

DCP 419 Working Group - Meeting 05

22 August 2023 at 14:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Amy Cox [AC]	EDF
Collette Baldwin [CB]	REC
David Brown [DB]	Power Data Associates
David Jones [DJ]	Alt Han Co
John Orr [JO]	SPEN
Kevin Woollard [KW]	Centrica
Nikhel Jethwa [NJ]	SSE
Paul Abreu [PA]	ENA
Peter Skirvin [PS]	ENWL
Richard Brady [RB]	National Grid
Victoria Burkett [VB]	SSE
Code Administrator	
Alysson Peña [AP]	ElectraLink
Dylan Townsend [DT]	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink

1. Administration

- 1.1 All Working Group members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.
- 1.2 The Working Group reviewed the previous meeting minutes and agreed them to be an accurate reflection of the discussions held.
- 1.3 An action log has been created and all updates are provided in **Appendix A**.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair explained that the purpose of this meeting is review and discuss the draft DCP 419 RFI document within the Working Group and agree next steps.

3. Working Group Discussion of DCP 419

Adding MEMs to the proposed new data flow Scenario Variant

- 3.1 In regard to **Action 04/04**: CB queried who the obligation would sit with if a MEM was working on a site independently (not for a Supplier) – KW stated that the obligation would sit with the Supplier as they are the only Parties that are a Party to DCUSA but providing the MEMs with an ability to send the flow would be beneficial as the Supplier may agree with the MEM that the pre-notification is sent by the MEM in some circumstances.
- 3.2 CB stated that to place an obligation on the MEM to send a pre-notification flow, a separate REC change will need to be raised. It was also noted that MEMs would need to be consulted on before anything is progressed in relation to placing obligations on them.

Alternative solutions

- 3.3 It was noted that whilst the creation of a new data flow is one potential solution, consultation responses questioned what analyse had been completed to determine that the pre-notification option was the most effective and whether other solutions had been considered. The Working Group agreed to explore other solutions and issue out a second consultation. It was therefore agreed that the discussion regarding MEMs also sending the new data flow will be put on hold until the DCP 419 solution is agreed.
- 3.4 The Working Group discussed the original intent of this change and stated that introducing pre-notification flows in the form of a data flow is one potential solution that has been developed.
- 3.5 Another suggestion was put forward whereby the DNOs could put a process in place to check the supply status using either 'Read Supply Status' or 'Read Power Event Log' commands – one member stated that although this is a good suggestion, if a DNO checks the "Supply Status" and it shows the fuse has been pulled, they will still not know the reason for it and therefore it does not add any additional information to the POA. The Event Log is a historical log to look back on and would not be feasible as a solution.

- 3.6 One member explained that the DCC sends the POA to the DNO if the power has not been restored after three minutes – another member queried if a power restoration alert has been received, would this mean that the DNO would not need to follow up with the Customer? If this is the case, an alternative solution could be to put a time limit on the AD1 alert, where if a power restoration alert has not been received within X amount of hours after receiving the POA, then the DNO would not need to contact the Customer. It was agreed to ask Suppliers how long they believe a standard job which requires de-energisation takes. If, for example, this is two hours it would need to be determined whether it is acceptable for DNOs to wait for 2 hours after receiving a POA to see if a power restoration alert is received. They would then start making contact with customers after this two-hour period if no restoration alert is received.
- 3.7 It was also agreed that a question should be proposed to DNOs asking what their interpretation of the RIG requirement is (i.e. when a POA is received, how quickly to they believe the customer should be contacted).

ACTION 05/01: The Secretariat to draft a consultation to include the alternate solution and additional questions as discussed.

- 3.8 Before deciding what would be the appropriate windows, it was agreed for the Secretariat to speak with Ofgem to explain the discussions that are currently being held in regard to the alternate solution, and also ask for Ofgem's view on the 2G/3G comms hub swap-outs in the next few years.

ACTION 05/02: The Secretariat to speak with Ofgem to explain the current discussions being held in relation to the alternate solution (i.e., power restoration alert) and also ask for their view on the 2G/3G comms hub swap-outs in the next few years.

- 3.9 One member noted that for the comms hub replacement programme, the DNO will receive a POA alert but no restoration alerts will be sent, as it is the meter that sends the restoration alert, and will not have been turned off. It was noted that DNOs are able to send a signal to a meter to determine its supply status and that it would do this prior to contacting a customer to ensure that they are only contacting customers with a genuine outage. In addition to the proposed solution of having a window where the DNO waits for a power restoration alert, there could also be an automatic signal sent after x hours. This could capture the comms hubs changes where a POA is received but not a restoration alert and ensure that DNOs only contact customers where it is believed there has been a genuine outage (i.e. not planned work).
- 3.10 After further discussion, the Working Group agreed that the next steps are for the Secretariat to update the draft consultation and circulate to the group for review prior to issuing to wider industry.

4. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

- 4.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
- The Secretariat to update the draft consultation and circulate to the Working Group for review.
 - The Secretariat to contact Ofgem regarding the alternate solution.

5. Any Other Business

- 5.1 The Chair asked the group whether there were any other items of business to discuss.
- 5.2 There were no other items raised.

6. Date of Next Meeting

- 6.1 The next Working Group meeting will be held on 28 September 2023 at 10am.

7. Attachments

- Attachment 1_DCP 419 Work Plan

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
04/05	The Secretariat to re-look at the DCP 394 legal text and compare what potential amendments may be needed.	Secretariat	Ongoing.
04/06	The Secretariat to contact REC to confirm if the Supply Fault Information Centre (SFIC) and Distributor are one in the same.	Secretariat	Ongoing.
05/01	The Secretariat to draft a consultation to include the alternate solution and additional questions as discussed.	Secretariat	New Action.
05/02	The Secretariat to speak with Ofgem to explain the current discussions being held in relation to the alternate solution (i.e., power restoration alert) and also ask for their view on the 2G/3G comms hub swap-outs in the next few years.	Secretariat	New Action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update
04/01	The Secretariat to see if any analysis had previously been carried out under DCP 394, as this may be of benefit.	Secretariat	Closed.
04/02	The Secretariat to draft an RFI and circulate to all DNOs to help get a better understanding of the impacts of this change.	Secretariat	Closed.
04/03	The Secretariat to contact the DCC to ask whether they can confirm the expected process for comms hub decommissions and	Secretariat	Closed.

	also ask whether there is a way to filter alerts based on how the alerts are being generated.		<i>It has been suggested that it would be best to discuss this with the SEC.</i>
04/04	The Secretariat to contact REC in regard to a potential REC change to allow MEMs to able to send the data flows.	Secretariat	<p>Closed.</p> <p><i>Has been discussed, and decision has been paused until the RFI responses have been reviewed.</i></p>