

DCP 467 Working Group - Meeting 01

12 January 2026 at 14:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Alexander Pentecost [AP]	Eclipse Power
Amy Cox [AC]	EDF
Andrew Bevan [AB]	EON
Angela Copeland [AnC]	SPEN
Caroline Freimuller [CF]	RECCo
Cieta Davies [CD]	ENWL
David Jones [DJ]	Alt Han
John Harmer [JH]	Waters Wye
Jordan Hills [JH]	SSE
Komal Brown [KB]	Scottish Power
Laide Adekanle [LA]	Scottish Power
Michael Gorewoda [MG]	EON
Michael Turrington [MT]	EDF
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark
Paul Morris [PM]	UKPN
Richard Brady [RB]	National Grid
Richard Hill [RH]	British Gas
Steve Harker [SH]	Utilita
Code Administrator	
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Hannah Proffitt [HP] (Technical Secretariat)	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 An action log has been created, and all updates are provided in **Appendix A**.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The purpose of this meeting is to review the Change Proposal and agree next steps.

3. Overview of DCP 467 ‘Online reporting tools for Category A and B defects’

- 3.1 The Chair invited the proposer (PM) to provide an overview of the DCP 467 Change Proposal to the Working Group. This is summarised below.

Problem

- *Category A reports current via telephone, Category B reports currently via D0135 flow. These methods cause delays and can include limited information.*
- *40% of Category B aborts on the first visit are linked to missing work context.*
- *35,000 defect reports are expected to be received in 2026, online tool provides large efficiency and customer experience opportunities.*
- *Adoption rates of current online tools are critical to the business cases for other DNOs seeking to introduce a similar tool.*
- *Core costs are in DNO set up, linking the tool to primary IT interfaces.*

Proposal

- *To mandate the use of online tools as the primary route where provided.*
- *To introduce a single industry landing page linking to all DNO tools.*
- *To update the DCUSA legal text to reflect this obligation.*

Benefits

- *Improved online tool utilisation.*
- *Faster triage and safer outcomes.*
- *Improved report quality*
- *Fewer repeated visits, leading to a better customer experience.*

- *A lower carbon footprint from reduced visits.*

3.2 PM clarified that where a DNO has provided an online tool, the proposal is to mandate the use of this tool instead of reporting category As by telephone and category Bs via the D0135 data flow. PM added that the online tool raises a job in their system and that if (for category Bs) a D0135 flow is also sent, this would be rejected as only one job can be registered to each MPAN. This prevents duplicate jobs being raised.

3.3 PM shared data regarding the current usage of the tool for category A and category Bs.

4. Review and Discussion of the Change Proposal

4.1 The Chair invited the Working Group to discuss the DCP 467 Change Proposal.

4.2 KB raised that it is unclear who is currently using the online tool and suggested that it would be useful for Suppliers to see which MOPs are using the tool. PM noted that the data is currently collected by Supplier, however noted they understood that some Suppliers may use several MOPs.

4.3 PM advised that if using the online tools becomes mandatory, it will be easier to introduce as a requirement in MOP/Supplier contracts.

4.4 AC highlighted that the Proposer had mentioned delays in receiving the D0135 flows and asked if Suppliers are meeting their current obligations of sending these within five Working Days (WDs).

4.5 PM clarified that Suppliers are meeting their obligations but that the online portal would allow this information to be received sooner.

4.6 AC highlighted that the Proposer had mentioned issues with the data received via the flow. AC questioned whether the flows are not being completed properly or whether the portal just allows additional information to be included.

4.7 PM advised that the quality of the data is poor, with issues including missing customer names and telephone numbers. PM noted that around 20% include a landline instead of mobile number which can make contact more difficult. PM advised that the online portal ensures these details are included as the fields are mandatory.

4.8 AC noted that currently only one DNO has provided a portal, but that if more portals are introduced, it could become more complicated for Suppliers to remember which DNOs have a portal and which do not. AC highlighted that the current approach of sending a D0135 flow is universal to all DNOs and therefore simpler.

4.9 PM advised they are proposing a single industry landing page is created linking to all DNO tools. Members agreed that this would be crucial, and suggested it could be managed by the Energy Networks Association (ENA).

4.10 AC asked how the obligation would be monitored to ensure Suppliers are using the portal. PM advised that they are currently monitoring usage by the ten largest Suppliers, however that this can be expanded to monitor which Suppliers are using it.

- 4.11 AC asked if consideration had been given to updating the D0135 flow to fix the current issues, as this would benefit all users.
- 4.12 PM advised that they have been working for a number of years to improve the data and that ElectraLink are currently looking into this as well. PM advised that a big benefit of the portal is the inclusion of photos.
- 4.13 Regarding reporting Category As, CD asked if the MOP would make a phone call as well as using the portal. PM noted that only the portal would be needed which is a significantly faster process. CD noted that they find the phone call from the MOP valuable as it allows them to ask clarifying questions and request any missing information whilst the MOP is still on site.
- 4.14 PM noted that they understand the value in the phone call and this would need to be considered as part of the decision. PM noted that the inclusion of photographs in the portal adds a lot of value.
- 4.15 In addition, CD advised they would still like to receive a data flow when Category Bs are reported as flows are a crucial part of the current process. PM highlighted that a flow can still be sent but that it would be received a couple of days after the portal job and would get blocked because there would already be a job registered against the MPAN. PM advised that the D0126 and D0368 flows are still sent back by the DNO even if the D0135 is not sent.
- 4.16 KB noted they see value in using the portal for Category As as these reports are an emergency and the portal is a faster process. KB added that their preference would be to retain the flows for Category Bs and use the portal as well for extra information. PM reiterated that there would be no requirement to stop using the flow, however it will be received days after the portal job and would not be necessary.
- 4.17 RB highlighted that it is down to the individual DNOs to decide whether they want to implement a portal and how this would work with their processes. RB highlighted that the change is proposing to mandate the use of existing portals where already available.
- 4.18 KB noted that currently automation is set up to assist the MOP in filling in the information for the flow, and asked if this would be available for the portal. PM noted that the information would need to be completed manually.
- 4.19 Members considered that this could add time onto MOP jobs. PM agreed that extra time would be associated with reporting these online, however that approximately 1 in 40 jobs are Category B and therefore the burden would be minor and the benefits outweigh this.
- 4.20 PM noted that around 30% of MOPs are already using the online portal and therefore suggested that members refer to colleagues internally seeking their feedback and experiences. Members agreed.
- 4.21 MT highlighted that they support the principles of the proposal, however suggested that measures should be put in place to ensure DNOs do not mandate additional tools alongside the portals.
- 4.22 SH asked whether the MOP will receive confirmation of receipt of the job when submitting on the portal. PM agreed they would, noting the MOP would receive a reference number instantly which can be copied into their system.

- 4.23 SH asked what would happen if the MOP was unable to submit the job due to poor internet signal. PM advised that the MOP could still phone as this functionality is not going to be removed, or they could complete the online form and submit it once they have internet again.
- 4.24 KB noted that currently, if an engineer raises a job with the wrong DNO, a rejection flow is sent back, and asked what the process is on the portal. PM advised that the portal does not allow the job to be sent if it is for another DNO. KB acknowledged this is a benefit of the portal.
- 4.25 The Chair asked members whether they feel the change can progress straight to consultation or whether further work should be completed first to address any of the matters raised.
- 4.26 AC highlighted that the consultation needs to provide clarity on exactly what is being proposed and what has been discussed during this meeting. The Chair agreed.
- 4.27 Members discussed and agreed that a Request For Information (RFI) should be issued to DNOs, MOPs and Suppliers to seek further information before progressing to consultation. Members took an action to submit questions they would like included in the RFI.

Action 01/01 – Members to send in questions they would like included in the RFI.

- 4.28 The Chair took an action to create a draft RFI to circulate to members for review, once questions have been received.

Action 01/02 - The Chair to create a draft RFI to circulate to members for review, once questions have been received.

- 4.29 Members agreed that when deciding a deadline for the RFI responses, the end of January/early February should be avoided due to current workloads.
- 4.30 CF, a RECCo representative, raised that this change will impact the Retail Energy Code (REC) and that updates to the service termination issue reporting document will be needed to align with this. CF suggested that the consultation for the REC change should be aligned with the DCUSA consultation. The Chair agreed to meet with CF to discuss this after the meeting. CF also flagged that the D0135 flow notes will need to be reviewed and possibly updated as part of the REC change.

Action 01/03 - The Chair to meet with CF (RECCo) to discuss the REC change and aligning the two consultations.

5. Next Steps and Work Plan

- 5.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
- Members to send in questions to be included in the RFI.
 - The Chair to produce a draft RFI using the questions submitted and send to members for review.

- Once finalised the RFI can be issued to industry.
- The group will meet next to discuss RFI responses, date TBC.

6. Any Other Business

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

7. Date of Next Meeting

- 7.1 The date of the next Working Group meeting is to be confirmed.

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/01	Members to send in questions they would like included in the RFI.	Members	New action.
01/02	The Chair to create a draft RFI to circulate to members for review, once questions have been received.	The Chair	New action.
01/03	The Chair to meet with CF (RECCo) to discuss the REC change and aligning the two consultations.	The Chair	New action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update