

**COMPETITION IN CONNECTIONS
CODE OF PRACTICE**

G39 Self-Authorisation Working Group

Teleconference Minutes
Thursday 12th July 2018, 2pm

Attendees:

Chris Roe	CR	UCCG/EON
Maryline Guinard	MG	SSEN
Graham Smith	GS	UCCG/HEA
John Perry	JP	WPD
Jayson Whittaker	JW	Wolseley
Mike Doward	MD	ENWL
Michael Proctor	MP	Lloyd's Register
Tom Watson	TW	ENA

1. Welcome and introductions

TW welcomed the group to the meeting.

2. Awareness of Competition Act

TW reminded the group of the need to adhere to the obligations of the Competition Act. The Group agreed to comply and no issues were raised.

3. Election of chair (initial meeting only)

In the absence of the Panel having appointed a Chair, TW invited nominations and GS was elected.

4. Review and revise proposed modification

GS reiterated the basis of the moderation – namely that UCCG members feel they are at a competitive disadvantage due to their inability to self-authorise G39. The current position is inconsistent with other parts of the regulation. MP concurred. GS asked the Group for objections to the proposal; there were none. On that basis, GS moved the discussion to the wording of the proposal.

GS restated proposal, i.e. to replace clause 5.2.2 with: G39 authorisation shall be either by employer... OR DNO/IDNO at request of employer (options one and two respectively). There was a discussion around the fact that some organisations may not be familiar with the Competition in Connections Code of Practice and would therefore not be aware of the amendment and options one and two. G39 companies have to get agreement from the DNO as they do with live jointing so they can self-authorise; needs to be a framework in place to allow that to happen. GS questioned whether this was do-able in the views of DNO represented here – none objected.

GS noted that a large proportion of companies doing highway electrical maintenance and installation are part of the Highway Electrical Registration Scheme (HERS), and all do same training and assessment. Provided they are HEA approved, would that not be something the DNOs can take on board? MD expressed concerned around what liabilities would DNOs have were they to accept authorisation from an 'employer', but observed that the HER scheme provides some reassurance that there is an assessment process in place. MD does

not see why option one could not be followed, and asked whether there are any similar documents around similar to CiC CoP where options could be listed. It was observed that they should probably consider the G39 document itself, which discusses authorisation.

GS proposed keeping the wording as proposed. MD agreed provided operatives are insured and noted that there may be differences in process between DNOs. CR read out the relevant passage from section 11 of the G39 document and suggested that it really covers what the Working Group is trying to achieve. GS suggested that it is the wording within the Code of Practice that allows DNOs or IDNOs to do differently from what is already written in G39. The issue of asset ownership and responsibility was raised, and it was noted that this needs to be covered in a way that protects the DNO from any issues and that allows maintenance contractors to remove some of the DNO's asset (i.e. the fuse).

GS returned to the wording; there was a discussion around how from a HERS perspective the aim is get an agreement from the DNOs that the wording can be changed and that the authorisations can be interchangeable just as they are now on other owned live networks. For clarity, it was agreed that a reference to HERS would be added to 5.2.2. Agreement across the Group to recommend amended wording to Panel.

There was a discussion around process for making these changes and the Group agreed to put the proposal out for public consultation. GS proposed to add the suggested paragraph to 5.2.2 and send to TW. After considering timelines and dates of future Panel meetings, the Group decided to meet again w/c 20th August, after the consultation has concluded.

ACTION

GS

GS to send proposed changes to 5.2.2.1 and brief explainer to TW

ACTION

ENA

ENA to schedule next meeting w/c 20th August – TW to propose range of dates

5. Identify future actions

#	DATE	DESCRIPTION	OWNER	STATUS
1	12 July 2018	GS to send proposed changes to 5.2.2.1 and brief explainer to TW	GS	
2	12 July 2018	ENA to schedule next meeting w/c 20th August – TW to propose range of dates	ENA	

6. Future meeting dates

The Group agreed to reconvene w/c 20th August.

Post-meeting note

MD circulated minor suggested changes to the wording after the meeting as follows:

In the CIC COP as it stands today 5.2.2 reads “Training and/or authorisations relating to G39 authorisations accepted by a given DNO shall be accepted by other DNOs”.

In the proposed revised text the statement has been changed to: -

“5.2.2 G39 authorisation shall be either:

5.2.2.1 By the employer after ensuring that the relevant employee has been appropriately trained, assessed as competent & authorised or

5.2.2.2 By the DNO, or the IDNO, at the request of the employer

Where employers work across more than one DNO / IDNO area, then training and authorisations relating to G39 authorisations accepted by one DNO / IDNO shall be accepted by other DNOs / IDNOs”

Our authorising manager is asking if we could change the last statement to : -

“Where employers work across more than one DNO / IDNO area, then training and/or authorisations relating to G39 authorisations accepted by one DNO / IDNO shall be accepted by other DNOs / IDNOs”