

Minutes

Meeting Name	DCP 008 Working Group	Meeting Number	004
Meeting Date	11 January 2008	Meeting Time	10.30
Meeting Venue	ElectraLink, 289 – 293 Regent St, London, W1B 2HJ		

In Attendance

Attendee

Nigel Menzies (Chair)
Carole Pitkeathley
Duncan Mills
Glenn Sheern
Jen Daines
John Dallimore
John Lawton
Kevin Woollard (Teleconference)
Ljuban Milicevic
Lynne Hargrave
Mike Smith
Peter Waymont
Tom Chevalier
Elizabeth Lawlor (Secretary)

Representing

EDF Energy
energywatch
Ofgem
E.ON UK
RWE Npower
ScottishPower Energy Retail
Electricity North West Ltd
British Gas
Ofgem
CE Electric
Western Power Distribution
EDF Energy Networks
Association of Meter Operators
DCUSA Limited

1 ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 The minutes of the last meeting were approved subject to a distinction being made between John Dallimore and Jen Daines in the drafting.
- 1.2 A summary of new and outstanding actions is attached as Appendix A.

2 DCP 008 – STATUS UPDATE

- 2.1 NM provided the group with an update on the status and progression of DCP 008. NM reminded the group that it had been tasked with reviewing a proposal that sets out a process for managing the provision of urgent metering services in circumstances where a Distributor either goes out to deal with a no supply call and subsequently identifies that it is a meter fault, or identifies on the telephone that there is a metering fault but that the caller is a special needs customer and it is outside normal working hours. NM noted that some parties had questioned whether it was in the scope of the DCUSA to consider UMETS but that the Panel had determined DCP 008 was in scope and asked the Working Group to develop the change. NM noted that unless the proposal was withdrawn by the originator the Panel was obliged to put the DCP to the vote and as a Part 1 matter the Authority will be required to determine on the change.
- 2.2 NM reminded the group that some DNO and IDNO parties had put forward clear views about the ability to provide a UMETS service where businesses do not currently provide metering services. NM noted that some Suppliers have raised concerns about being obligated to use DNO services when they have commercial arrangements in place with MOPs. NM noted that that the group had received little input from smaller suppliers but that they were

unlikely to have commercial relationships in place. NM noted that energywatch had raised more fundamental issues regarding UMETS provisions as a whole and their scope within the DCUSA.

- 2.3 Working Group members agreed that all the issues had been fully discussed during previous meetings and were understood by members. NM recommended that the issues should be not be re-opened for further debate but informed the group that the discussions and views of all parties would be fully reflected in the final Change Report.
- 2.4 DM noted that at the last meeting he had asked DNO members if they could provide any indicative information regarding the cost of providing a UMETS service. DM noted that it would be especially helpful to understand the potential costs for those Distributors not currently providing metering service. LH stated that Suppliers should also be asked to provide the costs of setting up / appointing a 24/7 MOP service to manage the UMETS process. PW noted that the comparing the Supplier and DNO costs would not be a like for like comparison. DM re-iterated that any cost indications would be helpful and asked members to assess whether they would be able to provide any information to Ofgem as part of the assessment process.

Action: All

- 2.5 The Working Group noted that following discussions at previous meetings there were four options to consider:

- The original Change Proposal;
- The revised drafting as developed by the group;
- An alternative variation put forward by E.ON UK; and
- A recommendation of 'no change' and reliance on commercial arrangements.

3 REVIEW OF ENERGYWATCH LETTER TO OFGEM

- 3.1 CP informed the group that she had written to Ofgem to ask whether it could advise the Working Group on whether it deemed the DCP to be in or out of scope of the DCUSA and whether it was considering introducing a licence obligation to mandate the provision of UMETS. DM confirmed that Ofgem would be providing a formal response to energywatch but noted that its initial view was that DCP 008 could be considered within the scope of the DCUSA and that the assessment and development of the DCP should continue. DM reminded members that when the Authority determines on the DCP it will evaluate it against the DCUSA objectives but also its wider statutory duties. DM noted that it was possible that a DCP that was deemed neutral against the DCUSA objectives could be approved if it better facilitated wider objectives such as the Customer experience. DM confirmed that Ofgem was not currently considering any licence changes to facilitate the introduction of a UMETS obligation. CP agreed that she would circulate the formal response from Ofgem to the group for information.

Action: CP

4 REVIEW OF COMMENTS LOG & REVISED LEGAL DRAFTING

- 4.1 The Working Group began its review of the comments log and assessment of v1.1 of the drafting (the updated comments log is attached as Appendix B).
- 4.2 Members noted that v1.1 seeks to accommodate a two level obligation – the provision of a minimum basic service and the option for Distributors who wish to provide an enhanced service to do so. GS expressed concern that Suppliers may be obliged to accept an enhanced service from DNOs if the service is drafted into the DCUSA. GS noted that if Distributors can choose whether or not to offer a service beyond the basic credit meter, Suppliers also need to maintain the right to choose whether or not to accept the enhanced service.
- 4.3 JL noted that the provision of a basic service in the DCUSA and the development of bi-lateral agreements for enhanced services may be the best way to accommodate GS's proposal but noted that this moved away from the consensus reached at the last meeting. The group noted that the provision of a basic service would work on the principle that all Distributors would provide the same level of service and all Suppliers would be obliged to accept it.
- 4.4 TC noted that the objective of the AMO is to promote competition in metering services and expressed concern that the development of UMETS provisions outside commercial arrangements could undermine such competition. TC noted that if Suppliers or Distributors wished to contract with MOPs to provide UMETS there would be willing service providers. John Dallimore suggested that given the low volumes associated with UMETS there was limited scope for competition for the provision of that sole service. TC recommended that the DCUSA should only set out the minimum requirements and that any additional services should be developed on a bi-lateral commercial agreement outside of the DCUSA. The Working Group concluded that it needs to determine how to take the drafting forward at its next meeting.
- 4.5 The Working Group noted that it needed to address some definitions within the drafting. It agreed that the definition of 'Working Hours' / 'Out of Hours' would refer to Regulation 10 of the ESPR. The Working Group agreed that the definition of vulnerable customer needed careful consideration noting that industry agreements and participants use differing criteria. TC recommended that the Working Group should not seek to re-define the term but agree on an appropriate existing definition. The Working Group proposed that the definition contained within the Priority Services Register was suitable but that parties should maintain the ability to be flexible and use discretion at the point of taking a call. DM took an action to discuss the definition with the Social Affairs team at Ofgem and provide a view to the next meeting. JL and John Dallimore reminded the group that if the drafting determined that Distributors should provide a UMETS service to all customer types a definition would not be required.

Action: DM

5 ADDITIONAL AREAS OF CONSIDERATION

5.1 The group agreed that its next meeting it will need to consider the following areas in more detail:

- Rationale for the applicable DCUSA Objectives
- Definition of Special Needs Customers
- Drafting options - Scenario 5 / provision of basic service / bi-lateral arrangements
- Costs Analysis – implementation and ongoing management
- Communications methods – Electronic D0150 Flow or Manual Flows
- Impact on other industry codes / agreements

6 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 There were no additional items of business.

7 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

7.1 The next meeting of the DCP 008 Working Group will convene at 10.30am on 25 January 2008 at ElectraLink, London

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	Owner
02/02	Consider how energywatch would like special needs / vulnerable customers to be defined Ongoing – CP to provide view at the next meeting	AS
03/03	Investigate whether Distributors would need to be 'Qualified' under the BSC to carry out UMETS Work. Ongoing – TC indicated that BSCP514 – Meter Operations, section 6.3.5 which recognises LDSOs changing meters for 'Safety/Urgent Metering Services'.	NM
04/01	Parties to assess whether they will be able to provide any indicative costs for the provision of a UMETS service to Ofgem.	All
04/02	CP agreed that she would circulate the formal response from Ofgem to the group for information	CP
04/03	Provide a view on the appropriate definition of special needs / vulnerable customers	DM

Closed Actions

Action No.	Description	Owner
03/01	Update meeting 002 minutes to reflect that Ofgem was interested to ensure that the safety provisions are adequately covered by DCP 008. Minutes updated accordingly.	EL
03/02	Invite Tom Chevalier to participate in the group as an industry expert TC added to group membership.	EL
03/04	Work up the revised drafting for two DCP 008 variations and circulate to members in advance of the next meeting Versions issued	JL
03/05	Consider the impact of UMETS issues impact on NHH business customers.	CP

	CP confirmed that for the 2.5 million NHH small business customer sites energywatch received 1665 meter related queries between April 06 and Sept 07 which equated to 5-6% of the total NHH small business queries. CP confirmed that the figures cannot be broken down to indicate fault type or whether the issues related to urgent metering services.	
--	---	--