

## IWG Subgroup - Restricted Access Customer Letter - Meeting 04

12 August 2025 at 10:00am  
Teleconference

| Attendees                          | Company         |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Danielle Brown [DB]                | SPEN            |
| David Brown [DB]                   | AMO             |
| Jordan Hills [JH]                  | SSEN            |
| Michael Turrington [MT]            | EDF             |
| Paul Morris [PM]                   | UKPN            |
| Phillip Howell [PH]                | ENWL            |
| Raymond Elliot [RE]                | Energy Security |
| Richard Hill [RH]                  | British Gas     |
| Richard Brady [RB]                 | National Grid   |
| Shuba Khatun [SK]                  | SSEN            |
| Warren Lacey [WL]                  | NPg             |
| Secretariat                        |                 |
| Hannah Proffitt [HP] (Secretariat) | ElectraLink     |
| Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)       | ElectraLink     |

## 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 Updates on the open actions can be found in the Appendix.

## 3. Finalise Third Letters

---

- 3.1 The Chair advised that WL had sent an email prior to the meeting containing feedback from their Head of Regulatory Compliance on the letters and possible methods to notify the DNO of potential disconnection.

- 3.2 WL provided the following information regarding the method of communication.

*‘There is a disconnection data flow (D0132) which is either for the supplier to request a logical disconnection (MPAN only) or a physical disconnection. Generally physical disconnections are customer led direct into Connections, as the customer gets a quote and pays for the work. Clearly the customer will not request this disconnection. Current process where a physical disconnection data flow is received is, we initiate contact with the customer and a quote etc would be progressed.’*

- 3.3 WL advised they had asked internally whether they are prepared to disconnect on the Suppliers’ request in circumstances where the 3rd letter has not resolved the issue (this would have to be done outside the property since access to our equipment is blocked).

- 3.4 WL advised that the consensus was that disconnecting the customer would be a difficult step to take for a number of reasons. WL noted that cost must be considered, questioning who would pay as disconnection then reconnection is expensive and time consuming. WL added that although blocked in equipment is technically a safety issue, it is not an immediate one.

- 3.5 Members discussed the feasibility of acting on the third letter and disconnecting the customer and agreed that this step would require significant consideration. Members agreed that at this stage the group should work on incentivising the customer to remove the obstruction to the equipment.
- 3.6 The group reviewed letter one.
- 3.7 WL noted that feedback from their Head of Regulatory Compliance included stating which regulations are being referred to. The Chair highlighted that this is included in the footnote.
- 3.8 The group agreed to add 'and without full access to your electricity meter we are unable to do so.' To the second paragraph.
- 3.9 MT suggested they should not add anything further as it is intended to be a simple, easy to read letter.
- 3.10 The Chair highlighted that the purpose of the first two letters is to encourage as many customers as possible to engage and that only the third letter would require communication with the DNO. The Chair suggested that they could trial the use of the first two letters and assess benefits before deciding on a third letter.
- 3.11 The group agreed and suggested the Chair should circulate the first two letters to Supplier Contract Managers and ask that they provide any feedback/case studies they may have on the effectiveness. The group agreed to reconvene in six weeks to discuss progress.
- 3.12 The Chair agreed to circulate the letters and email to the subgroup for a final review before issuing more widely.
- 3.13 RB suggested that to use this as a trial, it would be beneficial to ask Suppliers to note the date that the letters are sent to track response times. RB asked how many days after the first letter is handed to the customer, should the second letter be sent, and then how long after that should the matter be referred to the DNO.
- 3.14 The Chair suggested that a recommendation could be included on the email circulating the letters.
- 3.15 RB raised that it could take longer to get a response if the letter has been handed to a tenant rather than the property owner. DB noted that MOPs will have a similar process for gas as there is a legal obligation to write to the landlord in rented properties.
- 3.16 The Chair agreed to include in the email that in instances where the letter is handed to a tenant, the Supplier should take necessary steps to inform the property owner as well.
- 3.17 The group agreed the following next steps:
- The Chair to circulate letter one and letter two to subgroup members for review.
  - The Chair to draft an email to Supplier Contract Managers and issue to subgroup members for review.
  - Members to meet again on 24 September at 10am to discuss progress with the letters.

- 3.18 *Post meeting note – following the meeting, a member provided feedback in relation to the first letter, suggesting this could be a leaflet left on site. This would provide a softer approach. Members feedback on this approach would be appreciated.*

## 4. Agree Communication Methods

---

- 4.1 This was discussed under agenda item 3. Members agreed that no communication with the DNO would be required regarding letters one and two.

## 5. Any Other Business

---

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

## New and Open Actions

| Action Ref. | Action  | Owner     | Update   |
|-------------|---|-----------|--|
| 04/01       | The Chair to circulate letter one and letter two to subgroup members for review.                    | The Chair | <b>New Action.</b><br>Completed after the meeting. |
| 04/02       | The Chair to draft an email to Supplier Contract Managers and issue to subgroup members for review. | The Chair | <b>New Action.</b><br>Completed after the meeting. |

## Closed Actions

| Action Ref. | Action   | Owner   | Update   |
|-------------|--|---------|--|
| 01/01       | Members to consult their regulations/legal teams regarding the third letter and potential actions.         | Members | <b>Action closed.</b><br>This was discussed under agenda item 3. |
| 03/01       | Distributor members to review how they should be notification that a Supplier has issued the third letter. | Members | <b>Action closed.</b><br>This was discussed under agenda item 3. |