

DCP 204 Working Group Minutes

Meeting Name	DCP 204 Working Group Meeting
Meeting Number	10
Date	19 January 2014
Time	10:00
Venue	ElectraLink's Offices (Grafton House, 2-3 Golden Square, London W1F 9HR)

Attendee	Company
David Brogden [DB] (Chair)	SSEPD
Andrew Monks [AM]	SSE
Chris Allanson [CA] (teleconference)	Northern Powergrid
Dominique Tilquin [DT]	SSEPD
David Boyer [DB]	UKPN
Emslie Law [EL]	SSE
Helen Fosberry [HF]	E.on
John Lawton [JL]	ENWL
Keren Kelly [KK]	Npower
Kevin Woollard [KW] (teleconference)	British Gas
Maria Hesketh [MH] (teleconference)	Scottish Power
Paul Saker [PS]	EDF energy
Rory McCarthy [RM] (teleconference)	Ofgem
Peter Morgan [PM]	DECC
Rosalind Timperley [RT] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink Limited

Apologies	Company
Graham Brewster	WPD

1 ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 The minutes of the last meeting were approved without amendment.
- 1.2 All Working Group members agreed to the terms set out in the "Competition Law Dos and Don'ts" document.
- 1.3 The group reviewed the open actions. Updates on all actions are set out in Appendix A.

2 DISCUSSION ON THE PROVISION OF MPAN LEVEL DATA

- 2.1 Supplier attendees provided their views on whether they would like to receive MPAN level data on Load Managed Areas (LMAs). One Supplier attendee explained that they did not believe that MPAN level data would add value. Five other Supplier attendees expressed the

view that MPAN level data would be beneficial. One attendee explained that some LMAs can be half in and half out of a postcode, thus providing LMA information at postcode level would not be useful in these situations.

- 2.2 Based on the views of Working Group members, it was agreed that MPAN level data should be provided.
- 2.3 Working Group members noted that having LMA information within central registration systems would be preferable to sending the information via email. However, it was noted that there is not a drive to make a change to central registration systems at present. It was also highlighted that some DNOs do not have any LMAs. If a requirement was placed on all DNOs to provide MPAN level data in central systems then these DNOs may incur unnecessary costs to update their systems for fields that would not be used.
- 2.4 The group then discussed whether a full list of all impacted MPANs could be sent out to Suppliers, or whether Suppliers should only receive data for MPANs registered to them. It was noted that if the MPAN list were Supplier specific then it would need updating more frequently due to customers switching Suppliers. By providing a full list of all MPAN then there would not be a requirement to update the information so frequently.
- 2.5 It was suggested that as lists of MPANs are already circulated for other reasons under the provisions of another industry code, there should not be any issues with confidentiality. Attendees took an action to check that there are no confidentiality issues with sending all MPANs to Suppliers and also to consider whether this data should be encrypted.

Action 10/01: All

3 REVIEW OF NOTIFICATION TEMPLATE

- 3.1 CA presented a proposed LMA notification template to the Working Group. The template is provided as Attachment 1.
- 3.2 During the review of the template, it was suggested that all the information should be in a single list as this will make it easier for Suppliers to load the information onto their systems. It was agreed that Supplier Working Group members should feedback to ElectraLink on how they would like the information in the notification template to be presented.

Action 10/02: Suppliers

- 3.3 ElectraLink will then update the template based on the feedback received.

Action 10/03: ElectraLink

4 DISCUSSION ON CONFIDENTIALITY CLAUSE

- 4.1 The Working Group noted the advice that the DCUSA Legal consultant had provided on the DCUSA Schedule 8 confidentiality clause. This is provided as Attachment 2.
- 4.2 It was observed that where there is an issue on the network, Network Operators do not wish for Suppliers to be passing information on to customers when they do not have the required knowledge to accurately explain the situation. The confidentiality clause ensures that the right message is put across to the customer by the party that is best placed to explain the issue, i.e. by the Network Operator.
- 4.3 It was highlighted that DNOs do seek to keep customers updated where there is a loss of Supply, therefore, incidents and faults on the network are communicated upon already.
- 4.4 The group agreed to update the confidentiality clause such that information can be marked as confidential and any information which is not marked as such can be shared with third parties. The updated clause is shown in the DCP 204 legal text provided as Attachment 3.

5 REVIEW OF LEGAL TEXT

- 5.1 The Working Group reviewed the comments that had been received via email on the DCP 204 legal text; these comments are provided as Attachment 4. The group then walked through the DCP 204 legal text and agreed amendments to it. The latest version of the legal text, which includes amendments agreed at the meeting as redlined text, is provided as Attachment 3.
- 5.2 During the review of the legal text an attendee highlighted that the terms “Supplier” and “User” are used interchangeably throughout Schedule 8 and suggested that the legal text should be clarified. The Working Group member explained that in paragraph 5.2 a distinction is made between Users and Suppliers, namely a “Supplier” may go in to an LMA and at that point need to take some action. A “User” is actually operating in the LMA (i.e. is responsible for an MPAN in an affected area) and will need to take action. JL took an action to review instances of “Supplier” and “User” in the legal text to confirm that they are correct.

Action 10/04: JL

- 5.3 It was also agreed that the DCP 204 Change Report should be updated to clarify the difference between “Supplier” and “User”.

Action 10/05: ElectraLink

- 5.4 ElectraLink took an action to check that the legal text is baselined against the current version of the DCUSA.

Action 10/06: ElectraLink

6 PRESENTATION ON RADIO TELESWITCH ARRANGEMENTS

- 6.1 AM presented to the group on the current Radio Teleswitch (RTS) arrangements; this presentation is provided as Attachment 5.
- 6.2 It was explained that within network areas there is a desire to stagger load switching times. The use of the RTS to achieve this is a historical set up that is not governed within any existing code.

- 6.3 When customers move to Half Hourly (HH) settlement they will not have a Standard Settlement Configuration (SSC), as SSCs do not exist in HH settlement, and thus the customer may lose out as their switching times may be lost. Additionally, Distributors will have no visibility of when load will be switched.
- 6.4 In his slides, AM proposed that to address this issue the last two digits of the MPANs could be used to allocate MPANs to switching groups.
- 6.5 Attendees reviewed the RTS Agreement dated September 1999. A copy of this agreement is provided as Attachment 6. It was noted that switching group codes are referenced in the RTS agreement; however, these are examples rather than actual groups. The actual groups are defined in Market Domain Data (MDD).
- 6.6 It was observed that whilst the staggering of load switching times is a network requirement, Suppliers would like to know how the issue will be addressed so that they can incorporate this into their systems and processes as they prepare for the smart rollout. The Working Group agreed that this topic was outside of scope of DCP 204.
- 6.7 It was noted that the Standing Issues Group (SIG) discussed this issue at its meeting on 19 December 2014. At this meeting CA took an action to investigate the governance arrangements of the industry codes (MRA, BSC, DCUSA or the smart metering programme) and determine if there is a particular governance arrangement that this issue would best sit under.
- 6.8 PM also offered to raise the issue at the small supplier forum, to make smaller suppliers aware of the RTS arrangements and the difficulties around replicating them under smart.

7 REVIEW OF DRAFT CHANGE REPORT

- 7.1 The Working Group walked through the DCP 204 Change Report and agreed amendments to it. The latest version of the report, with amendments agreed at the meeting shown as tracked changes, is provided as Attachment 7.
- 7.2 During the review of the Change Report the following actions were taken:
- Add information on the SIG issue to the report;
 - Add an executive summary to the report which captures the issue and the key changes.

Action 10/07: ElectraLink

8 WORK PLAN

- 8.1 The next steps for DCP 204 were agreed as follows:
- Working Group members to complete outstanding actions prior to the next DCP 204 Working Group meeting; and
 - Working Group to meet on Tuesday 24 February 2015 to finalise the DCP 204 Change Report and legal text.

9 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

9.1 There were no items of any other business.

10 NEXT MEETING

10.1 The next DCP 204 Working Group meeting is at 10:00am on Tuesday 24 February 2015 at ElectraLink's office.

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

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
08/03	Consider the confidentiality clause (paragraph 9.1) and how it might better be worded.	All	On going
09/01	Provide information on why Load Managed Areas (LMAs) exist so that this information can be captured in the Change Report (e.g. investment would be needed in new subsea cable).	DNOs	On going
09/02	Review position on the provision of MPAN data and feedback back to the Working Group. If a list of MPANs is desired then the feedback should include how this information will be used.	Suppliers	On going
10/01	Check that there are no confidentiality issues with sending all LMA MPANs to Suppliers (rather than just sending them to the registered Supplier). Also, consider whether this data should be encrypted.	All	
10/02	Feedback to ElectraLink on how you would like the information in the LMA notification template to be presented.	Suppliers	
10/03	Update the notification template based on the feedback received.	ElectraLink	
10/04	Review instances of "Supplier" and "User" in the legal text to confirm that they are correct.	John Lawton	

10/05	Update the Change Report to clarify the difference between “Supplier” and “User”.	ElectraLink	
10/06	Check that the legal text is baselined against the current version of the DCUSA.	ElectraLink	
10/07	Update the Change Report as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add information on the SIG issue to the report; • Add an executive summary to the report which captures the issue and the key changes. 	ElectraLink	

ACTIONS AGREED CLOSED AT THE MEETING

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
07/04	Prepare a strawman template for circulation to Suppliers that would be used to provide information on LMAs in a defined format.	Chris Allanson and ElectraLink	Closed
09/03	DNO Working Group members to determine whether new connections should be considered under DCP 204, to reduce the risk that this area may need to be reviewed again in a couple of years.	DNOs	Closed
09/04	Review the draft Standing Issues Group (SIG) issues form and provide comments via email. The issue will	All	Closed

	then be raised at the SIG meeting on 19 December 2014.		
09/05	Raise with the SMICoP Governance Board the suggestion that a SMICOP Change Request should be raised to make sure that before a meter exchange is carried out the customer's heating and switching requirements are left on an appropriate arrangement.	Kevin Woollard	<p>Raised at the November SMICoP meeting. There is an action on SGB members to consider.</p> <p>It was also discussed at the SIG on 19 December. CA has taken an action to produce a paper on where existing governance sits, to be presented at the next SIG meeting.</p> <p>Closed</p>
09/06	Seek advice from the DCUSA legal advisor on how best to phrase the Schedule 8 confidentiality clause such that Suppliers have the ability to communicate with customers affected by load management but not to publish information on their websites and circulate it widely.	ElectraLink	Closed
09/07	Replicate clauses 5.4(e) and 5.4(f) of the legal text in section 7.4	ElectraLink	Closed
09/08	Submit suggested legal text changes via email	Paul Saker	Closed