

DCP 467 Working Group - Meeting 05

09 September 2026 at 14:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Amy Cox [AmC]	EDF
Angela Copeland [AnC]	SPEN
David Jones [DJ]	Alt Han
George Barnes [GB]	Utilita
Jordan Hills [JH]	SSE
Karen Ince [KI]	ENWL
Komal Brown [KB]	Scottish Power
Meg Wong [MW]	Stark
Paul Morris [PM]	UKPN
Scott Mcphillimy [SM]	Ofgem
Code Administrator	
Andy Green [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Hannah Proffitt [HP] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Caroline Freimuller [CF]	RECCo
John Harmer [JH]	Waters Wye

1. Administration

Recording

- 1.1 The Chair advised members that the meeting would be recorded for the purposes of aiding the technical secretariat only.

Apologies

- 1.2 Apologies are detailed in the table above.

Terms of Reference and Competition Law Guidance

- 1.3 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.
- 1.4 The Chair reminded Working Group members of the requirements set out in the Terms of Reference and the DCUSA letter signed by members. The Chair noted that, where possible, members should consider the proposal from an independent DCUSA perspective during Working Group discussions, while recognising that voting positions may be taken on behalf of members’ respective organisations.
- 1.5 The Chair encouraged members to work towards a solution where possible and confirmed that the Working Group does not need to reach a unanimous view. Any differing views will be reflected in the Change Report. The Chair also noted that, as this is a Part 1 matter, the DCUSA vote will act as a recommendation to Ofgem, with Ofgem making the final decision on whether the Change Proposal is implemented.

Minutes of the Previous Meeting

- 1.6 Regarding the minutes of the previous meeting, the Chair advised that VB had requested an amendment be made clarifying her preference for flows to be used in the solution. The Chair advised that the amendment has been made and the minutes reuploaded to the DCUSA website.
- 1.7 Updates on the actions are provided in **Appendix A**.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the possibility of using the Secure Data Exchange Portal (SDEP) in the solution and to consider next steps.

3. Discuss SDEP Solution

- 3.1 The Chair advised that they had met with the Proposer and REC to discuss the possibility of using the SDEP for this change solution. The Chair presented a set of slides provided by the REC, as CF had sent her apologies for the meeting.
- 3.2 The slides are included as **Attachment 1**.
- 3.3 KB proposed that Meter Operators (MOPs) should send photographs directly to DNOs through the SDEP, with Suppliers retaining visibility. KB argued that requiring MOPs to send photographs to Suppliers, followed by Suppliers uploading them to SDEP, would add administration, cost and an unnecessary intermediary step.
- 3.4 The Chair asked for an overview of the current process. KB explained that MOPs currently report asset-condition issues on behalf of Suppliers. Category A defects are reported by telephone because they

require an emergency response, while category B defects are reported through industry flows, including D0135, with Suppliers receiving a copy.

- 3.5 AmC supported removing unnecessary process steps but cautioned that Suppliers need visibility and may sometimes need to raise these reports. AmC suggested that the next consultation should ask industry what the appropriate process is. KB noted that currently, Suppliers can raise a request through the SDEP for other processes.
- 3.6 PM noted that historically the Supplier puts the MOP to work, however moving forward there will likely be Safe Isolation Providers (SIPs) and other parties working independently of the Supplier and therefore any solution implemented must be able to facilitate this. PM noted that the URL can do this and suggested that the group will need to decide if the SDEP can also fulfil this requirement.
- 3.7 PM highlighted that there would be costs to Suppliers and DNOs associated with updating their systems to allow taking pictures, storing them and sending them through the SDEP.
- 3.8 AmC argued that the SDEP solution needs to be put to industry consultation to allow parties to assess what their associated costs would be.
- 3.9 PM presented a table he had created comparing the SDEP and UKPN's online portal (URL). This is included as **Attachment 2**.
- 3.10 KB noted that using the online portal for one DNO and existing processes for others would create dual processes for Suppliers which would have associated costs, creates confusion and could lead to errors. AmC agreed.
- 3.11 KB stated a preference for using the SDEP as it is already an established system that Suppliers have experience in using. KB added that SDEP would allow the inclusion of photos which is one of the main benefits of the online portal.
- 3.12 AmC highlighted that the comparison created by PM is specific to the portal created by UKPN, and that other DNOs may develop portals that are different. AmC noted that in the first consultation, several DNOs indicated that they have no intention of developing their own portal, and questioned whether these DNOs would be looking to use the SDEP solution. AmC suggested that this question is asked in the second consultation.
- 3.13 JH noted that they are currently developing their own portal and asked that detail on the capabilities of the SDEP is included in the consultation to allow them to provide a comparison to the tool they are developing. The Chair agreed that this would be included.
- 3.14 The group discussed the possibility of using SDEP only to send photographs alongside the existing D0135 process. PM explained that receiving photographs separately from the flow could create timing, matching and data-quality problems; a photograph might arrive before the flow or the flow might never arrive. The group therefore agreed that the consultation should explain why a simple hybrid of separate photographs and D0135 may not be fit for purpose, while asking whether the solution should cover the complete process.

3.15 KB asked whether the process would be used for both Category A and B reports, or just for Category Bs. KB clarified that the existing telephone process for Category A emergencies must remain, because a photograph cannot replace an urgent call or the DNO's decision to attend site. PM noted that photographs can still help identify the correct asset and prepare the appropriate response. The group agreed to ask a consultation question around this.

3.16 The group agreed to ask the following questions in the second consultation. The Chair agreed to finalise the wording and order of these in the consultation document.

- SDEP or online portal? Please provide your rationale.
- If SDEP, would your preference be for suppliers to manage this process or the MOPs and the SIPs?
- Should the MOPs and the SIPs be onboarded first? Or suppliers should manage this process?
- Do you currently use the online portal? If yes, would you be willing to use SDEP as an alternative?
- Do you have an online portal and if so what is the percentage defects that are raised via the portal per party?
- If you don't have an online portal, are you currently developing one and how long do you estimate this will take to be online?
- Are there any other data items that you believe should be added on this list?
- What are the estimated costs of utilising the URL and SDEP?
- Should SDEP be used just to share the photos related to the Asset condition already reported through the D0135 process?
- Do Suppliers / MEMs / SIPs / envisage that there would be set up costs to report Cat A & B Defects directly from site via SDEP.
- Do you think that the solution should cover both category A and B defects or only category.
- SDEP or Online portal - can you ask or probe for reasons/evidence why one is being pick over the other?

3.17 The group agreed that responses from SIPs and MOPs would be beneficial. The Chair advised that SIPs are DCUSA parties so will automatically receive the consultation. The Chair agreed to ask CF whether they have a distribution list for MOPs that can be used.

Action 05/01 – The Chair to ask CF (REC) for a MOP distribution list so that MOPs can be invited to respond to the upcoming DCP 467 consultation.

3.18 AmC asked what the next steps for the change would be if responses to the consultation are split/there is no consensus. The Chair explained that if consultation responses show no viable way forward, the Proposer may withdraw the change. If support is split, the Change Report can include alternative

solutions for voting. If one solution has clearer support but is not unanimous, it can still proceed to an industry vote, with the outcome then submitted to Ofgem.

- 3.19 SM, the Ofgem representative, explained the importance of all arguments being thoroughly articulated in the Change Report to allow Ofgem to make a final decision.
- 3.20 KB asked how long it would take to onboard MOPs and SIPs to the SDEP. The Chair agreed to ask CF. The group agreed that this would be important information to include in the consultation.

Action 05/02 – The Chair to ask CF (REC) how long the process would take to onboard SIPs and MOPs to the SDEP.

4. Next Steps and Work Plan

- 4.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:

- The Chair to draft a consultation and to circulate to the Working Group for review.
- The group to meet again on 29 September at 2pm to finalise the document (unless the group decide to do this via email, and the meeting will be cancelled).

Action 05/03 – The Chair to draft a consultation and to circulate to the Working Group for review.

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 on 29 September at 2pm.

7. Attachments

- Attachment 1 - R0306 SDEP slides for DCUSA work group
- Attachment 2 - SDEP vs URL Review UKPN

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	Action ongoing.
05/01	The Chair to ask CF (REC) for a MOP distribution list so that MOPs can be invited to respond to the upcoming DCP 467 consultation.	The Chair	New action.
05/02	The Chair to ask CF (REC) how long the process would take to onboard SIPs and MOPs to the SDEP.	The Chair	New action.
05/03	The Chair to draft a consultation and to circulate to the Working Group for review.	The Chair	New action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update
03/02	The Chair to produce a draft Change Report ahead of the next meeting.	The Chair	Action closed. <i>Working Group have agreed that a further consultation is required ahead of a Change Report being drafted.</i>
04/01	PM to send the presentation with the secretariat so it can be shared with the working group.	The Chair	Action closed. <i>Complete.</i>

04/02	The Chair to set up a subgroup of DNOs to discuss the solution and explore standardisation.	The Chair	Action closed. <i>SDEP solution discussed with REC and Proposer. As discussed during the meeting, group agreed to progress to a second consultation.</i>
-------	---	-----------	---