

Interventions Working Group - Meeting 69

26 July 2023 at 10:00am

Teleconference on Teams

| Attendees | Company |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Boz Laird-Clowes [BLC] | BEIS |
| Callum Sheen [CS] | EON |
| Christopher Varney [CV] | OVO |
| Danielle Brown [DB] | SPEN |
| Geoff Huckerby [GH] | Power Data Associates |
| Nikhel Jethwa [NJ] | SSE |
| Paul Abreu [PA] | ENA |
| Paul Morris [PM] | UKPN |
| Peter Skirvin [PS] | ENWL |
| Richard Hill [RH] | Centrica |
| Simon Wilson [SW] | EDF Energy |
| Victoria Burkett [VC] | SSE |
| Warren Lacey [WL] | NPg |
| Secretariat | |
| George Kestner [GK] | ElectraLink |
| Mel Kendal [MK] (Secretariat) | ElectraLink |
| Richard Colwill [RJC] (Chair) | ElectraLink |
| Shazad Khalid [SK] | ElectraLink |
| Apologies | |
| John Orr [JO] | SPEN |
| Martin Murphy [MM] | NPg |
| Richard Brady [RB] | National Grid |

1. Administration

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed attendees to the 69th 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 68 – Draft Minutes

- 2.1 The minutes from the previous meeting were reviewed. The group agreed the minutes to be an accurate reflection of the discussions held at the previous meeting. These are included as **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**.
- 3.2 The key updates can be found below:
- 3.3 **66/06, 66/07 & 66/08:** PA confirmed that both issues relating to B codes were raised at the recent STIG meeting. DNOs stated that they are a problem, and all have various ways of managing these codes internally. It was noted that it is important for those who report issues to the DNO must try and do so as accurately as possible.
- 3.4 **67/10:** The Chair informed the group that there have not been any examples received as of yet. DB stated that they have not sent over any examples as they have narrowed down to a particular Supplier and have managed to work out whether it is legitimate or not – these conversations have been happening bilaterally.
- 3.5 **68/02:** This was discussed at the REC Electricity Operational Metering Forum, and it was agreed for a subgroup to be setup to review the five requested changes.
- 3.6 **68/03:** DNOs have raised their concerns to the REC Code Manager. Legal representatives have been informed, and the REC Code Manager will communicate potential ways to overcome these issues in due course.
- 3.7 **68/05:** The Chair agreed to follow-up with MM post-meeting to see if there are any further developments.

69/01 – The Chair to follow-up with MM post-meeting in regard to Action 68/06 to see if there are any further developments.

- 3.8 **68/06:** The Chair is currently following this up and awaiting an update. More details of the discussion can be found under agenda item 6 (Customer Journey and Communications).
- 3.9 **68/07:** The Chair noted that there has not yet been any feedback received offline.

- 3.10 It was agreed for bilateral conversations to happen offline to discuss a future trial in relation to the process of dealing with B11 reports.

69/02 – PS to have bilateral discussions offline to discuss a future trial in relation to the process of dealing with B11 reports.

- 3.11 The group noted the action updates.

4. Extra Validation Checks for Data Flows Sent Across the DTN

- 4.1 The Chair invited SK (DTN representative at ElectraLink) to further discuss with the group the extra validation checks for data flows sent across the DTN.

- 4.2 The key points can be found below:

- SK stated that by default, the DTN does not differentiate between mandatory and optional items, as its main purpose is to ensure that the flows are delivered.
- SK created a D135 flow live on screen for the group to follow. The group were informed that the fields will only be validated if they become mandatory (i.e., phone number/email address).
- A suggestion was to request REC to make these optional fields mandatory, however, it was worth noting that this may not guarantee the accuracy of the data received.
- If the company has enhanced validation checks enabled, the data flow will still be sent, however a warning will be shown if 'bad data' is present. There is also an option to reject a 'bad data' file from sending. In summary, having the enhanced validation checks enabled will allow the mandatory fields within the flow to be validated before sending the flow.
- The group were informed that this could be trialled at no additional cost as it is included in the service that is already paid for in regard to the DTN.
- The Working Group discussed the above and agreed it would be beneficial to run trial tests on making the fields mandatory for phone number and email address. It was agreed for this to be taken offline and progress.

69/03 – The Secretariat to contact NJ and PM offline to carry out trial testing on making the phone number and email address fields mandatory.

5. Proposed Updates to the Service Termination Issues Guide (STIG)

- 5.1 The Chair invited members of the group to discuss the proposed updates to the Service Termination Issues Guide (STIG).

- 5.2 The key points can be found below:

- RH informed the group that the A19 guidance document was presented to the REC Electricity Operational Metering Forum, and it was agreed for a subgroup to be setup to review the five requested changes.
- PA stated that the state of the STIG is being looked in due to how voting of changes is currently carried out. DNOs have raised their concerns to the REC Code Manager. Legal representatives have been informed, and the REC Code Manager will communicate potential ways to overcome these issues in due course.
- The ENA have suggested that if the document cannot be replicated to that of MCOPA, it may be appropriate to have the document as an ENA engineering recommendation or host the document within DCUSA.
- PA informed the group that they have created a new A03, B05 and a new C code as there was a non-standard PME arrangement that was identified by a MOP, to which they queried how this should be reported. Due to this, a new C21 has been drafted as guidance for non-standard MPE arrangements.
- An update to the B07 provides MOPs to continue with the installation if there is a neutral block.
- PA informed the group that the REC-led meeting will take place to discuss the above on Thursday, 27 July 2023 at 2pm if any members on the call wish to join.

5.3 The Working Group noted the discussions.

6. 2023 Work Plan

Asbestos

- 6.1 The Chair informed the group that RB provided details of an asbestos related case offline to be discussed with members during this meeting (in his absence).
- 6.2 RB stated that NGED received several reports of an asbestos meter board where they believe the DNO owns the item and is responsible for replacing it, and in all of them the DNO equipment is in good serviceable order it is the fact the supplier has no procedure to exchange a meter on such a board.

- 6.3 RB provided the image below and stated that this was sent to the Ombudsman, and it was deemed to be a Supplier issue where they should liaise with the DNO to work together to remove the board. In all cases NGED seem to get a call from the customer asking when we are going to attend and replace the board.



- 6.4 NGED spoke to the Ombudsman, where it was explained that the board is part of the property infrastructure, and that all parties working on DNO or metering equipment in the area should know this fact. RB also believes some of the training given by EUSR also state that the board is owned by the DNO.
- 6.5 Working Group members discussed this and stated that some DNOs have processes/procedures to deal with this, and others do not.
- 6.6 One member stated that all Parties just need a reminder of the responsibilities of those within this situation.
- 6.7 The Working Group agreed with the decision of NGED is the correct position and noted not to send these cases to the DNO.
- 6.8 One member suggested circulating comms to wider industry outlining the responsibilities when it comes to related to reporting an asbestos meter board. The Chair agreed that this would be beneficial and agreed to take an action to include this within the IWG headline report presented to the monthly DCUSA Panel and also to include some wording on the DCUSA website.
- 6.9 One member suggested circulating these comms as wide as possible, including the 'Smaller Suppliers Forum' to ensure that a wider representation of Suppliers receive the comms.

69/04 – The Chair to include the responsibilities of those involved in reporting an asbestos meter board within the IWG headline report at the monthly DCUSA Panel.

69/05 – The Chair to include the responsibilities of those involved in reporting an asbestos meter board to the DCUSA website for Customers to refer to.

69/06 – PA to draft wording around the responsibilities of those involved in reporting an asbestos meter board and send to the Chair post-meeting.

69/07 – The Chair to send comms to all DCUSA Parties to include the responsibilities of those involved in reporting an asbestos meter board within the IWG headline report at the monthly DCUSA Panel.

- 6.10 BLC also stated that there is an Independent Suppliers and MOPs Forum (ISMF) where he agreed to take have conversations with the Chair offline to discuss how this could be progressed there offline.

69/08 – BLC and the Chair to have conversations offline regarding the ISMF post-meeting.

Supplier Forecasts and Inaccuracies

- 6.11 The Chair agreed to follow-up with MM post-meeting, in relation to Action 68/05 (as stated earlier in the meeting) to see if there are any further developments.
- 6.12 An update will be provided to all members of the Working Group offline.

Customer Journey and Communications

- 6.13 PS informed the group that ENWL are currently developing their own portal which will allow for photos to be sent and reporting of A and B codes.
- 6.14 It was noted that there would be Supplier interest in having a portal to allow photos and reporting of A and B codes, however, a concern was raised around the fact that Suppliers may have to provide these reports using multiple different ‘portals’ if each DNO creates their own way of doing so.
- 6.15 One member suggested creating a single link which would take Suppliers to a communal webpage which would then contain all of the separate links to each DNO portal (in regard to sending photos/reports).
- 6.16 SK mentioned that it was previously discussed whether the DTN could be used to send photos a few years back and suggested that this could potentially be re-explored – members noted that there was not a cost-benefit to this when previously looked at, however, are happy for ElectraLink to re-look at this and provide some updated costs if the DTN were to be used.
- 6.17 It was also noted that the DTN is real-time, which is another reason for this to be re-explored.
- 6.18 In relation to the process of dealing with B11 codes, it was agreed earlier in the meeting for bilateral conversations to happen offline to discuss a future trial in relation to the process of dealing with B11 reports. An action for these conversations was captured in earlier discussions.

7. Operational, Safety and Reporting Issues

- 7.1 CS informed the group that they have attended a number of jobs recently where the DNO have downgraded a heavy-duty cut-out from 200a to 100a fuses. A number of these cut-outs will only accept a minimum of 35mm cables, whereas they only carry up to 25mm cables.
- 7.2 CS noted that they have received mixed messages from the DNOs in regard to next steps within these types of scenarios, and asked the group whether this is for the Customer and DNO to agree/fund a new cut-out on that property?
- 7.3 PM stated that the options in these scenarios would be to put in a distribution board in its place to allow for it to be downsized to 100a, or have the service replaced to allow it to go down to 100a. It was noted that replacing the service can tend to be expensive, and the first option would be recommended.
- 7.4 WL stated that they currently do not install a secondary cut-out distribution board, however they are looking into what options they have for these scenarios.
- 7.5 SW noted that Customers may not have the space or want to have a secondary cut-out installed which could make the scenario difficult to resolve.
- 7.6 PA stated that the issue is not with DNOs downgrading the service as this can easily be done, however the issue is who will pay for this to be done – it can be an expensive solution and is not sure if Suppliers would want to fund this to be completed.
- 7.7 It was suggested that a separate IWG sub-group is set up to discuss potential solutions to be able to move forward in these scenarios – the Secretariat agreed to take an action to set up an IWG sub-group and will circulate an invitation email to the group post-meeting.

69/09 – The Secretariat agreed to set up an IWG sub-group and will circulate an invitation email to the group post-meeting.

8. Opportunities for Updates on Related IWG Activities

- 8.1 The Chair provided details of the below related IWG activities to the Working Group:
- DCP 419 'Pre-Notification of Planned Supply De-Energisations' – this was issued for Consultation and the Working Group will be meeting on 08 August 2023 to review the Consultation responses. This also incorporates the obligation for the SIP that was developed within DCP 394 'any REC accredited meter operator to de-energise any metering point'.
- 8.2 The Working Group noted the updates.

9. Smart Meter Installs

- 9.1 The Chair informed the Working Group that figures have now been received and agreed to take an action to circulate these to members as a paper post-meeting.

69/10 – The Secretariat circulate a paper relating to Smart Meter Installs figures to IWG members post-meeting.

9.2

10. Any Other Business

10.1 The Chair asked whether there was any other business, to which nothing was raised.

11. Next Meeting

11.1 The next IWG meeting is scheduled to be held on 06 September 2023. The meeting will start at 10:30am.

11.2 The group agreed that the meeting should be held face to face. Microsoft Teams dial-in details will also be available for those who are unable to attend in person.

Attachments

- Attachment 1 - IWG 68 - Final Minutes
- Attachment 2 - IWG 69 - Actions