

## IWG Subgroup - Restricted Access Customer Letter - Meeting 02

13 May 2025 at 10:00am  
Teleconference

Attendees	Company
Chris Varney [CV]	OVO
Danielle Brown [DB]	SPEN
Jordan Hills [JH]	SSEN
Michael Turrington [MT]	EDF
Paul Morris [PM]	UKPN
Richard Brady [RB]	National Grid
Shuba Khatun [SK]	SSEN
Victoria Burkett [VB]	SSE
Warren Lacey [WL]	NPg
Secretariat	
Hannah Proffitt [HP] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink

### Apologies

Attendees	Company
David Brown [DB]	AMO
Michael Gorewoda [MG]	EON
Paul Abreu [PA]	ENA

## 1. Administration

---

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed attendees to the IWG Subgroup, advising that the purpose of the group is to produce a set of customer letters regarding restricted access.

### **Recording**

- 1.2 The Chair asked members for permission to record the meeting for the purpose of aiding the Technical Secretariat. No members objected.

### **Apologies**

- 1.3 Apologies are noted in the table above.

### **Competition Law Guidance**

- 1.4 The Chair reminded members to act in accordance with the terms set out in the DCUSA “Competition Law Guidance” for the duration of the meeting.

### **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

- 1.5 The Chair asked members if there were any comments on the minutes of the previous meeting, to which nothing was raised.

## 2. Review Open Actions

---

- 2.1 The Chair asked members for updates on the below actions from the previous meeting.

### Feedback from members’ regs/legal teams on disconnection

- 2.2 JH advised that their legal/regs team agreed to review the letters once the drafting had been finalised.

- 2.3 No further feedback was received.

### Examples of restricted access situations

- 2.4 CV and JH presented several pictures to the group showing examples of equipment with restricted access.

- 2.5 The Chair noted that these were intended to provide examples to members of the subgroup and would not be circulated in the minutes.

## 3. Finalise First and Second Letters

---

- 3.1 The Chair advised that following the last meeting, several members had provided further feedback on the letters. The Chair presented the updated versions to the group.

- 3.2 Members reviewed the first letter, and did not have any further comments.

- 3.3 Members went on to review the second letter. A summary of discussions are below.

- Members agreed to update the first sentence of the letter to include the date of the first visit to the property. Members also agreed to add 'you were informed that' to reference the initial conversation regarding the issue.
- Members acknowledged that if the Supplier had not handed the letter to the customer on the first visit, it would be possible to amend the text slightly as it is just a template.
- Members considered whether they needed to ask customers to contact them if they had completed the work to resolve the issue, but agreed that the current wording makes it clear that the customer needs to contact them either way.
- Members discussed whether they should provide examples of ways to resolve the situation, e.g. to create access or to move the meter position. Members decided there would be too many possible solutions and agreed not to add this information as it may cause confusion. Members acknowledged that these options would be discussed with the customer once they had phoned.
- Members updated the third paragraph to read 'to discuss options for a resolution'.

3.4 The Chair agreed to send the updated versions of the letter to members following the meeting for a final review.

3.5 The Chair noted that once finalised, the templates can be issued to DNO and Supplier Contract Managers along with some background information on the work done by the subgroup.

## 4. Creation of Third Letter Template

---

4.1 Members agreed that in situations where the first and second letters have not been effective, the actions taken will be company specific.

4.2 CV noted that the second letter alludes to disconnection if the customer does not comply and noted that it is easier for DNOs to disconnect a supply than it is for Suppliers. CV asked if there would be scope for DNOs to assist Suppliers with the disconnection. CV acknowledged that this would likely be a very rare occurrence.

4.3 RB noted that the Supplier could disconnect from the cut out if it is accessible. If it is not accessible, RB and PM agreed that the Supplier would need to contact the DNO and each situation would be considered on an individual basis.

4.4 PM asked whether Suppliers have many of these situations and noted that resource will be needed to resolve them once the process is in place. CV noted that the number they have is in the hundreds but that they feel the majority will be resolved quickly if the customers feel there is a disconnection risk.

4.5 DB suggested there is likely an existing process/flow in place for Suppliers needing a disconnection and requiring DNO engagement. WL agreed there is a process for Suppliers to request a disconnection but that there are caveats around this. DB agreed to look into the process within her business.

Action 02/01 – DB to look into their companies' processes for Suppliers requesting a disconnection and requiring DNO engagement.

- 4.6 VB noted that the process may be outlined under the Consolidated Metering Code of Practice (CoMCoP).
- 4.7 VB suggested that a letter could be drafted and sent to the Federation of Master Builders to try and prevent these situations from arising. The group agreed that increasing awareness could reduce the numbers. Members noted that if some of these situations could be prevented, it would save those customers money.
- 4.8 VB agreed to investigate whether building regulations contain details on how access to a meter should be maintained. The Chair noted that if not, the group could consider looking to address this.

Action 02/02 – VB to investigate whether building regulations contain details on how access to a meter should be maintained.

- 4.9 A post meeting update has been added to the action in the appendix.

## 5. Agree Comms to be Circulated to Organisations with the Letters

- 5.1 The Chair agreed they would draft a communication to circulate with the letters once they had been finalised.

## 6. Any Other Business

- 6.1 The Chair asked whether there was any other business, to which nothing was raised.

## New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
02/01	DB to look into their companies' processes for Suppliers requesting a disconnection and requiring DNO engagement.	DB	<b>New Action.</b>
02/02	VB to investigate whether building regulations contain details on how access to a meter should be maintained.	VB	<b>New Action.</b> <i>Post meeting update – VB noted there was no information within building regs detailing how access to a meter should be maintained. There are several documents relating to installation and safety but not access. Other builders' forums do state that access should be maintained, but there are no guidelines.</i> <i>VB noted that ENA and GTC have both developed guidance for developers, but it does not cover renovations and access.</i>

## Closed Actions

Action Ref.		Update	
01/01	Members to consult their regulations/legal teams regarding the third letter and potential actions.	Members	<b>Action closed.</b> JH advised that their legal/regs team agreed to review the letters once the drafting had been finalised.
01/02	Members to provide examples of situations in which access is restricted.	Members	<b>Action closed.</b> CV and JH presented several pictures to the group showing examples of equipment with restricted access.  The Chair noted that these were intended to provide examples to members of the subgroup and would not be circulated in the minutes.