

## Interventions Working Group - Meeting 75

3 July 2024 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendees	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Danielle Brown	SPEN
Victoria Burkett	SSE Business Energy
Chistopher Varney	Ovo
Geoff Huckerby	Association of Meter Operators
Michael Gorewoda	E.ON
Nikhel Jethwa	SSEN
Warren Lacey	NPg
Paul Abreu	ENA
Richard Brady	NGED
Richard Hill	British Gas
Peter Skirvin	ENWL
Paul Morris	UKPN
Simon Wilson	EDF Energy
Lorna Mallon	REC
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
Craig Booth	Secretariat
Richard Colwill	Chair
<b>Apologies</b>	
No apologies received	

## 1. Administration

---

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed attendees to the 75<sup>th</sup> IWG meeting.

### **Recording**

- 1.2 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**

- 1.3 The Working Group reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance”. All Working Group members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.

## 2. IWG 74 – Draft Minutes

---

- 2.1 The Chair asked if the Working Group had any comments on the accuracy of the minutes. No comments were made.

## 3. Outstanding Actions

---

- 3.1 The Chair reviewed the outstanding actions.
- 3.2 Action 70/01 – PS advised the volumes of B11 phone calls are still very low. RH advised it had been raised in the meter operations business, but it was a nice to have alongside other priorities which have superseded it. RH advised he would raise it again. CV confirmed it hadn’t been rolled out to ENWL’s network area yet. CV requested the number used to call them in be shared with him. A proposed process created by ENWL is attached to these minutes as attachment 1. This action remains open.
- 3.3 Action 70/04 – RB explained that when a MEM calls in with a category A, they are asked to send an image in via email. This action remains open.
- 3.4 Action 71/03 – GH confirmed the guidance document review is completed and a copy will be sent to the Chair.
- 3.5 Action 72/04 – PA explained that he had tried again with STIG members and still cannot get a unanimous agreement on this. PA explained that some DNOs consider the bottom side of the cut-out to be their side of the cut-out and to permit a meter operator to touch that side of the cut-out would set an unacceptable precedent. PA advised he did not consider that an agreement could be reached as each DNO sets its own policy and that has to be respected. CV explained that this scenario is not in the service termination guidance and that some DNOs allow the neutral to be fed into the bottom of the cut-out whilst others do not. It was discussed that this would need to be brought up in bilateral discussions with each DNO. WL stated that this is an example that should go into each DNOs local information for meter operators, so that meter operators have a solution. This action was closed.

- 3.6 Action 72/05 – The Chair advised he has reached out to REC to understand where discussions have got to. The Chair advised REC would be joining the call to review the SIP process, so there may be opportunities in the review. This action remains open.
- 3.7 Action 72/06 – PA provided an update that Mel Swift had updated members on the outcomes from discussions with IDNO colleagues at the recent INA meeting.
- 3.8 IDNOs are unanimous that the only cut out fuses they have on their networks are 80A or 100A. For situations where a meter operator needs to restore a supply when the cutout fuse is not available, they should refer to the signage/labels on the side of the fuse holder and insert the matching cartridge fuse size. Some cut-outs will only accept a specific cartridge size by default so inserting the incorrect fuse size will not be possible.
- 3.9 PM suggested that 100amp fuses were OK on 16mm tails and that this may have gotten lost/forgotten, and that this could be refreshed and may alleviate some of the pain. RH stated it was a commercial decision between suppliers and their MEMs around whether the meter tails would be renewed, and the group needed to be careful not to try to dictate to them that they should do something specific. CV explained that he would be happy to put in whatever size fuse is on the carrier, but his concern was that it was not for the supplier to determine what size fuse should be in that carrier and it was for the DNO to determine this. CV explained it wasn't so much the fuse size versus the tail size, but instead ensuring the supplier or MEM are happy to install whatever is on the label on the carrier.
- 3.10 PS agreed that this did come down to the issue of getting a customer back on supply without being given a poor experience. PS explained that, as a DNO, the safest action was to install a 60-amp fuse (unless the label stipulates differently) and then the DNO could replace this with a higher rating if needed. PA stated that it was the IDNOs that required a higher rating, as per the label on the carrier, and that DNOs were happy with installing 60-amp fuses as a default.
- 3.11 GH asked if a DNO installation is labelled 80 or 100 amps, should the MEM still install a 60-amp fuse or go by the label. PS explained that UKPN would be happy with a fuse that matches the label to be installed. GH asked to clarify if this therefore meant to install a fuse that matches the label and, in the absence of a label, to then default to 60 amps. PS and PM agreed that going with the label, and in the absence of this going with a 60-amp fuse, would be acceptable.
- 3.12 PM raised that small-barrel 100-amp fuses should not be used on UKPN network. RB explained that NGED would not want a 100-amp fuse putting in. RB stated that he would prefer a 60-amp fuse to be the default.
- 3.13 RH asked whether the ENA could produce a table of the fuses that should be installed on each DNO and IDNO networks. PA explained that the default on DNO networks should be 60-amps if the supplier or MEM cannot determine what the previous fuse rating was.
- 3.14 CV stated that the customer should take some responsibility and be directed to their DNO if they believe a higher rating fuse is required. WL and MG echoed this position. RH and MG confirmed they were happy with this, as having a single policy across the UK would be easier to brief and ensure consistency.
- 3.15 PA stated he could provide a written response on this for clarity.

## **ACTION UPDATE – PA to provide a written response on this.**

- 3.16 Action 74/01 – VB advised this was still awaiting IT resource, but this could not currently be allocated. VB suggested reaching out to Energy UK to see if a supplier could help with this action. This action remains open.
- 3.17 Action 74/02 – The Chair confirmed this would be updated offline. This action remains open.
- 3.18 Action 74/03 – This action is to be discussed in this meeting.
- 3.19 Action 74/04 – LM explained this would be discussed in a meeting the same afternoon. This action remains open.
- 3.20 Action 74/05 – LM explained that this had gone back to the consumer to suggest they withdraw it and Ofgem had been made aware of the situation. This action was closed.
- 3.21 Action 74/06 – LM explained that SDEP would need a change to provide access, but this was locked down for MHHS at the moment. LM also explained that an API access cannot be used to scrape data from SDEP and a user is required to log into it. LM also explained that it wouldn't be user friendly on a mobile device for field agents. LM suggested that another platform or process may be more suitable. PM asked whether the photos could be sent via flows. LM explained that category As don't go via flow at the moment and are phoned in. LM explained that a solution could be developed in the longer term. PM stated that he could share the UKPN solution with REC to see if this could be replicated in another tool that all DNOs and suppliers could use. The Chair agreed to arrange this offline.

## **4. REC/DCUSA SIP Review**

---

- 4.1 The Chair explained that this is an initial discussion to agree how a review of the current SIP situation could be initiated.
- 4.2 LM explained that the REC is seeing a number of electricians trying to sign up, who then do not complete the process because they then realise they need to become a MEM. These companies have subsequently not withdrawn from the REC, so are in limbo.
- 4.3 The Chair explained that the DCUSA Panel had approved a guidance video be created to explain what a SIP is and what the requirements of becoming a SIP are (e.g., to become a MEM) and that, whilst this may not appease the electricians, it will at least make it clear what the requirements to become a SIP are. RB stated he would provide the details of video creators that could be used.
- 4.4 RH stated that in the video, the purpose of the SIPs was to provide a timely intervention and that it's now being misconstrued that electricians can break seals. RH stated that the entry to market requirements need to be considered, as individual electricians would never become a MEM, so this is a barrier to entry. PS stated that this comes back to who should provide a safe isolation service and that electricians/customers should be pointed to a SIP. LM explained that most customers would assume their electrician can do all of the work.
- 4.5 PM stated that one of the outcomes of the SIP would be bodies that become SIPs and these would provide services to electricians, and not that electricians become SIPs themselves. PM explained that

to get value out of the SIPs, electricians need to be able to identify which SIPs are willing to provide these services, which would add value.

- 4.6 LM explained that when industry codes publish lists, they are not supposed to be commercial. A list of SIPs is just a list of SIPs, not about whether the SIPs are able to provide services. PM suggested this could instead be hosted by one or more of the electrician bodies. RB asked whether a contact number could be provided for the SIPs that electricians could call. RB stated that some electricians are still cutting seals and pulling fuses and remain frustrated with the situation. LM stated that they could help to build a list, but the REC would not be able to host it. LM also explained there may be a geographical element to this, as electricians would need to know where the SIPs operate.
- 4.7 PA stated that any video should make clear that it is the customer supplier that is ultimately responsible for providing a safe isolation service.
- 4.8 The Chair stated it would be good to have the video out by the end of the year with a good introduction on what the SIPs are and what problems they were introduced to resolve.
- 4.9 The Chair asked whether an RFI to the SIPs would be the best next step.
- 4.10 PA suggested the SIPs should be asked if they offer a safe isolation service to electricians.
- 4.11 LM stated that the REC will be discussing this in a separate meeting and would bring back the output of that discussion. LM explained that this was triggered by the volume of queries being received via the help desk and the number of companies that are now not progressing through the process.

## 5. 2024 Work Plan

---

- 5.1 The Chair presented the 2024 work plan.

### **Asbestos**

- 5.2 The Chair explained that the asbestos document had been updated as per the action updates. The Chair confirmed he would discuss offline the potential of adding the gallery to this.

### **Extra validation across the DTN**

- 5.3 The Chair confirmed that he would reach out to Energy UK to seek help with this.

### **Improving customer journey via URL online forms**

- 5.4 The Chair explained that as per the previous conversation, the SDEP is likely not to be a favourable route and that there is other work being done, for example the interim solution developed by National Grid.

### **Review of CoMCoP**

- 5.5 Rh confirmed that whilst there were no updates to provide, progress was being made.

## Sharing and discussing internal policy changes

- 5.6 RH explained that this is about getting awareness of policy changes in advance rather than these changes being encountered in the field before being known.
- 5.7 The Chair asked if a simple spreadsheet could be completed that explained what changes were incoming.
- 5.8 PS stated that the responsibility is on DNOs to share these policy changes.
- 5.9 WL stated that the route for these updates should be via the REC as that is the relationship between the DNOs and the MEMs, however he did not recall any briefings coming out of REC around safety. WL suggested this should be raised at the EOMF. PS stated there are clauses in the CoMCoP that places obligations on providing information and that, as per WL, this should be via the REC and there was a need to understand the communication channel. VB explained that this had been raised with the REC as the messages are very broad, and this is being looked at to make it more descriptive.
- 5.10 PS explained that when the codes were amalgamated a forum was lost, so the IWG became a forum for parties to discuss these issues. PS asked if the IWG was still a good place to discuss the issue. Rh agreed it would be good for the IWG to have a discussion and for agreement could be that something should be sent to REC.

## Cage clamp isolators guidance

- 5.11 The Chair confirmed that he was engaging with LM on this and will keep the group updated on this.

## 6. Radio Tele-switch (RTS)

---

- 6.1 The Chair confirmed the switch-off date would be 30 June 2025 and opened this up for discussion.
- 6.2 PS explained that he knows of an example customer where four visits for a smart meter installation which were all aborted and of an example where a tele-switch was replaced, and this caused the heating system to behave differently. PS asked how suppliers would identify customers individual installations that rely on tele-switch and maintain their services.
- 6.3 GH explained there were currently around 900K radio tele-switch sites, according to an Elexon report which is broken down by region and supplier. GH explained that the smart meter should be able to replicate the features of the tele-switch. However, there are customers in CSP North that can't receive a signal and that in these instances, the supplier should be installing a preconfigured meter. GH stated that a lot of northerly MPs and MSPs wanted to get more information about this issue and that an event will be held soon.
- 6.4 WL and PM queried the accuracy of the numbers and how this could be validated. WL stated that he could not get to the numbers for the NPg area.
- 6.5 The Chair explained that ElectraLink may have the ability to get to this data and he would explore this offline.



Action 75/01	Chair to check whether ElectraLink has the ability to get to this data.
--------------	---

- 6.6 GH explained that in some remote locations, less than 30% of customers had taken up smart meters, citing Shetland as an example, and these customers would need a smart meter prior to the cut-off. GH noted that the Shetland council had contacted Energy UK to ask what was happening around this.
- 6.7 PS explained that his examples were both where an engineering solution was lacking (one supplier lacked a 5-terminal meter). GH stated he believed this was wrong, as 5 terminal meters are commercially available and that suppliers should be able to acquire these.
- 6.8 PA stated that an RTS installation group is being set up, which is looking at the logistics of identifying RTS locations and getting out there to replace those devices with a 5 terminal smart meter. PA stated it was accepted it's a big challenge and that help from DNOs may be needed, hence ENA's invitation to the group to be the link to STIG, but the bulk of this sits with suppliers to meet their obligations.
- 6.9 PM stated there was a challenge to get to a definitive picture on where these meters are and that the meeting above seems like a good place to discuss this. PM also stated that as a DNO, he would be happy to support these.
- 6.10 WL stated that DESNZ had asked DNOs to support suppliers, however having contacted suppliers to ask what support would be needed, very little came back.
- 6.11 The Chair confirmed this will be kept as an agenda item for the moment.

## 7. Operational, Safety and Reporting Issues

- 7.1 PM presented a picture of a meter with 25mm tails and a sticker on the meter that stated 40 amps maximum. PM asked what the 40 amps sticker means (whether this is the rating of the meter or the accuracy of the meter) and that the fuse is not really there to protect the meter.



7.2 SW stated he would send this to his asset team for advice.

## 8. Smart Meter Installs

---

8.1 [Smart meter installations for May 2024 can be found at this link.](#)

## 9. Any Other Business

---

- 9.1 RB explained that NGED had received queries around 100-amp fuses on domestic properties and whether this could be replaced with an 80 amp fuse. RB stated that an 80-amp fuse would be preferable to a 100 amp fuse as a 100 amp fuse could sit for several hours with 130-140 amps going through it. RB asked if there was appetite around having a practice to change these fuses to 80 amps. SW agreed this would be worth exploring.
- 9.2 MG agreed with the principle but felt it should ideally cover all areas and that properties with heat pumps and EVs should be considered.
- 9.3 WL stated that although the cut-outs in NPG are rated at 100 amps, NPG's position has been to install 80-amp fuses as a result of labs tests showing most cut-outs would support up to 96 amps. WL stated the danger of a policy across all areas is that there are some exceptions where a 100 amp could be installed and would not want MEMs downgrading these when they came across them.
- 9.4 RB stated he would discuss internally to see if a change proposal would be raised.
- 9.5 RH stated that his company policy was to never upgrade or downgrade a fuse, as that is a DNO responsibility and that, in the event of physical damage being found, this would be raised to the DNO.