DCUSA

Interventions Working Group - Meeting 60

05 January 2022 at 10:00am
Teleconference on Teams

Attendees	Company
Adam Deacon [AD] (Part Meeting)	Scottish Power
Boz Laird-Clowes [BLC]	BEIS
Geoff Huckerby [GH]	Power Data Associates
John Heague [JH]	Scottish Power
Nick Dodridge [ND]	EDF Energy
Paul Abreu [PA]	Energy Networks Association
Paul Morris [PM]	UK Power Networks (UKPN)
Peter Skirvin [PS]	Electricity North-West (ENW)
Richard Brady [RB]	WPD
Richard Cockerill (RiC)	OVO
Richard Hill [RH]	Centrica
Simon Wilson [SW]	EDF Energy
William McKay [WM]	SSEN
Secretariat	
Hannah Proffitt [HP] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink

Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Callum Sheen [CS]	E.ON
Martin Murphy [MM]	NPg
Rachael Williams [RW]	SPEN

1. Administration

1.1 The Chair welcomed attendees to the 60th IWG 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.

2. IWG 59 – Draft Minutes

2.1 The minutes from the previous meeting held on 03 November 2021 were reviewed.

2.2 JH highlighted section 4.18 and asked that clarity is added surrounding whether the EV charger is left connected or not.

2.3 JH noted that their organisation would install an isolator but wouldn't disconnect the EV charger as they would not want the customer to be left in limbo. Another member noted that they would not disconnect or remove the taps but would leave the customer a safety advisory notice informing them to get an electrician to check it.

2.4 JH highlighted that the connectors are not fit to be used for this purpose and that a consistent approach is needed across industry to resolve this. The group agreed that the issue needs to be discussed further. One member suggested that a tougher stance is taken as it's unclear whether the equipment is safe as it is unfit for purpose.

2.5 RH advised that they had produced a set of slides regarding the issue to present under agenda item 4.

2.6 The Chair agreed to amend the minutes to add clarification to section 4.18 and these can be found in **Attachment 1**.

3. Outstanding Actions

3.1 The IWG reviewed the outstanding actions, and an updated version of the actions log can be found in **Attachment 2**.

4. Operational, Safety and Reporting Issues

4.1 The Chair advised that three issues had been raised ahead of the meeting by members and discussions were held as follows.

4.2 Slides were circulated to members ahead of the meeting and will be included in the post meeting papers for reference.

IPC Line Tap Connectors

4.3 RH highlighted action 59/02, taken at the previous meeting, for members to consider and share the main issues regarding line-tap connectors. RH noted that the IWG should highlight their findings to Energy UK and the Health and Safety Executive (HSE).

4.4 RH presented the slides to the group and highlighted the evidence that the connectors are only fit for purpose for use with certain cables.

4.5 RH highlighted the disclaimer ENSTO included on the YouTube video, noting they accept no liability concerning claims resulting from incorrect installation. RH explained that the connectors are being installed incorrectly by EV installers as they are not suitable to be fitted to metering cables.

4.6 RH presented a picture of a connector to IWG members and explained how the connector could cause a cable to become exposed, causing a safety issue. The group agreed that the device is designed to be installed on Aerial Bundled Cables (ABC) but is being misused by EV installers on metering cables.

4.7 One member raised that, if these incorrectly used connectors are only being identified during remedial work, they need to be stopped at source as there could be many more that are yet to be identified.

4.8 GH asked if a DNO or Meter Operator visited a site with this type of installation and took no action, whether they could be held liable for any future incident as they were the last to visit the site. RB noted that this would be down to the customer as the EV charger is classed as an additional circuit on their install. Another member noted that they do not believe it is a Supplier's place to remove the kit.

4.9 One member highlighted the Working Group chaired by Martyn Allen (Electrical Safety First) that discusses EV installations (ESF EV Charge Point Installation) and noted that they had raised this topic at the first meeting. The member noted that the Working Group had agreed that the connectors were not being used properly and that this should result in installers failing their audits.

4.10 SW asked if a specific installer had been identified and suggested that they could write to the installer to make them aware of the problem. Another member suggested that a formal way to collate the installers in question could be to issue a DCUSA Request for Information (RFI).

4.11 RB noted that they had identified two different installers on the EV application forms and have sent these on to the Suppliers. The group questioned who should contact the installers to advise them of the issue. One member suggested that the IWG could send a letter to the trade associations, NAPIT and NICEIC.

4.12 SW and RH agreed to work with the Chair to draft a letter to the trade associations regarding the IPC line tap connector issue. The Chair agreed to circulate the first draft to IWG members for feedback.

60/01: SW and RH to work with Chair to draft letter to the trade associations regarding the IPC line tap connector issue. On completion, Chair to circulate to IWG members for feedback.

4.13 JH referenced the ENA form providing notification to the DNO of installation of EV charging equipment (ENA Notification Form - EVN v1.9 280917) and asked if a warning could be added regarding use of the connectors. PA agreed to investigate this but noted that it would not be possible to include specific advice on the form. JH suggested that the warning could be included on the ENA website instead where the form is found. PA agreed to look into this.

60/02: PA to investigate including a warning on the ENA website regarding the use of IPC line tap connectors

4.14 One member asked for an update on the progress of DCP 390[1] as this is relevant to the issue. The Chair advised that the recommendation was to accept the DCP, however that this was awaiting Ofgem decision. The Chair noted that they hope for a decision to be issued in January or early February. The member also asked about DCP 394[2] to which the Chair confirmed it is at definition stage, and that they hope for it to be issued to Ofgem for decision in March.

Bending Radius

4.15 RH presented a set of slides to the group and gave an overview of the issue. RH highlighted that a Mechanical Clerk of Works (CoW) report had been received highlighting a potential issue with a New Build meter install site. A number of properties within 2x large developments have not been signed off due to insufficient bending radius of cables – a factor of x4 the diameter of the 25mm cable. This resulted in existing tenants being moved out of their accommodation and new tenants not being allowed to move in and all having to move to temporary accommodation.

4.16 RH noted that they believe this issue has no precedent in the whole Meter Operator industry and could have huge reaching implications to New Builds and existing installations where cabling is upgraded.

[1] DCP 390 - Provision of Isolations for Safe Working on Customers' Electrical Installations
[2] DCP 349 - Allow any REC Accredited Meter Operator to De-Energise any Metering Point

4.17 RH noted that bend radius is stated on Technical data sheets of all cable manufacturers and is also referenced in the BS7671 18th edition On-Site Guidance, Table D5. RH presented the guidance to the group and showed members the CoW report site photo, photos of the install variations on site and site photos of before and after rectification. RH pointed out that on rectification, there was a widening of bend radius, however that outgoing cables were tighter and were not questioned.

4.18 RH invited the IWG to consider the short and medium term implications of this matter and whether any next steps need to be taken.

4.19 SW noted that they have never come across this issue before and questioned how BS 7671 was being referenced when metering installations don't work to BS 7671. PM raised that they have seen some installations where the meter tails have been strained from bending. RH agreed that a common sense approach should be used and if the tails are strained and discoloured, there is a clear issue.

4.20 RH highlighted the risk that this same incident could occur again. The group agreed that this should be shared with the training department of the company. JH pointed out that whatever issue there is associated with exceeding bending radius, it will be the case with any cable throughout the electrical industry.

4.21 RB questioned whether the bending radius is included on any audits and noted that they have not seen this before. Regarding audits, JH noted that the main concerns are surrounding cable size and if cables are too short.

4.22 The group agreed that there is potential for this issue to cause disruption within the metering industry. RH also noted that they don't want to be in the situation where they follow different processes dependent on the CoW.. The group agreed to monitor the situation for now as it could be an isolated incident. RH agreed to update the IWG if anything progressed in future.

Biscuit Tin cut outs

4.23 JH presented two pictures of biscuit tin type cut outs and noted that they are asking the IWG to consider the specific risks associated with Metering Equipment Managers (MEMs) working on them for smart metering purposes and what plans if any the industry may have in replacement programmes.

4.24 JH highlighted that concerns are being raised by meter installers surrounding these types of cut out which are encapsulated in the device with a tail coming out of the top. JH noted that there are issues around working with this type of device and questioned whether there were plans to replace these across the country.

4.25 AD joined the meeting. AD advised that they have been looking into the issues raised by operatives around these devices and noted that there is limit advice surrounding how to report concerns. AD noted that firm guidance is needed from industry on how to report the concerns.

4.26 RB advised that from WPD's point of view, these types of devices should be replaced when identified. PM noted that they are aware that there are some of these devices on the network and agreed that a preferred solution is identified.

4.27 AD agreed and noted that across their business they would like a definitive guidance document in relation to these pieces of equipment.

4.28 One member noted that some of these types of devices are safe and easy to work on, therefore a generic code cannot be raised when they are identified. The member noted that it would depend on what specific fault is found as to which code is raised.

4.29 JH noted that it would not be right for the Meter Operator to be modifying the cut out and that on face value some are fit for purpose and are safe. However, if the Meter Operator has come to fit a smart meter and they can't line up, there are issues.

4.30 The group agreed that specific notes need to be added when raising a job related to these types of devices.

4.31 The Chair asked the group whether there were any additional issues to be discussed.

4.32 JH noted that COVID is still an issue with lots of staff sickness, however that working practices will remain the same.

4.33 PM highlighted the reporting of category A issues online rather than through the call centre and asked if there was any feedback on this. AD provided positive feedback, noting that it has proven to be efficient and saves time for operatives. PM noted that members could contact him if they need any further information.

4.34 The Chair presented the Operational, Safety and Reporting Issues spreadsheet to the group. No comments were raised.

5. Opportunity for updates on related IWG activities

5.1 The Chair informed the group of the below updates:

5.2 **DCP 390 'Provision of Isolations for Safe Working on Customers' Electrical Installations'**

5.3 The Chair advised the change was sent to Ofgem on 17 December 2021 with the recommendation to accept the DCP. The Chair noted that they hope for a decision from Ofgem to be issued in January or early February.

5.4 **DCP 394 'Allow any REC Accredited Meter Operator to De-Energise any Metering Point'**

5.5 The Chair noted that a DCP 394 Working Group meeting was scheduled for 06 January 2022 and that they are hoping to issue a consultation in January. The Chair highlighted that they hoped to consult sooner however with impacts to other codes, it was decided to delay and issue a better developed consultation with legal text included.

5.6 **DCP 383 'Provision for Distributors to Move Meters for Service Alterations'**

5.7 The Chair noted that DCP 383 has been approved by the Authority and that this will be implemented into DCUSA on 24 February 2022. Communications will be issued in relation to obtaining which Distributors and Suppliers wish to participate in the proposed solution.

6. Smart Meter Installs

6.1 The monthly Smart Meter installs for November 2021 were circulated with the meeting papers for information.

6.2 The Chair advised that there should not be any further delays going forward and that the reports should be received mid-month.

7. Any Other Business

7.1 The Chair asked the group if there was any other business to discuss, to which nothing was raised.

8. Next Meeting

8.1 The next IWG meeting is scheduled to be held on 09 March 2022. via Microsoft Teams. The meeting will start at 10am.