

## DCG Meeting 3 minutes

Minutes of the third meeting of the DCG held on Wednesday 13 October 2010	From	Ofgem	14 October 2010
	Date and time of Meeting	13 October 2010	10am
	Meeting Location	BIS, London	

### Present

Name	Company
Adrian Rudd	Ofgem
Alan Claxton	ENA
Andrew Beasley	Utilita
Ashley Pocock	EDF Energy
Chris Harris	RWE Npower
Chris Rowell	Elexon
Colin Sawyer (am only)	Ofgem
Dora Guzeleva (Chair)	Ofgem
Gary Cottrell	SBGI
Genevieve Bishop	Ofgem
Jamie Dunnett	Scottish Power
Jason Brogden	Engage-consulting (ERA)
Jill Ashby	Gemserv
Martin Baker	Xoserve
Martin Pollock	ESTA
Mattias Bjornfors (pm only)	Ofgem
Paul Clark	SSE
Richard Moore	Ofcom
David Speake	AIGT
Richard Street	ICoSS
Robert McNamara	Intellect
Rob Thornes	DECC
Rosemary McGlynn	Centrica
Steve James	Eon-UK
Stuart Lacey	ElectraLink Ltd
Tom Chevalier	AMO

## Apologies

Jeremy Guard	First Utility
--------------	---------------

### 1. Minutes of meeting 2

- 1.1. Comments on the draft minutes were received and discussed. A revised version will be circulated and published. Actions were covered during the relevant sections of this meeting.
- 1.2. The DCG agreed to amend the minutes to request Subgroup 2 look at transitional arrangements both at the start of an Interim Interoperability solution and at DCC 'go live'.
- 1.3. It also agreed to amend the minutes to reflect that the details of back end of implementation program will be provided once responses to the information request become available.

### 2. Update from the SMDG

- 2.1. Ofgem provided an update on the developments within the SMDG.

### 3. Review of Subgroup 1 activities / deliverables

- 3.1. Approval sought for release of the DCC Scope and Services Information Request.

Action: Approved

- 3.2. The group was provided with a high level presentation of the DCC Scope Information Request.
- 3.3. Under Option 1 DCC provides a data carrier mechanism with authentication of requests and routing information to get requests to the right meters. All processing intelligence remains in existing registered supplier or meter agent systems. Under Option 2 DCC's scope is extended to include meter point registration and under Option 3 data processing functions are also added. Various sub-options have been identified under Options 2 & 3 to reflect different approaches to implementation.
- 3.4. Some questions were raised about confidentiality of submissions as some of the data received in the Information Request responses may be confidential. It was asked if the information received in the responses could be successfully accessed under an FOI request. Concerns were expressed by the DCG on the impact this could have on availability of data.
- 3.5. Legal advice has been sought on this issue and the letter accompanying the information request states that:
  - Responses and any other information provided may be the subject of valid disclosure requests under the Freedom of Information Act and other statutory schemes or in accordance with other legal or regulatory

requirements and as a general rule Ofgem has a duty to disclose information held by it if requested. There are statutory exemptions which may mean that Ofgem is not obliged to disclose under the FoIA responses and other information provided, however whether these exemptions apply will depend on the content of the information sought and the circumstances of the information request.

**3.6. Action: Circulation of the DCC scope of services Information Request to CoTEs members and industry parties (including AIGT). Responses due Friday 29 October.**

**4. Review of Subgroup 2 activities / deliverables**

4.1. Approval sought for the Interim Interoperability Information Request

**4.2. Action: Approved.**

4.3. The group was provided with a high level presentation on Subgroup 2's output to date.

4.4. Concerns around standardising meter language were raised. It was proposed the meter languages could be standardised.

4.5. It was agreed to leave the options as they are, however include a question regarding one standard language and how this will impact on implementation, delivery and cost.

4.6. It was noted the language used in discussion and in the documentation tends to be electricity centric. Language going forward should be more inclusive of gas as well as electricity.

4.7. Next Steps:

- Update the Information Request to incorporate all comments and feedback from the DCG. Any further comments from the DCG need to be sent by COB Thursday 14 October. The revised paper will be redistributed to the Subgroup2 members by midday Friday 15 October. Ofgem will then take the paper to program.
- The information request will be sent the week beginning Monday 18 October.
- In response to the Chair's request for further Options to consider, EDF developed a further option to replace the previously removed option 4. EDF will provide a full description of this option to Ofgem on 14 October. This Additional option will be included in the revised paper.

**5. Review of Subgroup 3 activities / deliverables**

Roles and responsibilities at the consumer premises.

5.1. The group was informed of the progress of the subgroup who is considering two questions:

- Who owns, installs and maintains the metering equipment,
  - Who has enduring responsibility for the shared equipment?
- 5.2. The group was presented diagrammatic representations of possible categories of faults to the shared infrastructure, underlying causes, as well as what party may be likely to detect these. The point was made that the nature of the problems arising was such that problems were likely to be detected and reported by several parties (including the customer, one or both of its suppliers, the DCC or the network operator), potentially at the same time. To resolve this, a mechanism for tracking reported faults in real time may be needed.
- 5.3. The group was further presented with an outline of a central fault recording mechanism, including higher level functionality.
- 5.4. The group was then presented with higher level diagrams showing how a higher level fault resolution process could work in practice.
- 5.5. The group considered the proposed link through which a distribution company would be able to pass on faults reported by consumers to the DCC. It was considered that such a link would provide the wrong incentives to the consumers and the view was held that the current arrangement through which the distributor would inform the consumer that it needed to contact its supplier was preferable.
- 5.6. A view was expressed by the ENA that an additional type of communication fault also needed to be considered where a customer had lost power due to a fault in the distribution network.
- 5.7. The distribution network currently has a process in place to notify suppliers of network faults, this process could be extended so that the DCC was also notified of network faults.
- 5.8. The view was also raised that the diagnostic capabilities of the Suppliers and the DCC would be very important for a process to work. The group was informed that the diagnostic functionality was being considered as part of SMDG's work.
- 5.9. Regarding the enduring responsibility for shared infrastructure the group made the following observations:
- (i) WAN – the group observed that there needed to be a cost recovery mechanism to ensure that the suppliers do not carry risks for the WAN infrastructure procured and owned by the DCC. The group was informed that the current view held was costs due to manufacturing faults would be recovered from the DCC (and it would have warranty processes in place with its service providers).
  - (ii) HAN – the view was held that faults to the HAN infrastructure would follow the same principles as for the WAN (the role of the DCC would however be more limited as it would not be likely to own any of the infrastructure).

- (iii) IHD – the group considered the four options presented to it. The group considered that a suitable principle should be that the former supplier of a customer should not be required to be contacted or to revisit a former customer as part of the process. The group asked that the sub-group should consider further options under which the current suppliers address faults to the IHD.

#### Cost recovery and financability

5.10. The group was asked to comment on the paper on cost recovery and financability. The following observations were made:

- (i) It was highlighted that the principles of how charges should be split between parties were still outstanding
- (ii) It was observed that it may be useful to consider further how certainty could be provided to the DCC that would enable it to reduce its cost.

5.11. It was further observed that the balance of risks and rewards was very important.

### 6. AOB

6.1. A concern was raised that Consumer Focus has not been attending this group or within the subgroups, and therefore there is a risk of disconnect with consumer interests. It was requested that if it's not possible to have consumer representation within this group, whether there is an opportunity to update consumer bodies and industry on the progress of the project. The concern was noted and Ofgem has been in consultation with consumer bodies via updates with the CAG. The upcoming ICG meeting will also provide another opportunity for their involvement.

### 7. Reflections on the meeting

7.1. It was requested that for future papers distributed to the group, the points that need specific consideration be highlighted.

### 8. Date of next meeting

8.1. Wednesday 3 November 2010

#### DCG Action Log

Ref No	Date Raised	Action	Date Due	Action Owner	Date Updated	Status
001	27/09/10	Update the IR	05/10/10	Ofgem		
002	13/10/10	Circulation of the DCC Scope and services information request to AIGT	20/10/10	Ofgem		