

Minutes

Meeting Name	DCP 010 Working Group	Meeting Number	003
Meeting Date	04 February 2008	Meeting Time	14.30
Meeting Venue	ElectraLink, 289 – 293 Regent St, London, W1B 2HJ		

In Attendance

Attendee

Rosie McGlynn (Chair)
 Glenda Simons (Teleconference)
 Glenn Sheern (Teleconference)
 Jacqueline Gehrman (Teleconference)
 John Lawton (Teleconference)
 Tony Savka (Teleconference)
 John Lees (Teleconference)
 Kevin Woollard (Teleconference)
 Nigel Nash (Teleconference)
 Melinda Anderson (Teleconference)
 Peter Waymont (Teleconference)
 Brian O' Shea (Secretary)

Representing

EDF Energy Customers
 The Electricity Networks Company
 E.ON UK
 Scottish Power Energy Retail
 Electricity North West Ltd
 Electricity North West Ltd
 RWE Npower
 British Gas
 Ofgem
 Ofgem
 EDF Energy Networks
 DCUSA Limited

1 ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 The minutes of the previous meeting were approved without amendment.
- 1.2 The working group discussed the open actions and agreed to close actions 01/04, 02/01, 02/03, 020/04 and 02/05. Action 01/03 is still ongoing.
- 1.3 Action 02/02 was discussed and amended to reflect an action on John Lawton to circulate copies of the ENA process which provides details for when information is distributed.

Action: John Lawton

2 DEFINITION OF LOAD BLOCK

- 2.1 RM identified that the issue to be resolved was whether to include a definition of Load Block and Alpha Identifier within the DCUSA or alternatively to include a cross reference to the defined term within the Electricity Supply Emergency Code ("ESEC").
- 2.2 Having discussed the issue and the merits of each proposal the group resolved to include the following definition of Load Block, as provided by PW, within the DCUSA. The definition to be provided to Wragge's for inclusion within the drafting.

Action: BOS

Load Block - means a geographic grouping of customers within a Distribution Services Area for the purpose of applying rota disconnections, as more fully described in the Electricity Supply Emergency Code from time to time.

- 2.3 The group noted the comments raised by NN regarding potential link between the requirement to define the Load Block and the Paragraph 13 amendments. The Group considered that both these items are mutually exclusive. The Group further noted that if the definition of Load Block within the ESEC changes a mirror change maybe required to the definition within DCUSA.

3 PART 1 MATTER

- 3.1 John Lawton presented his comment to the group and identified that as DCP is considered to be a Part 1 matter a change is required to Clause 9.5.3 to reflect this position. The group concurred with the assessment and agreed both the inclusion of the proposed drafting in the Change Pack and the provision of the revised drafting to Wragge & Co for their approval and consolidation within the final legal text.

Action: BOS

9.5.3 Schedule 2A (Mandatory Terms for Contracts), Schedule 2B (National Terms of Connection), ~~and~~ Paragraph 6.1 of Schedule 5 (Disputes Under Approval and Permission Procedures) [and Paragraph 13 of Schedule 8 \(Notification and Publication of Rota Load Block Alpha Identifiers\)](#); and

4 PARAGRAPH 13 AMENDMENTS

- 4.1 John Lees outlined the rationale behind the comment raised by Npower and the potential ambiguity around the interpretation of the 40 Working Days requirement. The group discussed the matter and agreed that a plain English rationale of the intent of the change would be provided to Wragge & Co who would be directed to reflect such intent in the drafting. The agreed intent is that after the 40 Working Days period has elapsed Suppliers will include the relevant data on the next invoice to be issued to the customer. The following text is to be provided to Wragge for their considered opinion as to whether it meets the agreed intent.

Action: PW

13. NOTIFICATION AND PUBLICATION OF ~~ROTA~~-LOAD BLOCK ALPHA IDENTIFIERS

13.1 During July of each year, the Company shall provide to the User (where it is a Supplier Party), in the format specified in Schedule [X], the Alpha Identifier of the Rota Block for each of the post code areas within which Customers have connections to the Company's Distribution System.

13.2 The User shall, within 40 Working Days of receipt of each Alpha Identifier provided under ~~Paragraph~~ 13.1 that is relevant to one of its Customers, take reasonable steps to [prepare to](#) communicate that Alpha Identifier to that Customer. Where practical, the Alpha Identifier shall be displayed on the front top third of the Customer's next and subsequent invoices or schedules, and shall be set out as a single letter contained in a square box.

- 4.2 It was also agreed that the Change Report would include a plain English version of the intent of the group as regards the 40 Working Day deadline.

Action: BOS

- 4.3 The group considered the inconsistent use of terms such as Invoice, Bill, Statement etc and agreed that some clarity and standardisation of term was desirable. NN noted that the use of "Bill" is a defined term within the Supply Licence. PW noted that "Invoice" was a readily understandable term. The Group agreed to seek legal advice from Wragge & Co of a standard definition for the purposes of Paragraph 13.

Action: PW

- 4.4 The working group also considered the comment provided by John Lawton regarding the misallocation of post codes to Load Blocks and the unavoidable nature of such misallocations due to shortcomings of the current technologies. The group considered this issue and it was noted that the Suppliers will publish such information as provided by the DNO's and will not take on either an explicit or implicit obligation to validate such data. The group agreed to seek legal opinion on the proposed additional wording, as detailed below and specifically on the implications of the insertion of the reference to Good Industry Practice. In addition legal opinion would be sought to confirm that no obligation was being placed on Suppliers to carry out any data validation on data supplied by DNO's.

Action: PW

The Company will provide Load Block information in line with Good Industry Practice. -, however there will be a small number of misallocation of post codes to Load Blocks, and is unavoidable with the current state of technology"

5 EVENT LOG

- 5.1 John Lawton outlined the rationale supporting his comment and detailed that as there would be an exchange on information between two parties the Event Log would need to be updated to reflect this communication. The group noted that a separate DCUSA project is to be initiated to review the Event Log and considered that the issue identified is addressed within that project.

Action: J Lawton

- 5.2 The group then discussed whether the Data Items should be included in a separate schedule to the DCUSA or included within the legal drafting. The merits of both options were discussed as was the rationale for defining the data items. It was agreed, given the relatively simple nature and the low number of data items that a definition within the legal best would be the most effective solution. It was agreed that the legal text should reflect agreed position of ".....Post Code followed by

Alpha Identifier and data will be provided in electronic format which is currently a CD.....". Wragge & Co will be asked to reflect such required intent in the legal drafting.

Action: PW

- 5.3 In addition the group agreed that the Change Report would clearly set out the agreed data sequence and method of communication.

Action: BOS

6 DCP 010 TIMETABLE

- 6.1 PW confirmed that he would push for Wragge and Co to provide the legal drafting by the 8 February with such legal drafting circulated to WG members thereafter for comment.
- 6.2 RM noted that as the outstanding major issues had been resolved it was unlikely that another meeting would be required. A meeting would only be required where one or more members fundamentally disagreed with the drafting provided by Wragge & Co. It was expected that any minor drafting issues would be resolved through email correspondence, collated and managed by the Secretariat.
- 6.3 The group agreed that the aim was to table the Change Report at the DCUSA Panel meeting on 20 February 2008 and the following timetable would apply.

Activity	Due Date
Change Report presented to Panel	20 February 08
Change Report issued to Parties for Voting	21 February 08
Ofgem determination period	16 April 08
Implementation	26 June 08

7 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 7.1 There were no additional items of business.

8 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- 8.1 No future meetings of the Working Group have been convened.

Appendix A: Summary of Actions

Open Actions

Action No.	Description and Status	Owner
01/03	Speak with the ENA to determine if it can provide iDNOs with the current version of the CD 10/01/08: PW to take forward with Robert Friel 05/04/08: Ongoing	PW
02/02	Speak to ENA to discuss: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed date of annual update Potential for 2008 update Data format / delivery mechanisms Role of IDNOs 05/04/08: JL to distribute relevant ENA process which details requirement for when information is provided.	John Lawton
03/01	Provide Wragge's with agreed definition of Load Block	BOS
03/02	Provide Wragge's with proposed revised drafting to Clause 9.5.3	BOS
03/03	Provide and discuss with Wragge's whether proposed Clause 13 drafting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets intent on 40 Working Day requirements Agree defined term to be used and agree definition e.g. Invoice, Bill, Statement etc Assess implications of inclusion of Good Industry Practice within Para 13 Assess whether drafting places any data validation requirements on Suppliers 	PW
03/04	Provide and discuss with Wragge & Co sequence, format and method of communication of data items for inclusion in the legal drafting as opposed to inclusion in separate schedule.	PW
03/05	Ensure Change Report reflects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plain English version of intent on Para 13 40 Working Day requirement Ensure data sequence, format and method of communication is clearly identified in the Change Report 	BOS / EL
03/06	Ensure DCP010 is included within Event Log review	J Lawton

Closed Actions

Action No.	Description	Owner
01/01	Update ToR to reflect membership	EL
01/02	Send electronic copy of presentation to dcusa@electralink.co.uk for distribution to members	RF
01/03	Speak with the ENA to determine if it can provide iDNOs with the current version of the CD	RF
01/04	Confirm whether DNOs would be able to provide MPAN to Block mapping information	RF
01/04	Confirm whether DNOs would be able to provide MPAN to Block mapping information 10/01/08: PW to take forward with Robert Friel	PW
01/05	Re-draft DCP 010 to incorporate comments made by the group	GS
01/06	Draft Consultation Document for review by the group	RM
01/07	Issue Consultation to all DCUSA Parties, Ofgem and energywatch	EL
02/01	Discuss how to mitigate risks for site with no Post Code / Multiple Post Code areas	PW
02/03	Write to COG Members to highlight the progression of DCP 010 and the negative experience of ENC	PW
02/04	JG to discuss with her IT team the possibility of replacing the X which is currently populated with box where an Alpha ID has not yet been allocated to a post code	JG
02/05	Send proposed text for legal review and draft Change Report	EL