

## DCUSA Standing Issues Group (SIG) Meeting 173 Minutes

31 October 2025 at 10:00am: Web Conference

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Peter Waymont (PW)	UKPN
Mark Bellman (MB)	ENWL
Giannis Katsaros [GK]	ENA
David Spillett [DS]	ENA
Mark Jones (MJ)	SSE
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark
Niall Simmons [NS]	Smartest Energy
Kevin Woolard [KW]	British Gas
Megan Wong [MW]	Stark
Tim Ellington [TE]	RWE
Erik Baguzis [EB]	Indigo Networks
Jacqui Fellows [JF]	Valda Energy
Mark McClean (MM)	SPEN
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
Andrew Green [AG] (Chair and Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink

## 1. Administration

---

- 1.1 SIG members reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance”. All members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair advised the meeting would be recorded and it was explained that the recording would be deleted after the Draft Minutes are approved.

## 2. Review of Previous meetings actions and minutes

---

- 2.1 SIG members reviewed the previous minutes and agreed they were an accurate reflection. Action updates can be found in Appendix 1.

## 3. Review of the ENA RFI responses

---

- 3.1 The Chair began by reminding the SIG that late in 2024 the ENA gave a presentation on a project they were looking to deliver which would allow SIPs and MEMs to upgrade fuses to 80 amps without the DNO being present.
- 3.2 It was noted that the SIG agreed that it would be best for the DCUSA to issue an RFI on this project and its aims and the responses to this RFI were to be discussed at this meeting.
- 3.3 Further detail of this meeting can be found within the meeting minutes [here](#)
- 3.4 GK gave the SIG a more detailed explanation of what the project is aiming to deliver. GK reinforced that the project is looking to allow SIPs and MEMs to upgrade fuses to 80 amps which will support more low carbon technologies (LCTs) being installed in properties across the UK.
- 3.5 GK went on to explain that there will be a rigorous training programme to support the MEMs and SIPs in being able to carry out the upgrades and the training programme will be agreed with the DNOs.
- 3.6 DS advised that this was a piece of work that the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) was pushing the ENA to deliver.
- 3.7 The Chair shared the RFI responses on screen, these responses can be found within Attachment 1 ENA Fuse Upgrade Project RFI Responses.

Q1 In what ways do you communicate with DNOs? For what purposes you are using these systems and what are their benefits? Currently, we have identified the DTN and ENA Connect Direct as potential mechanisms for audit trail and we are keen to get your views on these systems or any others that we may not be aware of.

- 3.8 There was a mixture of different communication channels raised that parties use to communicate with DNOs. These are below
  - The DTN
  - ENA Connect Direct

- Emails
- Telephone calls

- 3.9 In the instances of telephone calls, the responses suggested that these are mainly used when there is an urgent query as this is a more direct line of communication.
- 3.10 It was noted by one response that ENA Connect Direct had a number of issues and areas for improvement. They include:
- Lack of centralised inbox access: responses and updates are only received by the submitting user, so messages are sometimes missed during staff absence (annual leave or sickness), which is difficult for a multi-team operation.
  - Limited visibility of DNO updates: in many cases, the DNO completes work (including fuse upgrades) without updating Connect Direct, leaving applications stuck in the 'more information required' status.
  - No consistent communication feedback loop: in some cases, after using Connect Direct we are redirected to the DNO's own portal, removing any efficiency benefit. In our view, the Connect Direct platform has potential to be an effective tool, yet it continues to operate as a consolidation of each individual DNO portal, rather than seeking to standardise the different processes.
- 3.11 It was noted that the platform for the notices to be issued on must be standardised across the industry so that parties were not using different communication methods, as this would be an inefficient process.
- 3.12 DS highlighted to the SIG that the notification process would be to tell the DNO that a job was happening, not asking for permission to carry out the fuse upgrade.
- 3.13 It was noted by a DNO SIIG member that whilst the DTN had been mentioned as the tried and tested method for sending notices to industry parties, not all parties or party categories are forced to use the DTN.
- 3.14 They went on to state that whichever platform is taken forwards, it would need to be fit for purpose for all parties involved.
- 3.15 A supplier SIG member queried if these RFI responses would be taken to the IWG for discussion. The Chair said he'd speak with the IWG Chair and see if this can also be raised within that forum.
- 3.16 A DNO member queried if the scope was only for the fuse upgrade, not for other jobs like a service cable upgrades and, if it was fuse upgrades only, what mitigations are in place to ensure it's only the fuse that's upgraded and the fuse is only upgraded when it is safe to do so.
- 3.17 DS highlighted that this process will be limited to 80-amp fuses only and anything over that would have to be done via the DNO.
- 3.18 He went on to say that they were currently working to create an energy recommendation document (ERED) that will give guidance on when a SIP or a MEM can upgrade the fuses and what processes they must follow. The training programme will reflect what's in the ERED.

Q2 What are the benefits and challenges of the work under the proposed scope?

- 3.19 One party noted that there isn't a lot of demand for LCTs to be installed and questioned if the project was needed.

- 3.20 DS highlighted that DESNZ has given direction that they are expecting to see a lot more LCTs being installed in the coming months and years and that demand will significantly increase meaning that whilst demand is low for now, it is expected to increase over time.
- 3.21 A DNO party within the meeting stated that this was their expectation too.
- 3.22 The same respondent above noted that there may not be any efficiency in this project as the DNO can carry out the fuse upgrade in the current process, however the SIG agreed that the efficiency was with the customer as jobs could be completed in one visit by one party rather than waiting for DNOs to attend a site to upgrade the fuse.
- 3.23 There were a few challenges raised around health and safety issues. DS advised the SIG that this project was only going to apply to services that had plastic cut outs and plastic cut outs and nothing else. This means that no work on metal cables or metal cutouts would be expected to occur as a result of this project.
- 3.24 DS went on to clarify that this will be made clear in the ERED and also the training and so the health and safety issues will be mitigated. DS also went on to state that the fuse upgrade will also not be allowed to take place on looped supplies.
- 3.25 A challenge was raised that the training material had not been seen yet and before anything is taken forward by the project, that would be a key area for review. DS ensured that this material will be shared in due course and that DNOs will be involved in the materials production.
- 3.26 It was noted by GK that the training will be carried out by a certified organisation such as the EUSR.
- 3.27 The main benefit mentioned by most parties was that the jobs would be carried out in one appointment which would be a better process for the customer.

Q3 Do you see appetite within your organisation to take this work forward considering the proposed scope?

- 3.28 A supplier response stated that there wasn't much appetite for this work at present within their organisation. It was again raised that it was anticipated that there would be a significant uptake in LCTs in the future and as such, appetite would increase in line with the demand in work.
- 3.29 DS mentioned that if the supplier party who raised this point wanted to have a chat about what the future uptake was expected to be, he would be happy to a speak with them.
- 3.30 Of the Six responses received, one said they wouldn't foresee them wanting to take this work on, four outright said yes, there would be appetite, and another said the main restriction for their business at present is the asbestos policy in place does not allow the removal of cartridge fuses from cut-out fuse carriers.
- 3.31 DS stated that as the project is only looking to allow the fuse upgrade to take place on plastic cut outs and cables, this should mitigate any risks around asbestos.

Q4 To support improvements in the customer journey, we propose that the costs associated to the purchase of the impedance loop testing, the cost for metering tails (supply and install) and the cost for purchasing the fuse are covered by your organisation. Would you be willing to proceed on that basis?

- 3.32 Five responses stated that they would be happy to proceed on the above basis with four of these responses stating that they already have the equipment in stock so the costs would be minimal, especially in comparison to the benefits this project could offer to customers.
- 3.33 The party who stated they wouldn't be willing to proceed under the current proposal stated that the expectation that suppliers fund loop testers, fuses, and training, for a task already performed by DNOs, is not commercially or operationally justified.
- 3.34 They also went on to say cost transfer would need to be supported by clear industry wide efficiencies and evidence of measurable benefit to our customers.
- 3.35 A concern was raised on how this would work with DUoS to ensure that there was no doubling up on costs and that further consideration to this would need to be made so the cost element isn't billed to the customer and also recovered.

Q5 Any other comments?

- 3.36 Three responses offered no further comment.
- 3.37 A supplier respondent noted that they see benefit in allowing SIPs and MEMs to carry out fuse downgrades as it aligns with existing safety and compliance obligations.
- 3.38 They went on to add that they believed DNOs should retain responsibility for upgrades to their own assets, with suppliers focusing on metering and safety assurance functions.
- 3.39 They also noted that allowing suppliers to utilise SIPs and MEMs to carry out fuse upgrades could create a potential commercial advantage for those supporting or promoting specific product installations (e.g. EV chargers or heat pumps).
- 3.40 They went on to say that the current proposal is unclear how this risk would be managed or audited and the SIG agreed that further consideration to this would be required. The SIG agreed that this was an area that required further consideration.
- 3.41 There were no other points raised that hadn't already been discussed in earlier responses.

#### 4. DIF 89 D0164 / MM00069 Flow

---

- 4.1 The SIG moved on to discuss DIF 89 D0164 / MM00069 Flow, for more information on this please see Attachment 2 DIF 89 D0164 - MM00069 Flows.
- 4.2 The proposer for this DIF explained that they have identified three flows that are DCUSA owned but and so they wanted to understand what these flows are used for, and they also raised that for the D0164 flow, no details could be found, and it appeared the flow was redundant.
- 4.3 MB went on to clarify the purpose of the DIF was to see if there was some other obligation for this flow that meant it was still needed and also if it wasn't needed how can a redundant flow that is identified be deleted.
- 4.4 It was queried where the information had been pulled from so MB agreed to take that away and check as it was unclear who owned what flows and whether this flow was in the EMDS, the DTC, the MRA and the REC flow portal.

- 4.5 As a side issue it was noted that the Electralink Data Transfer Catalogue had some flaws, not just in the description of the flows and ownership but also that some of the information within the flows was unclear.
- 4.6 The Chair noted that the Data Transfer team at Electralink were looking at the DTC to improve its accuracy, but he would feed this back to the correct team at Electralink.
- 4.7 It was noted that in relation to the specific D0164 flow, if it was not used then it could be deleted.
- 4.8 It was agreed for MB to raise a Change Proposal to remove the D0164 flow from the EMDS and then this should feed into the DTN team at Electralink to remove the flow from the DTC as well.
- 4.9 It was agreed that whilst the panel would review, it was this would likely be a part 2 matter going straight to vote.

## 5. Charging Interest on Credit Cover Defaults

---

- 5.1 MB highlighted that there is a provision within the DCUSA that allows a party to charge a fee and interest on a credit cover default.
- 5.2 MB went on to state that whilst he understood why there'd be fee and interest charged on a normal credit default, credit cover isn't really working capital so questioned if that was appropriate to charge interest on a credit cover default.
- 5.3 A DNO SIG member agreed that it would be worth exploring this further and how the interest element came around and suggested that a Working Group discussion would establish how and why the interest charge was landed on and if it's still appropriate in the present time.
- 5.4 They went on to say that the interest payment came about from Ofgems original guidelines in 2005 and agreed to send this over to MB as this may contain information as to how Ofgem arrived at the decision to charge interest for credit cover defaults.
- 5.5 It was noted that a lot has changed since 2005, so these guidelines don't necessarily mean that it is still appropriate to charge interest today.
- 5.6 MB agreed to raise a new change proposal to review.

## 6. Any Other Business

---

- 6.1 There was no AOB.

## 7. Date of Next Meeting:

---

- 7.1 The next SIG meeting will take place on 28 November 2025 at 10:00am, via Microsoft Teams.

## 8. Attachments

---

- Attachment 1 ENA Fuse Upgrade Project RFI Responses
- Attachment 2 DIF 89 D0164 - MM00069 Flows.

## APPENDIX 1

---

## New and open actions

Action Ref.	Topic	Action	Owner	Update
173/01	DCUSA Flows	MB to raise to CP to look at deleting the D0164 flow	Mark Bellman	<b>Open</b>
173/02	Credit cover	MB to raise a CP to see in interest charges should apply to credit cover defaults	Mark Bellman	<b>Open</b>
<b>164/02</b>	ECR changes	Secretariat to set up a subgroup to discuss ECR changes with a new set of terms of reference.	Secretariat	<b>Completed</b>
<b>168/03</b>	DIF 82	ACL to take the output of Mays SIG meeting to the next IDNO forum to identify which data items would be required.	ACL	<b>Completed</b>
<b>170/01</b>	SIG 169 Minutes	AG to correct SVs name in the minutes from SIG meeting 169	Andy Green	<b>Completed</b>
<b>170/04</b>	DIF 84	The Secretariat to raise a DCP to be presented to the August Panel in accordance with the direction from the SIG Group	Andy Green	<b>Completed</b>
<b>170/05</b>	DIF 85	The Secretariat to raise a DCP to be presented to the August Panel in accordance with the direction from the SIG Group	Andy Green	<b>Completed</b>
<b>170/07</b>	Housekeeping item 127 RIO ED2	The Secretariat to investigate if the' RIIO-ED1 to RIIO-ED2 references' housekeeping item is still required and if so, establish next steps.	Andy Green	<b>Ongoing</b>
<b>171/01</b>	DIF 88	EC to report back to SIG next month with update on progress in relation to DIF 88.	Emma Clarke	<b>Ongoing</b>

## APPENDIX 2

### Closed actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
<b>162/01</b>	RC to request a housekeeping change is raised to change party to a lower-case p within the DCUSA	Secretariat	<b>Closed.</b>

	legal text were the text lays out the process for who can raise an ECR change request.		
<b>162/02</b>	RT to liaise with the technical lead on the LTDS project to understand how a change could be implemented outside the project if that meant it could be delivered quicker than if it was done via the LTDS project.	Ryan Taylor	<b>Closed.</b>
<b>162/03</b>	RC to continue to liaise with RT offline post RT speaking with their technical LTDS project lead to discuss if and how the ECR changes could be dealt with and then bring these ideas to the SIG early in 2025.	Secretariat	<b>Closed.</b>
<b>164/01</b>	AG to update the November meeting minutes with what the LTDS acronym meant, insert a link to the LTDS guidance page and mark the actions captured within paragraphs 3.3 and 3.18-3.23 in a clearer fashion and add them to an action log and reissue.	Secretariat	<b>Closed.</b>
<b>164/03</b>	Secretariate to ensure that the panel receives regular updates on the ECR change requests	Secretariat	<b>Closed</b>
<b>165/01</b>	AG to update the January meeting minutes so that the actions correctly show as 164/2 and 164/3	Secretariat	<b>Closed</b>
<b>165/02</b>	AG to create a subgroup to continue to investigate the issue.	Secretariat	<b>Closed</b>
<b>165/03</b>	AG to create a subgroup to continue to investigate the issue.	Secretariat	<b>Closed</b>
<b>165/04</b>	SIG members who have experienced this issue to see who had installed the generators	Secretariat	<b>Closed</b>
<b>165/05</b>	AG to create a subgroup to continue to investigate the issue.	Secretariat	<b>Closed</b>
<b>165/06</b>	AG to support KB with the REC to draw a high-level process map for the installation of generators.	Secretariat	<b>Closed</b>
<b>165/07</b>	MB to raise a DCUSA change proposal to resolve the issues raised in DIF 79.	Mark Bellman	<b>Closed</b>
<b>165/08</b>	MB to raise an issue for March's SIG meeting to discuss the use of RPI and CPIH	Mark Bellman	<b>Closed</b>
<b>166/01</b>	RC to update the minutes and post new version on website.	Secretariat	<b>Closed</b>
<b>166/02</b>	RC to reach out to REC to explore reviewing the de-energisation processes.	Secretariat	<b>Closed</b>
<b>166/03</b>	RC to create raise DIF 80 at DCMDG.	Secretariat	<b>Closed</b>



<b>167/01</b>	The Secretariat to contact VB to see if any gaps in the process were highlighted.	Secretariat	<b>Closed</b>
<b>167/02</b>	MB And PW to set up a Bi-Lateral call to discuss the issue and bring the output of this call to the SIG in May	Mark Bellman and Peter Waymont	<b>Closed</b>
<b>167/03</b>	MB to update a DCUSA CP with the aspiration to have this reviewed at the May Panel meeting.	Mark Bellman	<b>Closed</b>
<b>167/04</b>	The MHHS Stakeholder Group to review the data within EMDS and the Swagger and feedback on any inconsistencies.	MHHS Stakeholder Group	<b>Closed</b>
<b>170/06</b>	DIFs 86 and 87	AG to create a Doodle Poll to invite interested parties to a SIG Subgroup to discuss the DIFs in more detail.	<b>Closed</b>