DCP 390 Working Group Meeting 04

30 September 2021 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Charlotte Lee [CL]	NAPIT
Christine Austin [CA]	ENWL
Finn Davies-Clark [FDC]	SSE Business Energy
Geoff Huckerby [GH]	Power Data Associates
George Barnes [GB]	Utilita
Jonathan Elliot [JE]	Certsure
Kevin Liddle [KL]	NPg
Paul Abreu [PA]	Energy Networks Association (ENA)
Paul Morris [PM]	UKPN
Peter Skirvin [PS]	ENWL
Steve Halsey [SH]	UKPN
Code Administrator	
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Frank Bertie [FB]	NAPIT
Ian Crawley [IC]	SSEN
Martyn Allen [MA]	Electrical Safety First
Richard Brady [RB]	Western Power

1. Administration

1.1 The Chair welcomed attendees to the DCP 390 Working Group meeting.

1.2 The Chair reminded members to act in accordance with the terms set out in the DCUSA "Competition Law Guidance" for the duration of the meeting.

1.3 The Working Group reviewed the minutes from the last meeting and agreed that the minutes were an accurate reflection of the discussions held.

1.4 The Working Group noted the items on the actions list from the last meeting. Updates on all actions are provided in Appendix A.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

2.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was to run through NAPIT's presentation for 'Survey Results of Members experiences when requesting the removal of the Service Cut-Out Fuse for a Domestic Property' and to also review the responses to the Consultation.

3. NAPIT Survey Presentation

3.1 CL presented the NAPIT Survey Results to the Working Group. This presentation can be found at Attachment 1.

3.2 The conclusions of the Survey can be found below:

- *It is evident from the Survey that the current situation is very confusing, disparate and causes a lot of frustration within the industry.*
- *Multiple respondents to the Survey were told to 'remove the seals', some via email, which completely contradicts the guidance and gives a very confusing message to the electrical contractor.*
- *Lack of dedicated phone numbers, and staff who understand the request being made, causes a lot of wasted time and frustration – this needs urgent consideration to streamline an overly bureaucratic process.*

3.3 **Question 1 – Did any of the respondents suggest that they were contacting the DNOs directly due to problems with the Suppliers?**

3.4 CL confirmed that this question was not asked directly to the respondents within the survey; however, respondents did state that Suppliers were asking them to contact the DNOs and vice versa.

3.5 **Question 2 – Were the respondents purely from Domestic properties?**

3.6 CL stated that the Survey went to all members who could be Domestic but could also be Commercial. It can be assumed that the majority are from Domestic properties, however this cannot be confirmed.

4. Review of Consultation Responses

4.1 The Working Group reviewed the Consultation responses, and the following key points were noted:

Question 1 – Do you understand the intent of DCP 390?

4.2 The majority of Parties understand the intent of the CP, but some may not agree with the resolution. All concerns will be summarised within the Change Report.

Question 2 – Are you supportive of the principles of DCP 390?

4.3 The majority of respondents acknowledge the purpose of the CP but have noted that there may be alternate solutions.

Question 3 – Do you agree with the proposer's view that the Supplier is the responsible Party for providing isolations for safe working on Customers' electrical installations?

4.4 The Working Group are aware that there is various support for this Change. The Working Group are responding to this Change to give clarification around who the responsible Party is in regard to safe isolations and there is support for a clear process for this.

4.5 The Working Group acknowledge alternate views that the DNO should be responsible, however, the majority believe it is the Suppliers responsibility.

4.6 It was noted that the intent of this Change is to clarify the responsible Party, however there can be future Working Groups (i.e., DCP 394 – Allow any REC Accredited Meter Operator to De-Energise any Metering Point) that can look at additional issues.

Question 4 – Do you believe that a 10-Working Day service level agreement from the date of the request is appropriate?

4.7 The Working Group acknowledge the various views on the 10-Working Day SLA, however the Working Group suggested that the implementation of this could be delayed helping alleviate Supplier workload.

4.8 Whilst discussing the 10-Working Day SLA, the Working Group agreed to take an action to decide when the implementation of the SLAS will come in.

ACTION 04/01: Secretariat and Working Group to discuss and decide when the implementation of the SLAs will come in.

4.9 The Working Group also noted that a number of comments within the responses to this question were ultimately out of scope of this Change.

Question 5 – Do you agree that if this CP is approved, it should be implemented in the next DCUSA release following Authority approval?

4.10 The Working Group acknowledge the mixed views on the timeframe of the Change becoming implemented within the next DCUSA release, however it was noted that the intent of this Change is to implement an appropriate SLA to improve the current process.

Question 6 – Do you consider that the proposal better facilitates the DCUSA General Objectives?

4.11 The Working Group noted the mixed responses; however, it was noted that there may be future Working Groups (i.e., DCP 394 – Allow any REC Accredited Meter Operator to De-Energise any Metering Point) or potential electrician schemes that can look at additional issues.

Question 7 – Are you aware of any wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP?

4.12 The Working Group acknowledged the responses and noted other changes such as DCP 394 - Allow any REC Accredited Meter Operator to De-Energise any Metering Point.

Question 8 – Do you have any comments on the proposed legal text?

4.13 One of the responses highlighted potential clauses that may need to be re-looked at within DCP 383 – Moving Meters for Service Alterations – the Working Group acknowledged this and agreed that if DCP 383 is approved, a number of clauses will need to be reviewed.

4.14 There were a number of responses regarding comments on the proposed legal text with which a number of these were agreed by the Working Group to be out of scope of this Change. The Working Group agreed to review the legal text at the next Working Group.

Question 9 – Any other comments?

4.15 The Working Group discussed the NAPIT Survey Presentation, and the Secretariat agreed to take an action to circulate this to the Working Group within the post-meeting pack.

ACTION 04/02: Secretariat to circulate the NAPIT Survey Presentation to the Working Group within the post-meeting pack.

4.16 One response raised concerns with competition within the market – the Working Group noted this and stated that advice was previously sought regarding competition concerns and noted that in legislation, only a Supplier or DNO can isolate a Supplier.

4.17 Legal advice around these competition concerns suggested that this is not in breach of competition.

4.18 The Working Group reiterated that the aim of this current Change Proposal is to clarify who the notable responsible party is for providing a safe isolations and the proposer believes this is an improtant first step to achieving improvements within the process.

~~4.18~~4.19 The Working Group noted the additional comments.

5. Next Steps

5.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:

1. The Working Group will discuss the appropriate implementation dates for the SLAs to come in at the next meeting.
2. The Secretariat and Working Group to review the current legal text.

3. The Secretariat and Working Group to draft the Change Report.
4. The Secretariat to create an updated Workplan with key dates within the post-meeting pack (see Attachment 3).

ACTION 04/03: Secretariat to circulate an updated Workplan with key dates to the Working Group within the post-meeting pack.

6. Any Other Business

6.1 The Chair asked the Working Group if there was any other business to discuss.

6.2 There were no other items of business raised.

7. Date of Next Meeting

7.1 The date of the next meeting has been scheduled for 07 October 2021 at 1pm.

8. Attachments

- Attachment 1_NAPIT Survey Presentation
- Attachment 2_Collated Consultation Responses - Working Group Comments
- Attachment 3_Updated Workplan

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
04/01	Secretariat and Working Group to discuss and decide when the implementation of the SLAs will come in.	All	Ongoing.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
03/01	Working Group to issue DCP 390 Consultation.	ElectraLink	**Completed.**
04/02	Secretariat to circulate the NAPIT Survey Presentation to the Working Group within the post-meeting pack.	ElectraLink	**Completed.**
04/03	Secretariat to circulate an updated Workplan with key dates to the Working Group within the post-meeting pack.	ElectraLink	**Completed.**