

DCP 419 Working Group - Meeting 07

15 November 2023 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Amy Cox [AC]	EDF
Colette Baldwin [CB]	REC
David Williams [DW]	SSE
David Brown [DB]	Power Data Associates
David Jones [DJ]	Alt Han Co
Nikhel Jethwa [NJ]	SSE
Paul Abreu [PA]	ENA
Victoria Burkett [VB]	SSE
Warren Lacey [WL]	NPg
Code Administrator	
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Alysson Peña [AP]	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Kevin Woollard [KW]	Centrica
Richard Colwill [RC]	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 It was noted that one member's name was spelt incorrectly on the previous set of meeting minutes, and the Secretariat agreed to take an action to update this.

ACTION 07/01: The Secretariat to update the incorrect spelling within the previous meeting minutes (WG 07).

- 1.4 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 collated RFI responses document within the Working Group and agree next steps.

3. Review of Updated Draft Consultation Document

- 3.1 The Chair invited the Working Group to review and further discuss the collated RFI responses document. This document was presented live on screen and edited during the meeting; an updated version can be found as **Attachment 1**.
- 3.2 The key updates can be found below:
- 3.3 **Question 1**
- 3.4 The Working Group noted the amount of POAs received from a single premise which were not linked to a network fault, within the last three months.
- 3.5 **Question 2**
- 3.6 The Working Group noted that the responses provided are 'best guesses' but does provide a vague idea.
- 3.7 One member challenged whether this change would meet the threshold if only a vague idea has been provided – the Chair noted that ideally the Working Group will be able to provide Ofgem with enough information to be able to make a fully educated decision.
- 3.8 Another member mentioned that in the Electricity Distribution Regulatory Instructions and Guidance (RIGs) it states that the Customer has to be contacted, and queried whether it states *how* the Customer is contacted – members do not believe the way of contact is specified, so long as the Customer is contacted.

- 3.9 Following this, the Secretariat agreed to take an action to check what the process for contacting a Customer looks like and share with the Working Group.

ACTION 07/02: The Secretariat to check the RIGs for the process of contacting a Customer and share what this looks like with the Working Group.

- 3.10 Another query was raised around what to do in a situation where a POA has been received, however, there are no contact details for the Customer – members were unsure; however, it was noted that it may be worth considering whether Suppliers and DNOs could work together to share Customer contact information. It was agreed that these situations would most likely fall under ‘best endeavours’ in regard to trying to contact the Customer.
- 3.11 **Question 3**
- 3.12 The Working Group noted that a number of DNOs have similar approaches to managing and responding to genuine POAs (i.e., using service request that are sent to the meters to help determine which POAs are genuine).
- 3.13 **Question 4**
- 3.14 The Working Group noted that the majority of DNOs provided a duration of 1.5 hours of supply interruption following a POA.
- 3.15 **Question 5**
- 3.16 The Working Group noted that although the alternative may sound legible in theory, there are a number of flaws that need to be worked through (i.e., 90% of meters not providing a restoration flow).
- 3.17 The Working Group agreed that contacting the Customer should be proactive and there is room for improvement.
- 3.18 One member mentioned that some DNOs measure by Customer minutes lost, and they have targets to meet when measuring this. It was also noted that if the targets are exceeded, there may be severe penalties for this.
- 3.19 It was also noted that it may be worth considering comms hub replacements as these will trigger a POA to be sent to the DNO.
- 3.20 One member stated that if a solution can be developed whereby Suppliers can help DNOs to reduce the amount of POAs received by even 20%, it would help them to provide a much better service to their Customers and for those with genuine power outages.
- 3.21 One member stated that the SIP process was introduced to help prevent meters from being de-energised incorrectly, however, queried whether there is anything in process currently that would identify if the meter is being de-energised incorrectly – another member stated that SIP works only covers a small percentage of de-energisations that currently happen, and there is a large portion where an EV company, for example, have disconnected the meter to install an EV charger without contacting the DNO or Supplier and this will be unknown until the Customer is contacted.

3.22 The Working Group noted that the original solution may provide the DNOs with more information around when, why and how incorrect interruptions/unauthorised de-energisations take place.

3.23 **Question 6**

3.24 The Working Group noted that the average time taken to undertake works that requires de-energisation of the meter is between 1-2 hours.

3.25 **Question 7**

3.26 The Working Group noted the vast difference between the numbers of planned works that Suppliers have undertaken involving sites where a smart meter is already installed in the last three months. The numbers ranged from 0 to just under 52k.

3.27 Due to the vast differences, members considered whether the original question was clear enough and respondents may have potentially interpreted the question differently. It was suggested that the Secretariat contact the Suppliers that provided large numbers to seek an understanding of the types of jobs that have been included.

ACTION 07/03: The Secretariat to contact the Suppliers that provided large numbers to Q7 of the RFI to seek an understanding of the types of jobs that have been included.

3.28 **Question 8**

3.29 The Working Group noted that on average, the duration of the comms hub replacement programme usually takes between 30 minutes to one hour.

3.30 One member noted that a 'hot swap' of a comms hub does trigger a POA to the DNO.

3.31 **Question 9**

3.32 The Working Group noted that the majority of respondents are not aware of a method for Suppliers or MEMs to suppress the POA whilst works are undertaken on site; however, one respondent did note that there may be SEC obligations that need to be taken into consideration.

3.33 One member shared an email that was sent from their internal colleague in relation to Q9 – they stated that:

- *“There are certain alerts that they do (but do not always receive) that provide advanced notice that a device may experience a power outage, and therefore the AD1 should be discounted when this type of alert has been received prior to an AD1. One such alert is an N1 (Electricity Smart Meter Decommissioning or withdrawal) alert, which is an advanced notification that a device is going to be decommissioned. They have applied a filter within the Intelligent Filter dashboard that discounts AD1 alerts from a device that has sent an N1 alert within the last 24 hours – thus enabling them to discount the subsequent AD1 that they receive from the device as it is being decommissioned. However, it was noted that they do not always receive these notifications in a timely manner (or at all), meaning they still get, and investigate, spurious alarms as a result of decommissioning activity. If they received these types of alerts within a*

timely and consistent manner, they could virtually eliminate spurious AD1s as a result of meter changes or decommissioning activity, thus saving man hours and resources.”

- 3.34 Following this, AC agreed to take an action to speak internally around whether the above would be a potential option moving forward. The Secretariat also agreed to take an action to seek further information around potentially using the N1 alerts with the DCC.

ACTION 07/04: AC to speak internally to seek further information around whether using N1 alerts would be a potential option moving forward (Q9 of RFI).

ACTION 07/05: The Secretariat to speak with the DCC to seek further information around whether using N1 alerts would be a potential option moving forward (Q9 of RFI).

3.35 **Question 10**

- 3.36 The Working Group noted that the respondents who were able to provide a response to an estimate of how much it would cost to implement the market message and accommodating this process, ranged from £2k to £2.2m.

- 3.37 It was also noted that it is difficult to estimate a price as the end-to-end solution is currently not yet known.

3.38 **Question 11**

- 3.39 The Working Group noted that there appears to be a split in views between Suppliers and DNOs; Supplier respondents have shown support for the proposed alternate solution, however, DNOs have not.

3.40 **Question 12**

- 3.41 One member stated that the SEC forum that has been talking about the CMR system being referred to, have not approved this as a solution yet. This will be re-discussed at the next forum meeting.

- 3.42 One respondent suggested that MEMs are better placed to send the data flow given their proximity to the site operations - The Working Group noted that this suggestion would require a REC change to create the data flow and to place an obligation on the MEM. This would need a minimum of 6 months to create the data flow once the change has been approved.

- 3.43 It was noted that when a Supplier books an appointment with the MEM, this is not always done via a data flow (i.e., could be completed through an online portal). There is no obligation to send a flow to book and/or acknowledge the job.

- 3.44 Working Group members discussed the development and use of a Mobile App and agreed that although a good idea, it would not be feasible or cost-effective for DNOs to use.

- 3.45 The Working Group noted that allowing the MEM to send the flow as an alternative solution should be considered.

3.46 **Question 13**

- 3.47 One member suggested checking the draft legal text of DCP 400 to see if it states that the CMR have an obligation to notify the DNO. The Secretariat agreed to take an action to check this offline.

ACTION 07/06: The Secretariat to check the DCP 400 draft legal text to see if it states that the Crowded Meter Room [CMR] have an obligation to notify the DNO.

- 3.48 The Working Group noted the additional comments provided by respondents in relation to DCP 419.

4. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

- 4.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:

- The Secretariat to circulate the updated version of the collated RFI response document with Working Group comments to the Working Group post-meeting.
- The Secretariat to issue a doodle poll to the Working Group to schedule the next Working Group meeting (WG 08).

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 - TBC

- 6.1 It was agreed that the Secretariat will issue a Doodle Poll to the Working Group to determine the best availability for the next meeting.

ACTION 07/07: The Secretariat to issue a Doodle Poll to the Working Group to determine the next meeting date (WG 08).

7. Attachments

- Attachment 1_DCP 419 Collated RFI Responses_WG Comments v0.1
- Attachment 2_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. <i>15/11/2023 - Additional changes may be needed to the DCP 394 legal text, if a new flow is developed and it is utilised for SIPs to fulfil their pre-notification requirements</i>
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	Ongoing. <i>15/11/2023 - It was noted that there is currently no update as of yet, however, the RFI responses may provide more information.</i>
07/01	The Secretariat to update the incorrect spelling within the previous meeting minutes (WG 07).	Secretariat	New Action.
07/02	The Secretariat to check the Ofgem regulation for the process of contacting a Customer and share what this looks like with the Working Group.	Secretariat	New Action.
07/03	The Secretariat to contact the Suppliers that provided large numbers to Q7 of the RFI to seek an understanding of the types of jobs that have been included.	Secretariat	New Action.

07/04	AC to speak internally to seek further information around whether using N1 alerts would be a potential option moving forward (Q9 of RFI).	AC	New Action.
07/05	The Secretariat to speak with the DCC to seek further information around whether using N1 alerts would be a potential option moving forward (Q9 of RFI).	Secretariat	New Action.
07/06	The Secretariat to check the DCP 400 draft legal text to see if it states that the Crowded Meter Room [CMR] have an obligation to notify the DNO.	Secretariat	New Action.
07/07	The Secretariat to issue a Doodle Poll to the Working Group to determine the next meeting date (WG 08).	Secretariat	New Action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.		Update	
06/01	The Secretariat to circulate the updated version of the draft Consultation to the Working Group offline for a final review.	Secretariat	Closed.
06/02	The Secretariat to issue the final Consultation document to wider industry with a response period of 4-weeks.	Secretariat	Closed.