

# Minutes

<b>Meeting Name</b>	DCP 010 Working Group	<b>Meeting Number</b>	002
<b>Meeting Date</b>	10 January 2008	<b>Meeting Time</b>	10.30
<b>Meeting Venue</b>	ElectraLink, 289 – 293 Regent St, London, W1B 2HJ		

## In Attendance

### Attendee

Rosie McGlynn (Chair)  
 Glenda Simons  
 Glenn Sheern  
 Jacqueline Gehrman (Teleconference)  
 John Lawton (Teleconference)  
 John Lees  
 Kevin Woollard (Teleconference)  
 Lorraine Reddington  
 Nigel Nash  
 Peter Waymont  
 Elizabeth Lawlor (Secretary)

### Representing

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

## 1 ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 The minutes of the previous meeting were approved subject to an amendment to Section 4.3 to replace the word 'drafting' with 'DCUSA'. The Working Group was supportive of the requirement for Distributors to provide data to Suppliers being maintained with in Agreement but agreed that the DNO – IDNO relationship and the provision of data from DNOs to IDNOs should be managed outside the drafting until the implementation of DCUSA Section 2B.
- 1.2 The Working Group noted that DBERR had issued a letter to Suppliers who do not currently publish Rota Disconnection information on their bills asking them to commence activities for future publications. The Working Group noted that DBERR had asked Suppliers to update their billing processes in advance of the proposed implementation date of DCP 010. The Working Group agreed to consider the implementation date of the CP in line with the Consultation responses received from Parties.

## 2 DCP 010 CONSULTATION COMMENTS REVIEW

- 2.1 The group reviewed the comments received in response to the Consultation. The group noted that 9 Party Groups responded and that comments were also received from National Grid.
- 2.2 Question 1 - Does the proposed CP better facilitate the DCUSA Objectives?  
 The group noted that 100% of respondents felt that the proposed amendment better facilitates the DCUSA objectives and that the majority of respondents indicated that Objectives 1 and 3 were better facilitated.
- 2.3 Question 2 - Following the annual provision of data by DNOs, what implementation time is required by Suppliers to publish the block alpha identifiers on all bills? Members noted that Suppliers had indicated that

following the initial implementation they would require between 1 and 3 months to publish the data on customer bills. KW, John Lees and JG indicated that they could need up to six months to implement the change in the first instance for some customer types. The group agreed that the CP should obligate Suppliers to print the Alpha Identifier on bills within 40 Working Days of receiving the data and all members agreed that they were satisfied with the proposal. Members agreed that Distributors should be obliged to provide the data to Suppliers every July in order to ensure that the Alpha Identifier is available to customers in advance of the winter period.

- 2.4 Question 3 - How do you envisage the obligation being fulfilled by non-domestic or multi site customers? Members noted that respondents had indicated that non domestic and multi site customers may need alternative arrangements but that these could be managed by internal processes. The group agreed that the proposed solution would cover the majority of customers and that exceptions would be managed by workarounds such as communication via Account Managers and online web services. The Working Group agreed that the drafting would need to provide a carve-out to allow Suppliers to develop their own processes for some customer types. Members agreed that the drafting should not be too prescriptive but should ensure that the majority of customers were covered by the obligation.
- 2.5 Question 4 - Do you envisage any issues with the process for specific customer or bill types (e.g. pre-payment customers, online bills)? The Working Group noted that respondents indicated that processes could be adapted to ensure that pre-payment statements and online bills could include the Alpha Identifier in the majority of cases. The Working Group agreed not to specifically exclude such bill types from the process.
- 2.6 Question 5 - Is the description of the proposed position of the alpha identifier sufficient? The Working Group noted only one respondent did not feel that the description was sufficient and recommended that the DCUSA should prescribe that the identifier "must be directly under the address lines, so it can be easily and uniformly found by all customers". The Working Group agreed that there does need to be standard position for the information but concluded that the requirement to publish the identifier on the front top third of bill would provide adequate information for DNOs to answer customer enquiries and for enough detail to be published via national communications in the event of an emergency.
- 2.7 Question 6 - Should any customer groups (e.g. customers with a medical need, customers who use Braille or audio invoicing) be excluded from the requirement? The Working Group noted that Parties had mixed views and some had indicated that further assessment was needed. Some respondents indicated that they would deal with such customer types in the same way but others felt that significant changes would be required. JG noted that Suppliers already have standard emergency procedures in place for specialist customer groups and that any other changes to the bills may cause confusion or worry. The Working Group concluded that the drafting should be flexible enough to require the publication of the identifier on standard bill types but allow Suppliers to use reasonable steps to communicate in all other cases.
- 2.8 Question 7 - Are there any other alternative solutions that would better facilitate the DCUSA Objectives which you would like to be considered by

the DCP 010 Working Group? The Working Group noted that Electricity North West had submitted alternative drafting and agreed to discuss the drafting later in the agenda (see Section 3).

- 2.9 Question 8 - Please indicate if you expect to incur any costs to support the CP. The Working Group noted that 6 Parties had indicated that they would incur costs to implement the change but that in many cases work was already being undertaken and that all Parties were supportive of the proposal. The Working Group concluded that given the nature of the CP and the industry drivers to take the change forward the benefits of implementing the CP outweighed the potential cost to Parties.
- 2.10 Question 9 - Assuming that the solution is accepted, do you support the proposed implementation date of 26 June 2008? The Working Group noted that all but one respondent supported the implementation date although some parties had indicated that they may require derogations for particular customer types in the first instance. John Lawton informed the group that ENW considered that the implementation date should be delayed for pragmatic reasons - to ensure that DNOs have time to provide the data; that Suppliers have time to implement the process; and to await the implementation of DCP 012 (Section 2B).
- 2.11 The Working Group agreed that it was not the intention of DCP 010 to require Distributors to re-fresh their current data. The group also agreed that using the current data i.e. the most recently provided data to populate their systems would be acceptable outcome. The group considered that the responses from Suppliers had indicated that a June implementation was achievable for the majority of customers and in many cases work had already commenced. Glenn Sheern reminded the group that considering the view put forward by DBERR the work should not be delayed and it should be accepted that a small number of derogations may be necessary in the first instance. The Working Group concluded that the implementation date of 26 June 2008 was appropriate and achievable.
- 2.12 Question 10 - Please state any other comments or views on the Change Proposal. The Working Group noted that British Gas and Npower had indicated that the Block Codes should be aligned with Post Code rather than MPANs to reduce costs and simplify the process. However John Lees noted that there are some circumstances in which Post Codes cover more than one Distribution area and that there are some sites without Post Codes. JG informed the group that Scottish Power populates the field with 'X' if the Alpha Identifier is not known. Members recommended that the field should be left blank to avoid customers mistaking the X for their Alpha Identifier. PW took an action to discuss ways of mitigating the risks of confusion with the ENA. The Working Group noted RWE Npower's comments regarding Unmetered Sites and agreed that such sites were considered out of scope.
- Action: PW**  
**Action: JG**
- 2.13 Glenda Simons informed the group that there were still a number of issues outstanding with regard to the process to be followed by IDNOs. GS noted that IDNOs would need to know the format requirements for sending the data to the ENA. PW recommended that ENC obtain a copy of the latest disk and replicate the format. Members agreed that the data format for the provision of data to Suppliers should be specified within the DCUSA and

agreed to use the format currently in use and John Lawton took an action to discuss the format and delivery mechanism with the ENA and the impact of including IDNOs in the process.

**Action:** John Lawton

- 2.14 Glenda Simons also informed the group that ENC had made a number of enquiries to Distributors in order to agree the process for the transfer of data from DNOs to IDNOs outside of the DCUSA but had received a limited and negative response. GS noted that ENC favoured including the requirement in existing CUOSA contracts to ensure the obligation was maintained. PW took an action to write out to COG Members to highlight the progression of DCP 010 and the negative experience of ENC.

**Action:** PW

- 2.15 The Working Group noted the comments made by National Grid in support of the Change Proposal.

### **3 DCP 010 LEGAL DRAFTING**

- 3.1 The Working Group reviewed the legal drafting in the CP and the variation put forward by ENW in its consultation response. Members agreed that Distributors should provide data to the ENA for publication to Suppliers every July. John Lawton took an action to discuss the proposed timetable with the ENA and to ask the ENA whether it was planning to provide an update this year. KW asked whether the drafting should specify that Distributors send data to the ENA to prevent Suppliers receiving a disk from each Supplier. Members agreed that the current process is understood and did not need to be explicitly referenced in the DCUSA.

**Action:** John Lawton

- 3.2 Members agreed that the following text should be put forward for legal review:

#### ***13. NOTIFICATION AND PUBLICATION OF ROTA LOAD BLOCK ALPHA IDENTIFIERS.***

*13.1 Every July the Company shall provide to the User in the format specified in Schedule [X] of this agreement, the Alpha Identifier of the Rota Block for the post codes of all Customers connected to its Distribution System.*

*13.2 The User shall, within 40 Working Days of receipt of Alpha Identifier provided under paragraph 13.1, take reasonable steps to communicate it to its customers. Where practical, the Alpha Identifier shall be displayed on the front top third of the Customers next and subsequent invoices or schedules and shall be a single letter contained in a square box.*

- 3.3 The Working Group agreed that the data format for the provision of data to Suppliers should be set out in a new Schedule and that the terms 'Alpha Identifier' and 'Rota Block' should be defined in the DCUSA. Members noted that the terms are defined in the Electricity Supply Emergency Code and that the DCUSA should point to the existing definitions.
- 3.4 Glenn Sheern confirmed that he was satisfied with the proposed amendments and that the original CP could be modified accordingly. No further variations were put forward.

#### **4 DCP 010 CHANGE REPORT**

- 4.1 The Working Group instructed EL to draft the Change Report based on the matters agreed at the meeting. Members agreed that all categories of Party should be invited to vote on the CP and that it should be issued for a period of 10 Working Days. EL agreed to circulate the report to the group for review and sign-off week commencing 21 January 2008.

**Action:** EL

#### **5 DCP 010 TIMETABLE**

- 5.1 The group agreed that the CP would be progressed in accordance with the following timetable

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
Proposed drafting submitted for Legal Review	14 January 08
Draft Change Report issued for review by Working Group	21 January 08
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

#### **6 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- 6.1 There were no additional items of business.

#### **7 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

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

## Appendix A: Summary of Actions

This section provides details of actions placed at the meeting. The section is split into two sub-sections:

- New actions and progress against actions currently open; and
- Actions that were closed as a result of the meeting or a previous meeting.

### 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 <a href="#">10/01/08: PW to take forward with Robert Friel</a>	PW
01/04	Confirm whether DNOs would be able to provide MPAN to Block mapping information <a href="#">10/01/08: PW to take forward with Robert Friel</a>	PW
02/01	Discuss how to mitigate risks for site with no Post Code / Multiple Post Code areas	PW
02/02	Speak to ENA to discuss: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed date of annual update</li> <li>• Potential for 2008 update</li> <li>• Data format / delivery mechanisms</li> <li>• Role of IDNOs</li> </ul>	John Lawton
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

### Actions Agreed Closed This Meeting

Action No.	Description	Owner
01/01	Update ToR to reflect membership	EL
01/02	Send electronic copy of presentation to <a href="mailto:dcusa@electralink.co.uk">dcusa@electralink.co.uk</a> 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

01/05	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