

DCUSA SIG Sub-Group for DIF 65 - Meeting 01

14 November 2022 at 10:00am: Microsoft Teams

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Christine Austin [CA]	ENWL
Richard Brady [RB]	National Grid
Ricard Hill [RH]	British Gas
Warren Lacey [WL]	NPg
Code Administrator	
Mel Kendal [MK] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink

1. Administration

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the members to the meeting.
- 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.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair confirmed that the purpose of the meeting was to consider appropriate guidance for MOPs where they are unable to install a smart meter due to a higher fuse rating on site.

3. Review of DIF 65 and Draft Change Proposal

Overview of DIF 65

- 3.1 It was noted that MOPs are finding instances of cut-outs with a 200amp fuse but tails of a lower rating than 200amps. There are currently no Whole Current meters rated at 200amps so a meter exchange is not possible and there is no method of reporting this scenario.
- 3.2 The fuse is the responsibility of the DNO, however, through discussions at the REC Electricity Operational Metering Forum (E-OMF) DNOs confirmed that fuses would not be downgraded as the fuse rating will have been determined by the supply capacity stated in the connection agreement and any changes need to be discussed with the Customer via the Supplier.

- 3.3 Another associated point was raised that fuse downgrades would not support the business plans of DNOs, as they move to DSO network management.
- 3.4 The proposer suggested that a collaborative process needs to be agreed between Suppliers, DNOs and MEMs on how to effectively report and resolve these instances in agreement with the customer, via either a fuse downgrade or a change to supply arrangements so that the meter can be exchanged.

Working Group Discussions

- 3.5 The Chair previously asked the group at the October SIG meeting to review the Power Data Associates Guidance document that was circulated post-meeting and to bring suggestions around what 'appropriate guidelines' may look like to this session.
- 3.6 RB stated that it depends on what type of Connection Agreement the Customer has with the DNO.
- 3.7 The Chair confirmed that there needs to be a route developed in order to allow the Customer and DNO to have the relevant discussions if needed.
- 3.8 RB stated that if the MOP attends a site where they attempt to replace the meter but the fuses are higher than the meter rating, then the responsibility should be on the Customer to contact the DNO to agree what the next steps would be to resolve this (i.e., meter could be updated, new Connection Agreement to cover capacity etc.).
- 3.9 One member stated that there are solutions already out there, for example, the Supplier can contact the Customer to tell them that they will need to contact their DNO to resolve the issue as they cannot resolve this themselves.
- 3.10 One concern raised is that the process as it currently stands is relatively simple, such as swaps can be made on a like-for-like basis, however if a new process is introduced that can allow for upgrades and/or downgrades then this may cause some confusion.
- 3.11 One member suggested a card could be created for the Customer which would state clearly that they would need to contact their DNO for a resolution and the MOP would write who their DNO is on the card for the Customer.
- 3.12 Another member also stated that there needs to be assurance that the MOP has done everything they can or should be doing before referring the Customer to the DNO.
- 3.13 There was a debate around whether this should be treated as a B Code, however as it bypasses the Customer some members believe this shouldn't be the case.
- 3.14 It was mentioned that it is unlikely that MOPs would agree to upgrade or downgrade fuses and should therefore be a Customer/DNO responsibility to resolve this.
- 3.15 It was noted that there may be some bilateral agreements in place with Supplier and DNOs in relation to downgrading fuses and therefore any guidance should have a caveat stating 'unless otherwise agreed with an individual DNO'. The Chair also queried whether an RFI to DNOs would be beneficial asking what information they would need to have the most productive conversation with the Customer in these situations. The Working Group agreed that an RFI would be beneficial to progressing this forward.
- 3.16 One member noted that it may be worth asking DNOs within the RFI whether they believe there should be a responsibility of the MOP to notify the DNO of the issue prior to the Customer getting in

contact as key information may be missed if it is solely down to the Customer to relay the information to the DNO – the Working Group agreed with this.

Next Steps

3.17 The next step is to circulate an RFI to DNOs informing them that a previous RFI to Suppliers showed that it is apparent that this issue is on a case-by-case basis and to ask the below questions:

- The initial view of the Working Group is that a B Code is not appropriate as it is not necessarily a defect and may also affect DNO reporting – if not a B Code, how would you want this to be communicated?
- What information would you need to have the most productive discussions with the Customer?
- How would you, as a DNO, like to be notified?
- Do you believe there should be a responsibility of the MOP to notify the DNO?

3.18 The Chair agreed to draft an RFI and circulate to the Working Group for review prior to circulation.

ACTION 01/01: The Secretariat to draft an RFI and circulate to the Working Group for review.

ACTION 01/02: The Secretariat to circulate an RFI to all DNOs/IDNOs.

3.19 Members suggested arranging the next meeting prior to next Electricity Operational Meeting Forum (Chaired by REC) so an update can be provided as this is where the issue originated from.

4. Any Other Business

4.1 There was no other business and the meeting was closed.

5. Date of Next Meeting:

5.1 The next DIF 65 Sub-Group is scheduled for 07 December 2022.

Appendix 1

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/01	The Secretariat to draft an RFI and circulate to the Working Group for review.	Secretariat	Open
01/02	The Secretariat to circulate an RFI to all DNOs/IDNOs.	Secretariat	Open

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
			Closed