

DCP 400 Working Group Meeting 03

12 May 2022 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Colette Baldwin [CB]	Gemserv
David Jones [DJ]	Alt Han Co.
Emma Johnson [EJ]	Centrica
Irmeen Khan [IK]	Alt Han Co.
Jonathan Elliott [JE]	Certsure
Scott McLaughlin [SM]	Scottish Power Energy Networks
Paul Abreu [PA]	Energy Networks Association
Warren Lacy [WL]	NPg
Code Administrator	
Andy Green [AG]	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Hannah Proffitt [HP] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink

1. Administration

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed attendees to the third DCP 400 Working Group (WG) meeting and noted that no apologies had been received.
- 1.2 The group reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance”. All members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.
- 1.3 The Chair presented the minutes from the previous meeting, advising they had not received any comments ahead of the meeting. The group agreed that the minutes were an accurate reflection of events. The final version of the minutes is included as **Attachment 1**.
- 1.4 The group discussed the open actions, details of which can be found in **Appendix 1**.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was to review the Draft Legal Text and to consider next steps.

3. Consideration of DCP 400 Draft Legal Text

- 3.1 The Chair presented the legal text to the Working Group. This can be found as **Attachment 2**.
- 3.2 The Chair highlighted that the intention is for Alt HAN Co to accede to the DCUSA in order to allow them to act as the Crowded Meter Room Coordinator (CMRC).
- 3.3 DJ clarified that Alt HAN Co was established to find a collective solution for the installation of Smart and Alt HAN equipment and can undertake a number of activities to support this. DJ noted that Crowded Meter Rooms (CMRs) are a barrier to meeting this obligation and that acting a coordinator, they can work to resolve these issues.
- 3.4 The Chair highlighted the two proposed additional definitions, for Crowded Meter Room Coordinator and Crowded Meter Room Works. The Chair noted that they are discussing with legal advisors whether it will be possible to add a further row to the definition of Crowded Meter Room Works, to allow any other reasonable works to facilitate space. DJ agreed that if possible, this would be beneficial. A specific consultation question on this addition would be beneficial to seek views from Distributors.
- 3.5 CB asked whether this would be necessary if the intention is that before any work is started by the CMRC, an assessment will be completed of what works will be needed and agreed on a case by case basis. CB raised concern that the additional clause could be too broad and suggested amending the wording to ensure it is more specific. The group agreed that the additional clause should clarify that the other works are agreed with the Supplier or Distributor, or both.
- 3.6 SM noted that the intention was for the CMRC to be a coordinating function to ease interactions between involved parties.
- 3.7 DJ clarified that Alt HAN will have overall responsibility but will send a contractor in to assess possible options for resolution and assess whether other parties need to be involved. DJ noted that Alt HAN will retain overall responsibility. SM raised that engaging with multiple MOPs will be more complex than just one coordinator.

- 3.8 DJ highlighted section 52W.1 - Requirements for those Undertaking Works. SM agreed that this provided reassurance.
- 3.9 CB asked whether the CMRC will need the permission of the customer to carry our works. DJ noted that the CMRC will need to liaise with the landlord if they need to move trunking or cabling, however that this is not under DCUSA so will be a separate part of the coordination.
- 3.10 Regarding section 52W.3 - Meter Operator Code of Practice, CB highlighted the use of the term Meter Operator Agent (MOA) and noted that the term Meter Equipment Manager (MEM) is used within the Retail Energy Code (REC). CB suggested that MEM should be used, especially when referring to the REC. The Chair advised that the term MOA is used within the DCUSA and suggested that a housekeeping change could be raised to align. CB suggested that 'MEM' could be added in brackets following MOA. The Chair agreed to consider this further in relation to the DCP 400 legal text.
- 3.11 Regarding section 52X – Provision of Information to the Company, CB noted that they would expect the existing industry flows to be used. CB noted that the only change would be the need to send flows to any Supplier.
- 3.12 DJ noted that if there is an existing obligation to report interference, dangerous equipment or theft to the Supplier, this would be applicable to the CMRC. CB noted that the requirement for the CMRC to ensure messages are sent, should be included within REC and DCUSA.
- 3.13 CB asked how the information will be sent and asked whether this would be managed through project summary documents rather than via industry flows. DJ noted that any engagement before works take place would not be via data flows, however that it would make sense for anything identified during the works to be communicated via data flows. DJ noted that REC change R43 will set out the data flows suggested for MOPs to communicate with Suppliers.
- 3.14 DJ noted that if a smart meter is being installed and theft is identified, there is a process to follow. DJ noted that the same will apply here. The Chair highlighted that currently, MEMs can only send flows to their Supplier, and that the facility to send flows to all Suppliers involved in the CMR would be needed.
- 3.15 The Chair asked if the DCUSA consultation would need to be aligned with the REC consultation. CB agreed that it would. DJ advised that he has submitted the REC Change and is in discussion with REC, regarding the initial assessment report. CB noted that initial assessments will need to be undertaken by the RPA and RTS to consider possible technical changes. CB noted that there are currently a number of urgent Change Proposals ongoing which are taking priority.

4. DCP 400 Consultation Considerations

- 4.1 The Secretariat agreed to produce a draft consultation document to be considered at the next meeting.

5. Work Plan & Next Steps

- 5.1 The group discussed and agreed on the following next steps.
- The Secretariat to update the legal text based on discussions at the meeting.

- The Secretariat to produce a draft consultation for review at the next meeting.
- The Chair to work with DJ, CB and REC to consider timescales for the Change.

6. Agenda Items for the Next Meeting

- 6.1 The Working Group noted the next steps outlined above and agreed to further review the updated legal text at the next meeting and to review the draft consultation.

7. Any Other Business

- 7.1 The Chair asked the group whether there were any other items of business to discuss to which nothing was raised.

8. Date of Next Meeting

- 8.1 The date of the next meeting will be decided via a doodle poll following the meeting.

9. Attachments

- Attachment 1 - DCP 400 Working Group Meeting 02 - Final Minutes v1.0
- Attachment 2 - DCP 400 Draft Legal Text 12.05.2022

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/04	The Secretariat to organise subgroup to produce first draft of consultation document ahead of next meeting.	RC	Action ongoing. <i>A draft will be circulated ahead of the next meeting.</i>

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
02/01	DJ to refer to Gowling regarding whether the solution for DCP 400 could be achieved under the current provisions within SEC.	DJ	Action closed. <i>DJ informed the group that he had referred to Gowling who advised that it may have been possible to make the changes under the Smart Energy Code (SEC), but that it made more sense to do so under DCUSA as it has existing text for comparative scenarios.</i>