

DCP 419 Working Group - Meeting 14

26 November 2024 at 13:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Amy Cox [AC]	EDF
Caroline Freimuller [CF]	REC
David Brown [DB]	Power Data Associates
David Jones [DJ]	Alt Han Co
Jordan Hills [JH]	SSEN
Lorna Mallon [LM]	Gemserv
Monique Perreira [MP]	Indigo Networks
Paul Abreu [PA]	ENA
Richard Brady [RB]	National Grid
Shuba Khatun [SK]	SSE
Victoria Burkett [VB]	SSE
Warren Lacey [WL]	NPg
Code Administrator	
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Alysson Peña [AP]	ElectraLink

1. Administration

- 1.1 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 and agreed to the Terms of Reference.
- 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 to review and discuss the update on the DCC solution within the Working Group and agree next steps.

3. Update on DCC Solution

- 3.1 The Chair invited PA to provide an update on the recent developments and the interactions with the DCC with the Working Group.
- 3.2 The Key updates can be found below:
- 3.3 PA informed the group that he met with a number of people on 04 October 2024 to seek the DCC’s views on a potential proposal for their help with the DNOs comms hub swap out events.
- 3.4 Analysis was carried out looking at previous events that triggered an 8.12.1 and an 8.11 to get the timings of when they are typically sent. This was only looked at for the comms hub swap. They concluded that the 8.12.1 do complete quicker than the 8.11 because meters are also possibly being swapped out. The metrics are consistent month on month. It was noted that this may not be using the ‘hot swap’ process which is expected to bring this time down further.
- 3.5 AC queried whether using the power outage restoration alert could be used for everything else – PA explained that it has not been stated that DNOs accept this solution due to the 30 minutes timings that are involved. The DCC said they could create a bespoke solution for the DNOs as part of an elective communication service (commercial arrangement) to create a new alert.
- 3.6 For this to work installers must do live comms hub exchanges and follow strict procedures to be to do this as quick as possible. The new alert would then be sent to the DNOs between 15-30 minutes. AB noted that DNOs were not happy with the timescales for DNOs to wait before contacting the Customer.
- 3.7 VB queried how long DNOs are currently waiting to contact a customer after receiving a power outage alert (prior to receiving a restoration alert) as this would help the group to determine a timescale that is acceptable. WL and JH stated they aim to contact the customer no later than 15 minutes and PA confirmed this is the position agreed by DNOs.
- 3.8 The Secretariat agreed to take an action to circulate the RFI responses (2023) as an attachment to the minutes as there was a question within the RFI where DNOs responded in relation to timeframes. This can be found as **Attachment 1**.

ACTION 14/01: The Secretariat to circulate the DCP 419 Collated RFI Responses document to the Working Group as an attachment to the draft minutes.

- 3.9 In summary, DNOs do not believe the DCC solution is feasible, and they are minded to continuing with the Market Message for all DCUSA Parties (although noting the concerns raised).
- 3.10 LM raised a couple of points to the working group:
- Depending on the final solution decided, this may not be a DCUSA led change (i.e., maybe the REC).
 - LM queried DCP 419 related actions being discussed at different forums such as the STIG, however it was clarified that these discussions were at the direction of the DCP 419 working group to aid discussions at these meetings.
- 3.11 An alternative solution of app/ online portal was discussed to notify when works are going to be carried out.
- 3.12 PA explained that utilising an app was previously discussed, and DNOs felt that the DTN was the most appropriate solution as this is a widely used for various other messages. LM stated that any solution would be for REC/DCUSA to develop centrally and not for the DNOs to develop, with costs between split between all parties.
- 3.13 AC supported the approach of considering the above alternative solution.
- 3.14 Following the above discussions, LM agreed to take an action to explore this alternate option further and at the next Working Group meeting.

ACTION 14/02: LM to provide the Working Group with further detail as to what the alternative solution could look like.

- 3.15 It noted that any alternate solution must be in scope of the change, i.e. for the purposes of pre-notifying Distributors of planned work.
- 3.16 DJ suggested that the business requirements used for the discussions held with the DCC are provided to both LM/REC and then share this with a system provider that could potentially provide this solution. Following this, costs and timescales can then be discussed within the Working Group and next steps can be agreed as to whether the cloud-based alternate solution would be a suitable option to progress.
- 3.17 The Working Group agreed with the above approach.
- 3.18 The Chair agreed to reach out to both LM and REC to discuss the alternate solution suggested and will send a doodle poll for the next meeting to discuss the outcomes.

ACTION 14/03: The Secretariat to reach out to both LM and REC to discuss the alternate solution suggested.

ACTION 14/04: The Secretariat to issue a doodle poll to arrange the next Working Group meeting.

4. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

- 4.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
1. LM to provide the Working Group with further detail as to next steps with proposed alternative.
 2. The Chair to liaise with both LM and REC in regard to the alternate solution.
 3. The Working Group to further discuss the alternative solution at the next meeting.

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 The next Working Group meeting is TBC.

7. Attachments

- Attachment 1_DCP 419 Collated RFI Responses (2023)
- Attachment 2_DCP 419 Work Plan

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
11/02	The Chair to create draft Change Report and issue to Working Group for review at the next meeting.	Chair	Ongoing.
12/01	PA to provide the Working Group with an update on any further discussions in relation to the alternative DCC solution.	PA	Ongoing.
13/03	The Chair to reach out to Ofgem to discuss possibilities of utilising these POA to establish unauthorised activities.	Chair	Ongoing.
14/01	The Secretariat to circulate the DCP 419 Collated RFI Responses document to the Working Group as an attachment to the draft minutes.	Secretariat	New Action.
14/02	LM to provide the Working Group with further detail as to what the cloud-based alternate option would look like.	LM	New Action.
14/03	The Secretariat to reach out to both LM and REC to discuss the alternate solution suggested.	Secretariat	New Action.
14/04	The Secretariat to issue a doodle poll to arrange the next Working Group meeting.	Secretariat	New Action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Update
-------------	--------

<p>12/02</p>	<p>RC to reach out to REC technical team to explore amending the structure of the Market Message.</p>	<p>Chair</p>	<p>Closed. <i>The Chair will re-engage with REC once the REC when necessary.</i></p>
<p>13/01</p>	<p>DCC to provide a detailed analysis on the time taken for alerts to travel through the system, this information shall be shared in the next meeting.</p>	<p>PA</p>	<p>Closed. <i>On the Agenda.</i></p>
<p>13/02</p>	<p>LM to reach out to UKPRA in relation to feasibility of sending pre-notification of Priority 2 and 3 jobs.</p>	<p>LM</p>	<p>Closed. <i>LM stated that it the feasibility of sending pre-notifications of Priority 2 and 3 jobs is unlikely that revenue protection can give an advanced notice but can keep this in scope for now.</i></p>