

# DCP 467 Working Group - Meeting 04

22 June 2026 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
<b>Working Group Members</b>	
Amy Cox [AC]	EDF
Caroline Freimuller [CF]	RECCo
Steve Harker [SH]	Utilita
Meg Wong [MW]	Stark
Jordan Hills [JH]	SSE
Nik Wills [NW]	Stark
Paul Morris [PM]	UKPN
Priya Punj [PP]	Alt Han
Richard Hill [RH]	British Gas
Scott Mcphillimy [SM]	Ofgem
Komal Brown [KB]	Scottish Power
Victoria Burkett [VB]	Eon Next
Paul Thomas [PT]	SPEN
<b>Code Administrator</b>	
Andy Green [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Hannah Proffitt [HP] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
<b>Apologies</b>	
John Harmer [JH]	Waters Wye

## 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 REC consultation responses, review of the draft Change Report and agreement of next steps.

## 3. Online Reporting Tool Presentation

---

- 3.1 PM delivered a presentation on the online reporting tool currently utilised within the UKPN area. PM explained that the tool has been operational since October 2021 and has been developed to improve the reporting and management of Category A and Category B defects.
- 3.2 The presentation outlined the functionality of the portal, together with examples of reporting workflows and usage statistics.
- 3.3 PM highlighted several perceived benefits, including improved quality of information submitted, the ability to capture photographic evidence at the point of reporting, improved customer contact information and reduced numbers of disputed reports.
- 3.4 PM also presented examples of supplier usage data and outlined potential future enhancements that could be accommodated through online reporting solutions.
- 3.5 This presentation can be found within attachment 1 DCP 467 UKPN Online Reporting Tool.
- 3.6 Following the presentation, AC raised concerns regarding statements within the slide pack that suggested implementation costs would primarily be incurred by DNOs. AC noted that consultation responses received from suppliers indicated that the implementation of DCP 467 would have consequences beyond DNOs and that supplier impacts should be clearly represented within any supporting material.
- 3.7 A significant element of the discussion focused on concerns relating to the potential introduction of multiple DNO-specific portals. AC noted that DCP 467 would apply wherever a DNO had made an online reporting tool available and therefore suppliers could ultimately be required to interact with several different systems. Whilst individual portals may not necessarily involve substantial costs when viewed in isolation, AC suggested that cumulative impacts across multiple DNO solutions could become material.
- 3.8 KB supported these observations and noted that consultation responses and industry discussions consistently identified implementation costs for suppliers. CF advised that responses received through the REC consultation had similarly identified implementation costs across Suppliers, SIPs and MEMs.

- 3.9 AG acknowledged the points raised and confirmed that the future Change Report would be developed on the basis of factual evidence gathered through consultation responses and Working Group discussions.
- 3.10 The Working Group undertook a detailed discussion regarding the operational implications of potentially maintaining multiple reporting routes. Members noted that a number of consultation responses had identified concerns regarding the introduction of parallel reporting arrangements, whereby some DNOs utilise online reporting mechanisms while others continue to rely upon existing DTN processes and telephone reporting arrangements.
- 3.11 SM noted that whilst the proposed solution may deliver benefits in terms of operational efficiency and customer outcomes, any solution which results in fragmentation across industry parties would require careful consideration by Ofgem. Members discussed whether some of these concerns could potentially be mitigated through standardisation of information requirements across online reporting tools.
- 3.12 The Working Group revisited the concept of a DCUSA-hosted landing page that could direct users to the appropriate reporting tool depending on the network area concerned.
- 3.13 Members agreed that this concept may help mitigate some of the concerns relating to multiple reporting routes and user confusion. The Working Group discussed whether a specific obligation should be included within the legal text if such a solution were developed. Further work remains ongoing in this area.
- 3.14 It was suggested by VB that using SDEP could be another potential solution for notifying parties of category A and B defects. VB highlighted that SDEP was already being used successfully for a number of different processes to notify parties of actions that have been, or need to be taken.
- 3.15 The Working Group agreed that it would be best if a separate sub group meeting be convened, facilitated by the DCUSA secretariat with the DNOs to gauge whether all DNOs were on board with bringing in an online tool to report category A and B defects and if they, if some sort of standardisation could be agreed between them as this would mitigate some of the dual process concerns.
- 3.16 If standardisation cant be achieved between DNOs then other potential solutions will be invested, which includes SDEP.

## 4. REC Consultation Questions

---

- 4.1 The Working Group reviewed the specific questions raised through REC consultation. The first question related to circumstances where onsite operatives have no network connectivity. PM explained that both telephone reporting and online reporting mechanisms rely upon the availability of network coverage and suggested that where no signal was available, the practical response would be similar regardless of reporting route.
- 4.2 The second discussion focused on how suppliers, MEMs and other affected parties should be informed if a DNO introduces a new online reporting tool. Members generally supported the inclusion of formal notification requirements within the DCUSA legal text and discussed whether minimum notification periods may also be appropriate.

- 4.3 The final REC consultation question related to the potential development of a DCUSA-hosted landing page containing links to DNO reporting tools. Members agreed that such a facility could assist users in identifying the correct reporting method and may help reduce confusion where multiple processes exist.

## 5. Next Steps and Work Plan

---

- 5.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
- The Chair to set up a separate subgroup with DNOs to seeks to standardise the process.
  - Next Working Group to be agreed via poll.

## 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 agreed via poll.

## 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	Ongoing
03/02	The Chair to produce a draft Change Report ahead of the next meeting.	The Chair	Ongoing
04/01	PM to send the presentation with the secretariat so it can be shared with the working group.	The Chair	<b>New action</b>
04/02	The Chair to set up a subgroup of DNOs to discuss the solution and explore standardisation.	The Chair.	<b>New Action</b>

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