

# DCP 195A Review Working Group Minutes

<b>Meeting Name</b>	DCP 195A Review Working Group
<b>Meeting Number</b>	01
<b>Date</b>	16 March 2015
<b>Time</b>	10:00
<b>Venue</b>	ElectraLink (Grafton House, 2-3 Golden Square, London W1F 9HR)

Attendee	Company
Kevin Woollard [KW] (Chair)	British Gas
Andy Clay [AC]	DECC
Andy Jones [AnJ]	EDF Energy
Andy Jones [AJo]	npower
Dave Brogden [DB]	SSE Power Distribution
Martin Murphy [MM] (teleconference)	Northern Powergrid
Mike Ross [MR]	SSE
Neil Copeland [NC]	Ofgem
Paul Morris [PM]	UKPN
Paul Smith [PS]	Power Data Associates
Peter Waymont [PW]	UKPN
Richard Hill [RH]	British Gas
Tim Newton [TN]	E.on
Tony Savka [TS] (teleconference)	ENWL
Rosalind Timperley [RT] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink

## 1 ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Graham Brewster (WPD), Dave Wright (npower) and Mick Hickling (Northern Powergrid).

## 2 COMPETITION LAWS DO'S AND DON'TS

- 2.1 The Working Group agreed to act in accordance with the terms set out in the DCUSA "Competition Law Dos and Don'ts".

## 3 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR

- 3.1 KW was appointed as the Chair of the Working Group.

## 4 WORKING GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE

- 4.1 The Working Group noted the group Terms of Reference (ToR). All Working Group members agreed to the terms set out in the document.

## 5 REVIEW OF DCP195A KEY PRINCIPLES

- 5.1 The Working Group walked through the DCP 195A legal text. This text is provided as Attachment 1 and includes Working Group comments added over the course of the meeting.

### New Definitions

- 5.2 During the review of the legal text the Working Group discussed the new definitions that DCP 195A added to the DCUSA. It was highlighted that with regards to the Category A, B and C definitions, a new DCUSA Change Proposal<sup>1</sup> has been raised that may impact upon these definitions. It was noted that this was out of scope for the Working Group but could result in a future change.

### Category A Situations

- 5.3 It was observed that market participants are experiencing a number of issues around Category A situations, namely:
- Significantly more Category A situations are being reported than expected, which may be due to differing interpretations of what should be considered as a Category A situation. It was suggested that guidance on this could improve consistency in reporting.
  - Due to the dangerous nature of the situation, the principle of a Category A situation is that the Meter Operator remains on site until the Distributor arrives. However, in many instances this does not occur. It was noted that if the Meter Operator was not to stay on site then this would be a Meter Operator Code of Practice Agreement (MOCOPA) non-compliance.
  - There should be clearer guidance on making safe and leaving site as this will avoid differing interpretations.

- 5.4 PS took an action to raise the above points with the MOCOPA Review Group.

**Action 01/01: PS**

- 5.5 It was observed that the Distributor's ability to access a site can impact on their ability to meet the Category A Service Level Agreement (SLA) of responding within three hours. The group noted that the Meter Operator remaining on site would help to ensure that access could be gained. It was agreed that ideally there should be a physical handover between the Meter Operator and the Distributor.
- 5.6 PM took an action to draft a CP to amend the DCUSA to say that where the Meter Operator does not stay on site during a Category A situation, then the obligation on the DNO to attend site within three hours does not apply.

**Action 01/02: PM**

### Use of Data Flows

- 5.7 While reviewing Clause 30.53.B of the legal text, it was suggested that to create consistency in the use of the data flows it would be useful to walk through some example scenarios and clarify what would happen in each scenario. For example, if contact details are not provided to the Distributor, what code should be used in the rejection flow? The group observed that this area is potentially more relevant for the Master Registration Agreement (MRA) than DCUSA.
- 5.8 PM agreed to prepare strawman for circulation to Working Group members setting out some scenarios.

**Action 01/03: PM**

- 5.9 An attendee highlighted that it would be useful if there were a way of identifying where one issue affects multiple properties. For example, if a group of three flats are visited and it is

---

<sup>1</sup> DCP 235 – Provision of Service Termination Equipment

found that there is an issue with the service termination then three data flows regarding this issue would be sent (i.e. one for each flat). The group noted that it would be useful to know that only one Distributor job is needed to fix all three issues, however, the data flows are not set up for this.

#### Agreed Appointment Dates

- 5.10 The group discussed the requirement in the DCP 195A legal text for Distributors to notify the Supplier and Meter Operator of agreed appointment dates within 5 Working Days of the appointment being agreed. It was noted that WPD, ENWL and Northern Powergrid are currently sending this information. SSE plan to start sending the information from 24 March and UKPN are currently sending Category B information.
- 5.11 It was queried what Suppliers were using the appointment information for. In response, attendees noted that the information will make it possible to align Distributor and Meter Operator appointments, which will enhance the customer experience.
- 5.12 The Working Group noted that Clause 30.5D.5 releases the DNO from their obligation to meet Category B SLAs in situations where they have been unable to agree an appointment with the customer, provide that they have made “reasonable endeavours”. The group asked that the Ofgem representative provide clarification on what Ofgem considers to be “reasonable endeavours” and “best endeavours”.

**Action 01/04: NC**

#### Housekeeping Change

- 5.13 The group noted that the word “will” was missing from Clause 30.5D.4:  
*“30.5D.4 Where the Company and the Connectee are unable to agree an appointment date that falls within the Prescribed Period for Clauses 30.5A.4(b) or 30.5B.2(b), but they are able to agree one outside of that period, then the Company will be deemed to have met the Service Level.”*

- 5.14 ElectraLink took an action to add this to the DCUSA Panel housekeeping log.

**Action 01/05: ElectraLink**

## **6 SUPPLIER ROLL OUT REPORTING TEMPLATES**

---

- 6.1 The Working Group discussed the Supplier rollout forecast reporting templates. It was highlighted that not all Suppliers have provided Distributors with their roll out reporting forecasts.
- 6.2 For those reports that have been received, it was noted that they have slightly different formats making it harder to collate them. The group observed that the reason for this was that some Suppliers had used the DCUSA template whilst others had uses the template prepared by DECC.
- 6.3 The group reviewed the DECC and DCUSA templates and noted that whilst they were not identical, the differences were structural rather than the content being different. It was agreed that the DCUSA template should be amended to align with the DECC template.

- 6.4 The group noted that the dates for the publication of the DECC reporting template do not align to the dates for the DCUSA template. AC took an action to send Electralink the latest DECC template and to confirm the DECC report dates.

**Action 01/06: AC**

- 6.5 Once this information is received, ElectraLink should update the DCUSA template to match the DECC template. This updated template should then be issued to DCUSA Parties, highlighting that Suppliers have obligation to populate template. It was also agreed that the covering email should contain the following text:

*"If you missed the cut off for this quarters report submission, you should send the DCUSA tab your next set of DECC rollout forecasts to DCUSA Contract Managers too. The date that the DECC reports are due is TBC."*

**Action 01/07: ElectraLink**

- 6.6 The Working Group agreed that it would be preferable to align the DCUSA smart meter rollout reporting dates to the DECC reporting dates, to reduce the burden on Parties. KW took an action to raise a DCUSA CP seeking to do this.

**Action 01/08: KW**

- 6.7 An attendee queried whether it had been explained to small Suppliers that they are required to provide smart meter rollout forecasts. In response, the representative from DECC noted that this had been raised at the DECC Small Suppliers forum.
- 6.8 It was highlighted that if the number of notified Category A and B situations exceeds 2% of the number of aggregate smart meter installation forecasts across all Supplier Parties, then the Distributor is released from its obligation to meet the SLAs for obligations beyond the 2% level. If not all Suppliers are providing their rollout forecasts this will mean that the 2% threshold is calculated based on a lower number than it otherwise would be.
- 6.9 The DECC represented questioned whether there had been any consideration of centralised reporting. In response, it was explained that this area had been discussed during the development of DCP 195A and it had been decided that for the time being DNOs should collate the rollout reporting templates individually.

## **7 IDNO QUERY**

---

- 7.1 The group reviewed a query that had been raised by an IDNO party via email asking for confirmation on whether IDNOs are required to report on their performance against the SLAs. The Party explained that DCUSA clause 30.5F.1 states :

*"Starting with the Quarter commencing on 1 April 2015, the Company will produce a report in accordance with Part 3 of Schedule 24 for its Distribution Services Area, and in respect of each Quarter. The Company will send that report to the User within 55 Working Days after the end of that Quarter."*

- 7.2 Based on the definition of "Distribution Services Area" it was the Party's view that IDNOs are not required to report on their SLA performance.
- 7.3 The Working Group considered this query and noted that "Distribution Services Area" is defined in such a way that it does not encompass IDNOs or out of area DNOs. This means that IDNOs and out of area DNOs have an obligation to meet the SLAs but no obligation to report on their SLA performance.
- 7.4 It was noted that a DCUSA CP would need to be raised to oblige IDNO Parties to produce SLA reports. The group observed that there is a relatively low number of IDNO MPANs relative to

DNO MPANs. It was also noted that the number of IDNO interventions was likely to be lower than in DNO areas due to the networks being relatively new.

- 7.5 It was agreed that the group should not progress this area as part of the DCP 195A review group. It was highlighted to attendees that a Supplier Party could choose to raise a CP to oblige IDNOs to report on SLA performance outside of the work of the review group should the choose to do so.

## **8 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DCUSA PANEL**

---

- 8.1 ElectraLink took an action to provide the DCUSA Panel with a written summary of the progress of the Working Group. It was noted that there are no specific recommendations for the DCUSA Panel.

**Action 01/09:** ElectraLink

## **9 NEXT STEPS**

---

- 9.1 The group reviewed the actions that had been taken during the course of the meeting and agreed that the outcomes of these actions should be reviewed via email.
- 9.2 In addition PM offered to circulate a template relating to Category A and B situations which he had prepared, for review by group members.

**Action 01/10:** PM

- 9.3 It was agreed that the next meeting of the group should be held in June 2015.

## **10 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

---

- 10.1 One DNO attendee highlighted they were receiving copies of the D0135<sup>2</sup> flow sent by a particular Data Collector to the System Fault Information Centre (SFIC). The attendee asked that they not be sent this flow as it is not relevant to the Network Operator. It was noted that the use of the data flows sits under the MRA.
- 10.2 Another attendee highlighted that the Operational Delivery Group (ODG) plans to start to review some of the feedback about how the fault resolution processes are working out in the field (e.g. the types and nature of issues reported and whether there is any cross referencing that can happen) and looking at how this can be used to improve reports. The group will be an ODG subgroup of Suppliers and DNOs and will be set up later in the year, should any DCP 195A Review Group members be interested in attending.

## **11 NEXT MEETING**

---

- 11.1 The next meeting is scheduled for 10:00am on Monday, 1 June 2015 via webinar.

---

<sup>2</sup> D0135 - Asset Condition Report

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

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/01	Raise the Working Group's comments on Category A situations with the MOCOPA Review Group	PS	
01/02	Draft a CP to amend the DCUSA to say that where the Meter Operator does not stay on site during a Category A situation, then the obligation on the DNO to attend site within three hours does not apply.	PM	
01/03	Prepare a strawman document for circulation to Working Group members setting out some scenarios around the use of the data flows. For example, if contact details are not provided to the Distributor, what code should be used in the rejection flow?	PM	
01/04	Provide clarification on what Ofgem considers to be "reasonable endeavours" and "best endeavours".	NC	
01/05	Add missing "will" in Clause 30.5D.4 to the DCUSA housekeeping log.	ElectraLink	
01/06	Send Electralink the latest DECC template and confirm the DECC report dates.	AC	
01/07	Update the DCUSA template to match the DECC template. This updated template should then be issued to DCUSA Parties, highlighting that Suppliers have obligation to populate template.	ElectraLink	
01/08	Draft a CP to align the DCUSA smart meter rollout reporting dates to the DECC reporting dates.	KW	
01/09	Provide the DCUSA Panel with a written summary of the progress of the Working Group.	ElectraLink	
01/10	Circulate template relating to Category A and B situations	PM	