

DCP 467 Working Group - Meeting 02

20 April 2026 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Amy Cox [AC]	EDF
Caroline Freimuller [CF]	RECCo
David Jones [DJ]	Alt Han
George Barnes [GB]	Utilita
John Harmer [JH]	Waters Wye
Komal Brown [KB]	Scottish Power
Laide Adekanle [LA]	Scottish Power
Michael Turrington [MT]	EDF
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark
Paul Morris [PM]	UKPN
Richard Brady [RB]	National Grid
Richard Hill [RH]	British Gas
Shuba Khatun [SK]	SSE
Code Administrator	
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Hannah Proffitt [HP] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Angela Copeland [AnC]	SPEN
Jordan Hills [JH]	SSE

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 Updates on the actions are provided in **Appendix A**.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The purpose of this meeting is to review the draft consultation document and draft legal text.

3. Review Draft Consultation

- 3.1 The Chair presented the draft consultation to members, noting that some comments on the document had been submitted ahead of the meeting.
- 3.2 AC highlighted that at the previous meeting, some DNOs had stated they would want the D0135 flow sent in addition to the portal being used. AC suggested that the consultation document needs to clearly state that the process will not necessarily be the same for every DNO/reporting tool.
- 3.3 KB raised that it will be challenging for Suppliers to follow different processes for different DNOs. KB suggested that online tools should be implemented by all DNOs initially, and then a change could be raised to mandate their use. AC agreed. PM highlighted that it is not currently practical for all DNOs to be able to implement online reporting tools and that mandating their use may help with DNOs’ business cases to develop them.
- 3.4 CF advised that the solution is currently drafted under both the DCUSA and REC to state that using an online reporting tool supersedes the phone call or the flow.
- 3.5 RB suggested that when DNOs first implement online tools, they may want to send the flow as well to ensure the tool is working correctly and nothing is being missed.
- 3.6 The Working Group agreed to include a question asking DNOs if they would want the flow to be sent/the phone call to be made, in addition to the online tool being used.
- 3.7 Members questioned what would happen if there was no signal to use the online tool, or if the job did not go through properly. PM clarified that this possibility exists already with current processes, and that once a job is successfully submitted through the portal it provides a reference number as confirmation.
- 3.8 AC noted that this is the case with UKPN’s portal, however questioned how they can ensure all DNOs’ portals have the same. Members acknowledged the need for rules on what DNO portals should include and how they should function.
- 3.9 AC questioned whether these rules could be added as part of this change or whether a separate change would need to be raised. CF suggested that if there is a current obligation within DCUSA for reference numbers to be provided when reporting category As by phone, it would make sense for that change to be within DCUSA. Members were unsure if this obligation currently exists.

- 3.10 CF highlighted that they have made an addition to the REC legal text stating that online portals cannot make data items mandatory that are not mandatory in the data flows. CF noted that otherwise, things could be made mandatory without going through a code's change process. CF clarified that things like photos can be requested but cannot be mandatory.
- 3.11 PM noted that the inclusion of photos is one of the core benefits of using the online tools. MT agreed and suggested that if the inclusion of photos is not mandated they believe very few will be sent.
- 3.12 CF noted that if additional data items are to be mandated, there would need to be something in either DCUSA or REC that states the list of data items that are mandatory to be provided in online tools for DNOs. CF noted that they could include this under the current change, however it would become a much larger change.
- 3.13 The Working Group agreed to include consultation questions regarding whether parties believe including photographs is beneficial and whether it should be mandated.
- 3.14 MT raised a concern that moving to the online reporting tools could shift initial assessment from a DNO engineer site visit to a remote assessment based on the information submitted (e.g., photos). MT asked how the risk of incorrect assessments will be mitigated and whether extra training will be needed for those making remote assessments.
- 3.15 The Chair noted that he believes the intent would still be for a DNO engineer to visit the site, but that the photo could help ensure the correct person is sent with the correct equipment. PM agreed, but noted that in the future it could allow the DNO the possibility of deciding not to attend the site if it is clear the asset does not belong to them. Members noted that there could be cost associated with DNOs training people to be able to make these decisions.
- 3.16 KB raised that from a Suppliers perspective, they want to know how many DNOs are going to be using an online reporting tool and what their processes will be. KB noted that this is the only way Suppliers will know what they are voting on/agreeing to and whether the benefits will outweigh the costs. AC agreed, reinforcing that Suppliers will not be able to make an informed decision on the change as it is unclear what DNO online reporting tools that are yet to be developed will look like.
- 3.17 AC questioned whether UKPN are speaking with Suppliers to encourage them to start using the online tool. PM confirmed that they are.
- 3.18 KB suggested adding a question asking whether it should be mandated for all DNOs to provide an online tool. The group agreed.
- 3.19 Members also agreed to add a question asking if parties have any alternative solutions that could achieve the objectives of the Change Proposal.
- 3.20 The Chair agreed to update the document based on discussions and issue to members for a final review.

Action 02/01 – The Chair to update the draft Consultation based on discussions at the meeting, and issue to members for final review.

4. Review Draft Legal Text

- 4.1 The Chair presented the current legal text to the Working Group.
- 4.2 Members raised that the drafting needs to be updated, as currently it does not mandate the use of the online tools. The Chair agreed to do this offline and to send the updated version to members for review.

Action 02/02 – The Chair to update the Legal Text based on discussions at the meeting, and issue to members for final review.

- 4.3 Members acknowledged that the legal text may change based on the outcome of the consultation. This will be articulated in the consultation.

5. Next Steps and Work Plan

- 5.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
- The Chair agreed to update the consultation document and legal text as per discussions at this meeting, and issue to members for review.
 - Once finalised, the Chair to issue the consultation to industry for a period of three weeks.
 - The Working Group to meet again on Wednesday 27 May at 1pm, to review the responses to the consultation.

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 next Working Group meeting will be held on Wednesday 27 May at 1pm.

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
02/01	The Chair to update the draft Consultation based on discussions at the meeting, and issue to members for final review.	The Chair	New action. <i>Sent to members on 21/04.</i>
02/02	Action 02/02 – The Chair to update the Legal Text based on discussions at the meeting, and issue to members for final review.	The Chair	New action. <i>Sent to members on 21/04.</i>

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update
01/01	Members to send in questions they would like included in the RFI.	Members	Action closed. <i>Members agreed to issue a consultation instead. This is discussed during the meeting.</i>
01/02	The Chair to create a draft RFI to circulate to members for review, once questions have been received.	The Chair	Action closed. <i>Members agreed to issue a consultation instead. This is discussed during the meeting.</i>
01/03	The Chair to meet with CF (RECCo) to discuss the REC change and aligning the two consultations.	The Chair	Action closed.