Meeting
<b>Meeting Number</b>	16
<b>Date</b>	1 October 2015
<b>Time</b>	10:00
<b>Venue</b>	Teleconference

---

<b>Attendee</b>	<b>Company</b>
David Brogden [DB] (Chair)	SSEPD
Andrew Monks [AM]	SSE
Chris Allanson [CA]	Northern Powergrid
Chris Rotheram [CR]	Opus Energy
Dominique Tilquin [DT]	SSEPD
Emsile Law [EL]	SSE
John Lawton [JL]	ENWL
Kevin Woollard [KW]	British Gas
Paul Saker [PS]	EDF Energy
Rory McCarthy [RM]	Ofgem
Tim Newton [TN]	E.on
Rosalind Timperley [RT] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink Limited

<b>Apologies</b>	<b>Company</b>
Peter Morgan	DECC
Maria Hesketh	Scottish Power
Helen Fosberry	E.on

## **1 ADMINISTRATION**

---

- 1.1 All attendees agreed to the terms set out in the “Competition Law Dos and Don’ts” document.

## **2 QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

---

- 2.1 DB explained that the purpose of the meeting was to give DCUSA Parties that are not members of the DCP 204 Working Group the opportunity to ask any questions that they may have on the change. It was highlighted that this is the first time that DCUSA has run a Change Proposal Q&A session. The session has been organised as part of a number of activities to address Ofgem’s concerns that Suppliers are not sufficiently engaged in DCP 204.
- 2.2 It was noted that one Supplier attendee whose organisation is not represented on the DCP 204 Working Group had dialled into the meeting. Another attendee was attending the meeting on behalf of a colleague and was therefore unfamiliar with DCP 204.
- 2.3 Attendees were provided with a brief overview of DCP 204. It was explained that the Change Proposal (CP) seeks to:
- Make the existing DCUSA Schedule 8 suitable for smart meters;
  - Simplify the security restriction notice process, so that it is easier to understand; and

- Reduce the risk of strains on the network by specifying randomisation of 600 seconds for all meters.

### **DCP 204 Benefits**

- 2.4 It was flagged that a benefit of DCP 204 to the customer is that currently they may not be aware of drifts in their switching times, which means that the cheaper tariff may be a few minutes out from what they believe it to be. DCP 204 is an opportunity to address this with customers and make them better aware of their switching times.
- 2.5 It was observed that another benefit of DCP 204 is that it has raised awareness amongst the Supplier community of the existence of Load Managed Areas (LMAs). It has also highlighted that DNOs need to provide more regular data on LMAs and provide data at MPAN level rather than postcode.

### **Impacted Customers**

- 2.6 The group observed that Suppliers will need to be able to identify on their systems which of their customers are located in Load Managed Areas. For these customers Suppliers will need to keep the switching times the same as they are currently, or engage with the Distributor if they wish to change them.
- 2.7 It was queried how many MPANs are impacted by Load Managed Areas. In response, it was noted that for SSE Power Distribution over 100,000 MPANs are located in Load Managed Areas. There are also Load Managed Areas in Western Power Distribution and SP Energy Network's areas.
- 2.8 Attendees observed that it would be useful to know the affected number of customers (i.e. customers in load managed areas that are on multi-rate tariffs). It was highlighted that Ofgem has published a report on the State of the Market<sup>1</sup> that includes data on the overall number of customers that have these types of meter.

### **Implementation Approach**

- 2.9 The group considered whether there should be a two stage approach to the implementation of DCP 204, such that Suppliers are given information on the affected MPANs and then six months later the other elements of DCP 204 apply. This would give Suppliers time to understand the volumes involved and the ability to update their systems to put a flag in place on impacted MPANs and train staff.
- 2.10 Counter to this suggestion, it was highlighted that for other industry changes the go-live date is known and Parties prepare to ensure that they are ready for the implementation date. To facilitate this preparation, it was suggested that a pilot run of the Distributor notification template could be held so that Suppliers receive the MPAN data pre-go live.
- 2.11 Two Supplier attendees noted that they had been viewing DCP 204 as part of their DCC go-live activities.

### **Supplier Forum Presentation**

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/ofgem-publications/82288/state-market-customers-dynamically-teleswitched-meters.pdf>

- 2.12 It was noted that DB and JL had attended a Domestic Supplier Forum on 9 September 2015 to present on DCP 204.
- 2.13 DB explained that many of the attendees were pleased to receive the presentation as they were unfamiliar with DCUSA Schedule 8 and DCP 204. Receiving a plain English summary of the change was helpful to them, particularly as smaller companies do not have the resources to attend DCUSA Working Group meetings.
- 2.14 The forum attendees were generally supportive of the view that to undertake a full cost benefit analysis of DCP 204 would not be feasible, but identifying what parties would be subject to what costs would be useful.
- 2.15 RM noted that from Ofgem's perspective it sounds like attending the workshop to present on DCP 204 was very useful.
- 2.16 JL highlighted that he will be going back to the DCUSA Panel to say that it is a tool that could be used to engage with smaller market participants going forward for other DCUSA Change Proposals too.

#### **Interaction with BSC Change**

- 2.17 It was noted that there has been some discussions at Elexon about Standard Settlement Configurations (SSCs) and a recent Balancing and Settlement Code change<sup>2</sup> has been approved that states that Suppliers should use a static SSC in certain circumstances. It was queried whether this would impact on DCP 204. In response, it was noted that it should not as this change was to stop data integrity degrading as smart metering progresses and it does not interact with DCP 204.

#### **Next Steps**

- 2.18 It was highlighted that the current consultation for DCP 204 closes on 9 October 2015. It was flagged to attendees that the Working Group are happy to answer any further questions that they may have.

### **3 NEXT MEETING**

---

- 3.1 The next DCP 204 meeting is scheduled for 10am on 22 October via web-conference.

---

<sup>2</sup> CP1443 'Standard Settlement Configurations for smart and advanced Meters'

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

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
14/01	DNO Working Group members that operate load managed areas to provide an estimated value for avoided network reinforcement costs for inclusion in the DCP 204 Change Report	DNOs	Ongoing
14/02	Discuss internally the costs and benefits of DCP 204 and whether you can quantify them.	All	Ongoing
14/03	Ask National Grid if they are able to identify any benefits that they would receive from the implementation of DCP 204 and assign a financial value to these benefit.	ElectraLink	<p>Ongoing - National Grid have provided the following initial response. They have been asked to provide additional detail on the benefits:</p> <p>As DCP 204 is essentially replicating existing functionality in the new technologies, it is not clear to say that National Grid are benefiting but rather more accurate to say that potentially new risks and costs are being mitigated against in advance.</p> <p>The value of these costs can be seen as any potential fine from Ofgem in breaching the code and costs of services to deal with spikes in demand. However, I would rather that the benefit is seen as a mitigation of potential risks of cut-offs to supply which should be what Ofgem is really worried about. Perhaps we could give Ofgem some of the examples of load amounts that could be tripped from a single switch and we can convert that into # of houses?</p>

			7/09/15: Electralink to chase up response and ask if National Grid could make a statement that the 600 seconds is appropriate, as Ofgem have asked for justification that this value is appropriate.
--	--	--	--

**ACTIONS CLOSED AT THE MEETING**

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update