

DCP 467 Working Group - Meeting 03

27 May 2026 at 13:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Amy Cox [AC]	EDF
Caroline Freimuller [CF]	RECCo
Cieta Davies [CD]	ENWL
George Barnes [GB]	Utilita
John Harmer [JH]	Waters Wye
Jordan Hills [JH]	SSE
Laide Adekanle [LA]	Scottish Power
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark
Paul Morris [PM]	UKPN
Priya Punj [PP]	Alt Han
Richard Hill [RH]	British Gas
Code Administrator	
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Hannah Proffitt [HP] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
David Jones [DJ]	Alt Han
Komal Brown [KB]	Scottish Power

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 No comments were raised on the minutes of the previous meeting.

1.3 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 consultation responses.

3. Review Consultation Responses

3.1 The Chair summarised that the consultation responses revealed no clear consensus across industry, with Parties often holding differing opinions on the proposed change.

3.2 The Working Group agreed to discuss the main themes identified within the responses, rather than reviewing the responses one by one. Discussions on the key themes are summarised below.

Parallel Processes/Operational Challenges

3.3 A recurring theme was the risk of confusion and complexity arising from both the online portal and existing reporting methods (D0135 flow and telephone) running in parallel, with Suppliers particularly concerned about operational challenges relating to this. Members discussed the difficulties for Meter Operators and Suppliers in navigating different processes across DNOs, especially when moving between areas with varying requirements.

3.4 The REC representative noted that, given the increasing number of IDNOs in operation, it is becoming more common for Meter Operators to work across areas. The member highlighted that, in some cases, they may move between a DNO and an IDNO simply by crossing the street.

3.5 The group considered mitigation options such as developing a centralised landing page that would direct users to the correct process based on location or MPAN, and providing clear, standardised guidance to reduce confusion. Members discussed the possibility of this page being hosted on the DCUSA website, with the Chair agreeing to explore the feasibility and associated costs.

Action 03/01 – The Chair to explore the feasibility and costs associated with developing a landing page to be hosted on the DCUSA website that would direct users to the correct reporting process based on location or MPAN.

3.6 The Proposer noted that, even if all DNOs implemented an online tool, there would likely need to be a transition period in which the online tool and D0135 flow would need to run in parallel. The Proposer advised that online tools should be designed to avoid duplication (e.g., only one live job per MPAN) and suggested that this is included in any online tool requirements.

Alternative Solutions

3.7 Members discussed the potential use of the Secure Data Exchange Portal (SDEP) as a standardised reporting interface. It was noted that, while this could be a relatively quick and low-cost solution to implement, it would require Meter Operator onboarding, system access design, and further impact assessment under the REC. This could result in a longer lead time for delivery.

- 3.8 One member queried whether a standardised form could be used to capture information and either route it directly to a DNO portal where available or automatically generate a data flow where a portal is not in place. The group discussed whether it would be possible for such an interface to interact with the DTN. Members acknowledged the complexities and costs associated with this suggestion.

Standardisation of Data Fields

- 3.9 Members discussed which items are currently mandatory in the D0135 flow. The REC representative advised that currently MPAN, Supplier ID, Meter Location, Smart Meter Installation Visit, Asset Condition Report Code and Date are the only mandated fields. Address is listed as optional, however at least one of the nine address fields must be filled out. The representative advised that telephone number is optional.
- 3.10 There was agreement within the Working Group on the need to standardise the data collected via online tools, mirroring the D0135 flow, with the possibility of making certain fields (e.g., contact telephone number) mandatory through a REC change. One member agreed to progress this with REC.
- 3.11 The Proposer advised that their online tool has telephone number intelligence, ensuring the correct number of digits/format is inputted.

Category A Reporting

- 3.12 Several consultation responses highlighted that in the case of reporting Category A defects, the phone call remains critical. Members noted that the telephone call enables real-time clarification where information is incomplete or unclear and supports follow-up where needed.
- 3.13 One member added that a phone call being made by the individual on site provides reassurance to the customer that action is being taken.
- 3.14 The Proposer noted that the online tool is the fastest way to report Category As and allows pictures to be included, rather than having to email them in separately. The Proposer emphasised that the phone line will always remain live if it is needed, however that using the online tool allows call centre staff to focus on customers rather than these reports.

Photographs

- 3.15 There was general agreement on the benefits of including photographs in defect reporting, but opinions were mixed on whether this should be mandatory or based on best endeavours, with concerns raised around situations where taking a photograph may not be feasible (for example in revenue protection visits).
- 3.16 The REC representative agreed with the consultation response suggesting a best endeavours approach, referencing the recent REC change R0253 which introduced a photograph obligation as best endeavours only. The REC representative added that if it is decided photographs are mandatory, tweaks will be needed to either the DCUSA or REC solution (currently unknown which) to specify what online tools can and cannot make mandatory.
- 3.17 One member highlighted that the provision of photographs should not prevent DNOs from carrying out site visits within the required timescales, noting that photographs may not always capture the full circumstances on site.

- 3.18 Another member advised that currently if they need photographs, they ask the customer who is usually happy to provide them. The member added that, in their experience, site attendance is generally straightforward in urban areas and that most issues are resolved on the first visit without a photo being received.

Mandating DNOs Provide an Online Tool

- 3.19 The group discussed whether mandating the online portals is feasible or desirable. One Supplier representative argued that mandating online tools would drive adoption and consistency, especially when dealing with multiple subcontractors, but only if all DNOs implemented the same system.
- 3.20 One DNO representative stated that they do not see sufficient value or business case to justify investment in an online portal, preferring to retain their current processes which they believe already meet customer needs and regulatory obligations.
- 3.21 One member suggested that the current Change Proposal could be revisited in the future if more DNOs adopt online portals, potentially making a mandated approach more practical and beneficial.
- 3.22 The Proposer highlighted the challenge for DNOs of justifying the cost of developing an online portal if only a minority of Suppliers will use it.

4. Next Steps and Work Plan

- 4.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
- The Chair agreed to complete the action regarding the centralised landing page ahead of the next meeting.
 - The Chair agreed to produce a draft Change Report to be circulated ahead of the next meeting.

Action 03/02 – The Chair to produce a draft Change Report ahead of the next meeting.
--

5. Any Other Business

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

6. Date of Next Meeting

- 6.1 The next Working Group meeting will be held on Monday 22 June at 10am.

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
03/01	The Chair to explore the feasibility and costs associated with developing a landing page to be hosted on the DCUSA website that would direct users to the correct reporting process based on location or MPAN.	The Chair	New action.
03/02	The Chair to produce a draft Change Report ahead of the next meeting.	The Chair	New action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			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	Action closed. <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	Action closed. <i>Sent to members on 21/04.</i>