

**Competition in Connections (CiC)  
Code of Practice Panel**

**Monday 14<sup>th</sup> May 2018 10:00**

**Teleconference**

**Meeting Notes**

**Attendees:**

Tim Hughes (Chair)	(TH)	Western Power Distribution
Brian Hoy	(BH)	Electricity North West
David Overman	(DO)	CNA
Sue Jones	(SJ)	UK Power Networks
Paul McGimpsey	(PM)	SPEN
Gwen McIntyre	(GM)	SSEN
Neil Fitzsimons	(NF)	MCCG
Jayson Whittaker	(JW)	MCCG
Graham Smith	(GS)	UCCG
Paul Costello	(PC)	Lloyds Register
Chris Roe	(CR)	UCCG
Patrick Daly	(PD)	MCCG
Colin Jamieson	(CJ)	CNA
Hena Ahitan	(HA)	ENA

**Welcome/ Introductions**

TH welcomed the Group to the meeting.

**Competition Awareness Act**

TH reminded the Group of the need to adhere to the obligations of the Competition Act and pointed out that these were listed at the back of all agendas. The Group agreed to comply and no-one had any issues.

**Review of previous minutes and Actions**

The group reviewed the previous minutes, with no comments for changes. The actions were reviewed, with all actions closed except one;

Topic	Action	Whom
<b>A&amp;D Fees Regulation and the Code of Practice</b>	<b>DO to review whether any changes were needed to the Code of Practice as a result of the introduction of the Electricity</b>	<b>DO Carry Forward</b>

### **Modification Proposal G39 Authorisation – G Smith**

GS ran through his modification proposal, on behalf of the Unmetered Connections Customer Group, which has the intent to clarify the position with respect to G39 authorisation to more correctly reflect the aims of the CiC CoP. GS said the authorisation is currently worded that if an employee is currently working across multiple DNOs or IDNOs then if G39 is accepted by one, it should be accepted by all. This however doesn't allow for employees who only work within one DNO or IDNO area. GS is concerned that the authorisation is intended to cover harmonisation but doesn't really achieve that. GS summarised that a change is required to recognise that ICPs should be able to work under non-DNO authorisation schemes.. The Panel agreed that the intent was not fully brought out under the Modification Proposal and GS undertook to amend the document to bring this out.

PMcG stated that there is an ENA working group tasked with looking at changes to G39, however it may not be progressing quickly enough for those involved. PMcG understood there was a conflict between CiC CoP and G39, which is what needed to be addressed. BH said that prior to initiating a working group to progress the Modification Proposal, the first step will be to find out ENA G39 Progress and whether a working group is even required. It was raised that it was likely that the G39 Working group was yet to make a start on any work, which is why involvement of panel members has been limited thus far. ENA took an action to find out the progress of a G39 working group and report back to the Panel.

DO highlighted concern over whether the impact of the work under consideration (e.g. pulling cut-out fuses) strayed in to Meter Operator territory and that any working group should be careful of unintended consequences, especially in the light of the roll-out of Smart Metering.

The Panel voted to establish a working group once GS had amended the Modification Proposal, with further progress of the group being made when more information is relayed regarding the ENA G39 Working Group. HA took an action to send invitations, as the Code Administrator, to relevant representatives to form a working group.

**Action: HA to find out the progress of the G39 working group and report back to the group.**

**Action: HA to send invitation to form a working group.**

### **Potential Proposal - P.J Daly**

PD expressed his concerns in respect on the CoP document itself, and how it is a very one sided document that serves to regulate ICPs without placing many counter requirements of DNOs who provide the same service in competition. PD explained how this concern has varying levels of severity in different areas across the country, due to the varying extents of competition. PD explained that his position and those he is representing, is the belief that the document doesn't support the question of enabling equal and fair competition and as such they believe the exclusion of requirements for DNOs is no longer tenable. PD explained that the water industry is looking at almost identical issues.

PD explained he believed the sentence in the CoP, which excludes DNOs from various code requirements, should be taken out of the document to allow inclusivity of fair competition of all. PD took an action to formally fill in and submit a Modification Proposal request form, so that the specific areas he feels should be removed can be seen along with proposals for alternative wording, for the Panel to review formally at the next meeting.

**Action: PD to submit a formal change request form regarding the modifications he feels should be reviewed and considered, ready for discussion at the next meeting in June.**

### **AOB**

There was no other business

### **Next Meetings**

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> June, by telecon.

### **New Actions:**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Whom</b>
<b>A&amp;D Fees Regulation and the Code of Practice</b>	<b>DO to review whether any changes were needed to the Code of Practice as a result of the introduction of the Electricity (Connection Offer Expenses) Regulations and to report at the Panel meeting in June.</b>	<b>DO Carry Forward</b>
<b>Modification Proposal G39 Authorisation</b>	<b>HA to find out the progress of the G39 working group and report back to the group.</b>	<b>HA New Action</b>
	<b>HA to send invitation to form a working group subject to G39 working group progress.</b>	<b>HA New Action</b>
<b>Potential Proposal P.J Daly</b>	<b>PD to submit a formal change request form regarding the modifications he feels should be reviewed and considered, ready for discussion at the next meeting in June.</b>	<b>PD New Action</b>