

Meeting Session	DCUSA Panel (Open Session)
Paper Reference	Panel_2025_1119_08_SIG Headline Report
Action	For Information

SIG Headline Report

1. Synopsis

- 1.1 This report sets out the key decisions made at a DCUSA Standing Issues Group (SIG) meeting on 31 October 2025. The minutes of the meeting are available [here](#) on the DCUSA website.

2. Review ENA Fuse upgrade project RFI responses

- 2.1 The SIG began November's meeting by reviewing the responses to an RFI that was issued on behalf of the ENA in relation to a fuse upgrade project that they are hoping to deliver to support the installation of more low carbon technologies.
- 2.2 There were six responses to the RFI from a mixture of DNO's, SIPs, MEMs and Suppliers. One DNO in the meeting did state that they were still looking to issue a response to this RFI at a later stage which would bring the number of responses to seven.
- 2.3 There was broadly support for the project to progress with five of the six respondents saying they supported the initiative. The one respondent who didn't support the projects aims stated that demand for low carbon technologies (LCTs) was currently low, so they didn't believe there were enough benefits for the project to progress.
- 2.4 It was noted by the ENA that this was an initiative driven by DESNZ to support the installation of LCTs as it was expected that demand for these types of installations would significantly increase in the next few years.
- 2.5 There were concerns raised by the SIG and within the RFI responses around training and how the project seeks to ensure all the installations are safe. The ENA confirmed that there will be a guidance documentation shared with all installers detailing all processes and that a rigorous training program would also be in place.
- 2.6 It was advised that the training program would be designed with the DNOs and that it would be delivered by a credited training company.
- 2.7 It was also confirmed that the project was only seeking to upgrade fuses up to 80 amps and not above. It was also confirmed that the work would only be allowed to take place on supplies with plastic cut-outs and cables only, and that looped supplies were also out of scope. In the scenarios where the cut-outs and cables were not plastic, or a looped supply is identified, the DNO would be required to carry out the work as per current process.
- 2.8 It was also confirmed that where asbestos is identified, work on the site would be out of scope and that the DNO would be required to carry out the work as per current process.

- 2.9 It was noted by the suppliers, SIPs and MEMs who responded to the RFI that as they already have the equipment in stock for this type of work, the costs would not be prohibitive.

3. DIF 89 'D0164 / MM00069 Flows'

- 3.1 This DIF was raised to review the D0164 flow to see what it was designed for, if it was still in use and if it could be deleted if it was identified that this flow is redundant.
- 3.2 The proposer had identified that the flow was created in 1998, predating the DCUSA and that they could not find any current obligation in DCUSA requiring its use.
- 3.3 Other SIG members could not provide examples of this flow being used so it was agreed that a CP should be raised to request the decommissioning/removal of the flow.
- 3.4 It was believed within the SIG that this would be a part 2 matter and that the change would likely go straight to voting as it was unlikely a Working Group would be required.
- 3.5 As a side issue, it was noted that whilst the data transfer catalogue (DTC) was a user-friendly tool, some of the information within it was not accurate. The Chair took an action to speak to the relevant team at electriclink to review the DTC and also stated that the team was undertaking work to improve the accuracy and usability of the DTC.

4. Charging Interest on Credit Cover Defaults

- 4.1 An AOB item around the appropriateness of charging interest on credit cover defaults was raised.
- 4.2 It was noted that there is a provision within the DCUSA that allows a party to charge a fee and interest on a credit cover defaults. Whilst the admin charge was understood, it was queried if the interest charge was appropriate in the current time, as credit cover isn't really working capital.
- 4.3 A SIG member highlighted that the interest payment had been driven from Ofgem's original guidelines in 2005, and the member shared this document with the proposer to review offline.
- 4.4 It was noted that there had been a number of changes since 2005 so whilst the interest charge may have been appropriate then, it may not be appropriate now.
- 4.5 It was agreed that a CP should be raised to review the appropriateness of the interest charge for credit cover defaults and to remove the provision in the DCUSA, if the charge was deemed to be inappropriate now.

5. Next SIG Meeting – 28 November 2025

- 5.1 At present no new issues have been raised.

6. Recommendations

- 6.1 The DCUSA Panel is invited to:

- **NOTE** the contents of this paper.

Andy Green
Governance Senior Analyst