DIF 64 Subgroup Meeting 04

8 July 2024 at 14:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Simon Vicary [SV]	EDF
Simon Watton [SW]	Fulcrum
Kevin Woollard [KW]	Centrica
Donne Jamieson [DJ]	IDCSL
Frank Shackleford [FS]	SSEN
Sam Townend [ST]	ENWL
Lee Stone [LS]	Npower Business Solutions
Andrew E Jones [AJ]	Total Energies
Sue Bottom [SB]	SPEN
George Hamilton [GH]	SPEN
Victoria Burkett [VB]	SSE
Katherine Higby [KH]	Utilita
Mel Swift [MS]	GTC
Monique Pereira [MP]	Indigo
Emma Christensen [EC]	UKPN
Apologies	
Carl Henshaw	NGED
Code Administrator	
Richard Colwill	Chair
Craig Booth	Secretariat

1.   Administration

Recording

1.1   The Chair asked members if they were comfortable for this Working Group 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.

Competition Law Guidance and Terms of Reference

1.2   The Working Group reviewed the "Competition Law Guidance" and "Terms of Reference". All Working Group members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.

2.   Actions Review

2.1   The actions from the previous meeting had been closed down as this group has been on hold for a while.

3.   Purpose of the Meeting

3.1   The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss rota load alpha identifier in light of DCP 436 being approved. The Chair explained that the change itself was simple, resulting in date changes, but that it was not a simple process and that a discussion would be opened up around the process following the recent implementation of DCP 436. The Chair stated that a single upload per year should be the ambition.

4.   DCP 436 & DIF 64 Discussion

4.1   The Chair walked the group through the changes implemented by DCP 436.

4.2   The Chair explained that this group was convened to allow Suppliers to gain the confidence that the data set they receive will be correct and only a single set of data will be required.

4.3   KW asked if a DNO/ENA representative could talk the group through what happens to pull the data together and validate the quality and accuracy of the data.

4.4   ST explained that from the initial point of the update, there is work with the DNO who reviews the block letters live and takes a snapshot at a specific point in the year. Various updates may be required leading up to the publication of the data, due to changes in the code requirements, smaller changes to the network, additions of protected sites, etc. This process can take a couple of months ahead of the timescales for providing the data to the Nominated Central Source (ENA). The data is then passed to the IDNOs for them to check and update their block letters, which normally takes around 3 weeks to complete. Once completed, the DNOs and IDNOs would be considered to have provided the data as per the DCUSA requirement. The ENA would then have some work to do in collating the data, processing the data, verifying the data, etc., which takes around 4 weeks, after which it is provided to the DCUSA Secretariat. This is then published on the DCUSA website within 2 working days. This is summarised below:

Phase	Time
DNO phase	Around 2 months
IDNO phase	Around 3 weeks
ENA phase	Around 4 weeks
Secretariat Phase	2 working days

4.5   ST explained that a lot of lessons have been learned over the past few years and that a guidance document had been shared with the DNOs and IDNOs on the quality checks that should be performed prior to providing the data to the ENA, to ensure the data submitted is accurate and consistent.

4.6   ST explained the ENA will perform is own checks and produces maps to identify any issues, ahead of the publication date of the data.

4.7   MS asked whether ENA was able to host the guidance document so that this would be visible to all Parties. MS stated this would provide some assurance to Supplier Parties. ST agreed that this would be a good idea.

Action 01/04	ST to explore adding the guidance document to the ENA website.

4.8   KW agreed that the oversight and scrutiny had appeared to improve. KW explained that British Gas had considered raising a change to the DCUSA to strengthen the requirements around data quality but that in light of the steps explained by ST, it appeared it would not be necessary at this time.

4.9   KW suggested that if DNOs, IDNOs and/or the ENA becomes aware of an issue with the data, an early notice to Suppliers would be beneficial.

4.10 SV explained that the process to upload the alpha identifiers was not an automated upload and that it would therefore incur costs to Suppliers to perform additional uploads.

4.11 LS agreed with the views of the above, agreeing that notice of issues would be beneficial and that only doing the upload once was needed to keep Supplier costs down.

4.12 ST reassured Suppliers that the DNOs and IDNOs also wished to ensure the upload was only required once, as the effort of checking and correcting data is also burdensome for network operators.

4.13 MS stated that the dates are now approaching and suggested that this group should be reconvened later in the year, after the process has completed, to allow for discussions around any issues and/or lessons learned.

4.14 The Chair agreed to reconvene the DIF 64 subgroup on 18 November from 10:00am to 12:00pm, as per paragraph 4.13, to discuss how well the process performed.

4.15   ST suggested that the group could agree a way to send/receive notifications on the milestones that have been completed through the process, so that in future all parties to the process would have improved transparency on how the process is progressing.

4.16   The Chair suggested that the DCUSA website could be utilised to show the progress through the process, as a headline (e.g., "The Nominated Central Source has received all of the data as of DD MON YYYY.") The Chair stated it could also be included with the DCUSA newsletter.

Action 02/04	DCUSA to issue updates on the progress of the rota load alpha identifiers this year (dependant on receiving the updates from the DNOs, IDNOs and/or ENA.)

5.   Next Steps and Work Plan

5.1   The next subgroup meeting date will be on 18 November from 10:00am to 12:00pm.

6.   Any Other Business

6.1   SV asked whether other Parties had any views on the usefulness of the Powercut105 website. SV also stated that contact details for rota load alpha identifier bulk checks would be useful and that, currently, only a customer can request the check.

Action 03/04	Chair to reach out to the ENA to check whether it can publish contact details for bulk checking on the Powercut105 website.

6.2   ST explained that the bulk check API is owned by the ENA, so there may not be an answer available today due to a lack of representative on the call.

6.3   The Chair stated he would reach out to check whether it would be possible for Suppliers to request bulk checking, even if this has to go back to the customer, to improve the customer experience.

Action 04/04	Chair to reach out to the ENA to check whether it would be possible for Suppliers to request bulk checking, even if this has to go back to the customer.

6.4   SB asked whether the API was being used for individual post code lookups. LS stated that whilst unsure of the API use, the annual upload to DCUSA was being used.

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/04	Explore adding the guidance document to the ENA website.	Sam Townend	New action
02/04	Issue updates on the progress of the rota load alpha identifiers this year (dependant on receiving the updates from the DNOs, IDNOs and/or ENA.)	Secretariat	New action
03/04	Reach out to the ENA to check whether it can publish contact details for bulk checking on the Powercut105 website.	Chair	New action
04/04	Reach out to the ENA to check whether it would be possible for Suppliers to request bulk checking, even if this has to go back to the customer.	Chair	New action

Closed Actions

Action Ref.		Update		