

Minutes

Meeting Name	DCP 008 Working Group	Meeting Number	002
Meeting Date	26 October 2007	Meeting Time	10.30
Meeting Venue	ElectraLink, 289 – 293 Regent St, London, W1B 2HJ		

In Attendance

Attendee

Nigel Menzies (Chair)
Abid Sheikh (Teleconference)
Gill Burrage (Teleconference)
Jen Daines
John Dallimore (Teleconference)
John Lawton
Kevin Woollard
Lynne Hargrave
Mike Smith
Nicholas Rubin
Elizabeth Lawlor (Secretary)

Representing

EDF Energy
energywatch
SSE Distribution
RWE Npower
ScottishPower Energy Retail
United Utilities Electricity Ltd
British Gas
CE Electric
Western Power Distribution
Ofgem
DCUSA Limited

1 ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Glenn Sheern (E.ON UK), Mike Harding (The Electricity Network Company), Nicki Johnson (Central Networks) and Peter Waymont (EDF Energy Networks).
- 1.2 The minutes of the last meeting were approved subject to minor amendments to sections 4.3 and 5.7.

2 TERMS OF REFERENCE

- 2.1 The Working Group asked that the Terms of Reference be updated to reflect the new group membership.

ACTION: EL

3 UPDATE FROM DCUSA PANEL MEETING

- 3.1 NM informed members that he had attended the October Panel meeting to provide an update on the work being carried out by the group and to seek an extension to the definition period timetable. NM noted that the Panel was satisfied with the progress being made by the group and asked that NM report back to the November Panel meeting with a clear timetable for the completion of the work.

ACTION: NM

4 GAS POST-EMERGENCY METERING SERVICES

- 4.1 The group noted that following the last meeting Ofgem had issued a letter setting out guidelines for the provision of Post-Emergency Metering Services

(PEMS) in the gas market. The group noted that the letter also made reference to work being carried out on UMETS under the DCUSA. It noted that Ofgem is aware of the current DCUSA developments but would be minded to develop similar guidelines for the UMETS process if DCP 008 is not progressed. The group agreed that it was preferable to develop its own procedure under the DCUSA Change Process rather than have a solution mandated by Ofgem.

- 4.2 The group agreed that the guidance from Ofgem indicated that it was looking for the group to develop a similar model under the DCUSA to that used for PEMS. Members noted that the PEMS guidelines are based on the principles of the provision of a 'one stop shop' service by Gas DNOs with the aim of getting customers back on supply. It was noted that under PEMS like for like meter exchanges are considered standard and that the DNOs are required to provide the service in a cost efficient manner.
- 4.3 Members noted that although there are differences between the gas and electricity market it should be able to work on some of the same basic principles as the PEMS process – such as the requirement for all DNOs to provide a one stop service and for Suppliers to accept that service. However members agreed that competition in metering and the fact that not all DNOs provide metering services would mean that the service could only be provided at a basic level. DNO members stated that meters must be fitted in a safe and efficient manner by appropriately accredited personnel and therefore the replacement of like for like meters could not be achieved in all circumstances and should not be mandated in the drafting.
- 4.4 NR suggested that the key aim of the group should be to develop a clear and unambiguous process with drafting that sets out each party's roles and responsibilities to each other, the timescales involved, the management of costs, and to ensure that the safety provisions are adequately covered by the CP. NR recommended that the drafting provides a clear set of arrangements to deal with all circumstances consistently. The working group concluded that the governance structure provided by the DCUSA should enable an effective procedure to be put in place in the electricity market.
- 4.5 The group agreed that principles of the process would be based on UMETS starting when the engineer on site discovers that there is a metering fault. It was agreed that the primary aim of the process was getting the customer back on supply subject to electrical safety. The group noted that in some circumstances getting customers back on supply in the first instance may result in further disruption with additional visits to re-fit meters but it was considered that from a customer perspective getting back on supply was the key driver in the process.

5 QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

- 5.1 The group considered the responses received from parties to the questionnaire issued by the group. NM noted that the responses received were extremely varied but that they provide useful information about the volumes of UMETS calls dealt with and the differing services provided by Suppliers. The group agreed that the amount of variation in the industry meant that it could only aim to develop basic service provisions and that any additional services would be based on commercial arrangements.

- 5.2 JL noted that group members had also taken an action to consider the definition of 'special needs' customers. JL confirmed that United Utilities believes that special needs customers as a minimum should be identified special needs category 1-7 (J1699) but noted that it tends to ask the customer at the time of the call if there are any special need customers within the property rather than rely on system data.
- 5.3 JD indicated that Npower was also concerned that the use of defined categories could be taken too literally and that it favoured a solution which allowed parties to use their discretion. JD suggested that the following definition, taken from an ERA paper "Protecting Vulnerable Customers from Disconnection", may be more appropriate: *'A customer is vulnerable if for reasons of age, health, disability or severe financial insecurity they are unable to safeguard their personal welfare or the personal welfare of other members of the household'*. Members agreed that any solution should allow for DNOs to use their discretion. AS took an action to consider how energywatch would like special needs / vulnerable customers to be defined.

Action: AS

- 5.4 The Working Group also considered the note circulated on behalf of the Electricity Network Company. The group noted ENC's view that UMETS does not fall under the scope of the DCUSA but concluded that the Panel had already determined that the issue was in scope when it assessed the CP and entered it into the Definition Phase. The working group noted that ENC does not provide a metering service and that a requirement to provide any more than a basic UMETS service would have a significant impact on IDNO parties.

6 DCP 008 VARIATIONS

- 6.1 The group once again considered the drafting of the original CP. NR asked that members ensure they give due consideration to DCUSA objectives and ensure that the final CP clearly details how the relevant objectives will be better facilitated.
- 6.2 The group noted that it could choose to take forward some or each of the following: the original CP; an amended version of the original with the consent of the proposer; alternative variations put forward by the group. JL confirmed that United Utilities accepted that the drafting of DCP 008 was likely to change and was willing to accept necessary amendments to the original drafting.
- 6.3 The Working Group established that one of the principles of UMETS under the DCUSA would be the provision of a one stop shop for vulnerable customers out of hours. It was suggested that the DCUSA should only cover basic obligation and that suppliers could determine commercially if they wanted a more sophisticated solution but that arrangements would sit outside the DCUSA.
- 6.4 The Working Group reconsidered the scenarios table developed at the last meeting

Telephone Call – Metering Fault	1 In hours
---------------------------------	------------

identified – Not Special Needs	2 Out of hours
Telephone Call – Metering Fault identified – Special Needs	3 In hours
	4 Out of hours
Site Visit – Metering Fault identified – Not Special Needs	5 In hours
	6 Out of hours
Site Visit – Metering Fault identified – Special Needs	7 In hours
	8 Out of hours

6.5 JL proposed that for scenarios 1,2,3,5 and 6 customers would be referred to the Supplier or Agent and that an amendment be made to his original proposal to set out a basic service to be offered by all DNOs for scenarios 4, 7 and 8.

6.6 John Dallimore suggested an alternative which in addition to variation one included an additional requirement for scenarios 5 and 6. JD proposed that for scenarios 5 and 6, where a like for like meter could be fitted to get any customer (i.e. including non vulnerable customers) back on the supply the DNO should do so. Members suggested that the solution would be acceptable as long as the drafting did not obligate DNOs to carry multiple meter types and that the basic service would be the provision of a single phase credit meter.

6.7 The group noted the solutions put forward and agreed that a summary of the proposed solution should be circulated to all Contract Managers for comment. NM took an action to draft a summary document and JL took an action to see how DCP 008 could be varied to accommodate both solutions. NM asked that all members review DCP 008 Appendix 1 in advance of the next meeting and EL took an action to circulate a comments log template.

Action: NM

Action: JL

Action: EL

Action: All

7 ADDITIONAL AREAS OF CONSIDERATION

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

- Rationale for the applicable DCUSA Objectives
- Communications methods – Electronic D0150 Flow or Manual Flows
- Impact on other industry codes / agreements
- Emergency Credit
- Transfer of meter asset ownership
- Definition of 'Working Hours' / 'Out of Hours'
- Definition of Special Needs Customers

8 DCP 008 PROJECT TIMETABLE

8.1 The group agreed the following timetable for the next stage of work:

Activity	Due Date
Issue draft summary document to Working Group for	31/10/07

comment	
Provide comments on draft summary document	02/11/07
Issue final summary document to Contract Managers	06/11/07
Contract Managers to provide comments on summary document	20/11/07
Working Group members to provide comments on drafting	20/11/07
Secretary to publish all meeting papers	23/11/07

8.2 The working group agreed that it would need to hold two further meetings before the consultation document was issued to Parties and agreed that it would target January / February 2008 for the consultation, February / March 2008 for the final report to the Panel and the June 2008 Release.

9 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

9.1 There were no additional items of business.

10 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

10.1 The next meeting of the DCP 008 Working Group will convene at 10.30am on Friday 30 November 2007.

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
01/01	Update ToR to reflect membership	EL
02/01	NM to attend November Panel meeting to present update and proposed timetable	NM
02/02	Consider how energywatch would like special needs / vulnerable customers to be defined	AS
02/03	Draft summary document for issue to Contract Managers	NM
02/04	Re-draft DCP 008 to accommodate proposed solutions	JL
02/05	Review DCP 008 Appendix A and provide comments to EL	All
02/06	Consolidate all comments on log	EL

Closed Actions

Action No.	Description	Owner
01/02	Confirm whether categories 1 -7 of the D0255 flow suitably define 'Special Needs' customers	All
01/03	Write to contact CMs to ascertain the type of service currently provided and the volume of calls dealt with.	EI
01/04	Invite Ofgem to participate in future Working Group meetings	NM
01/05	Attend October Panel meeting to present update and seek timetable extension	NM