

DCP 436 Mid-Consultation Q&A

28 March 2024 at 10:30 - Web-Conference

Presenters	Company
Sam Townend (Subject Matter Expert)	ENWL
Craig Booth (Chair)	ElectraLink

Attendees	Company
Victoria Burkett	SSE
Samuel Fisher	ENA
Niall Simmons	Smartest Energy
Cathy Mulliss	E.ON Next
Simon Shaw	Good Energy
Mel Swift	GTC
Andrew Jones	Total Energies
Mark Bellman	ENWL

1. Administration

Recording

- 1.1 The Chair asked attendees if they were comfortable for this session to be recorded. No members objected to this request. The purpose of this recording is purely to aid the Technical Secretariat in producing an accurate report of the meeting. The recording will be deleted after 15 Working Days.

Attendance

- 1.2 There were 8 participants in the Q&A representing a mixture of Suppliers, DNOs, IDNOs and the ENA.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Change Proposal and allow participants to ask questions or raise concerns for discussion.

3. Background

- 3.1 Sam presented an information pack that provided an overview of the current process and dates, as they stand today, and the process and dates as they are currently proposed to be amended. A 'clearer' updated copy of this pack, conveying the same information, is provided as Attachment 1.

4. Q&A Session

Supplier Engagement

- 4.1 A Supplier member asked for confirmation that Suppliers had joined the Q&A call, after being the sole Supplier representative for the first Working Group meeting.
- 4.2 Two participants on the call confirmed they were Suppliers. One of the participants confirmed they were also on the Working Group.
- 4.3 Craig confirmed that more Suppliers had signed up to the Working Group and would note in these minutes, and in the email sent to Parties following this session, that more Supplier engagement is important.

Data Provision

- 4.4 A Supplier participant asked the other Suppliers on the call whether the provision of a subset of data, for those post codes where block letters had changed, would be useful in uploading the updated block letter data to their systems.
- 4.5 One Supplier Participant agreed that this would be useful whilst one Supplier participant said their preference would be to upload the entire dataset and do a simple overwrite of the old data.

Block Letter Changes

- 4.6 A Supplier participant asked for clarity on whether more block letter changes were expected or whether it would now be stabilised, and few changes would be expected.
- 4.7 Sam explained that whilst it's impossible to predict changes, more changes would be expected. This would be partly due to ongoing work with DESNZ and the ESO, and partly in response to changes needed to balance the network following other activities, such as new connections, changes in demand, etc.
- 4.8 An IDNO representative agreed with the above, explaining that where it adds additional demand to upstream providers, there would need to be balancing of the network and block letter changes would be likely in these instances.

Concerns Regarding Dates

- 4.9 A number of Supplier participants expressed concerns around the dates currently proposed, as some customers who are quarterly billed would potentially not receive their revised block letter until the Spring, after the risk period has passed.
- 4.10 A Supplier participant raised concerns about code freezes, explaining that a lot of Suppliers will implement code freezes in December to ensure the stability of their systems for the winter period. They explained that these Suppliers would be unlikely to be able to update their systems during this period.

- 4.11 Sam acknowledged the concerns and stated that it would be a balancing act to find a date that works to provide more up to date information whilst allowing time for Suppliers to notify their customers of their block letters.
- 4.12 Sam also noted that, in addition to the information on the bills, customers could visit the 105 website (<https://www.powercut105.com/>) and find their block letter by entering their postcode.

5. Any Other Business

- 5.1 One participant noted the clash with the DCMDG (Distribution Charging Methodologies Development Group) meeting and that this may have affected the attendance of this session.
- 5.2 The Chair acknowledged the above and explained that, whilst unavoidable due to diary availability, such clashes would be avoided in the future, wherever possible.
- 5.3 The Chair thanked the participants for their contributions to the session and invited feedback on how useful the session was, to help improve future Q&As. Feedback should be sent to DCUSA@electralink.co.uk.

6. Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner
1	Reiterate the need for Supplier engagement as part of the issuing of the output of this session.	Craig Booth
2	Provide the information pack to the Chair for inclusion with the output published on the website.	Sam Townend