DCUSA CHANGE DECLARATION

DCP 088 - Mid Year CDCM Charging Model

VOTING DATE: 01 June 2012

DCP 088	WEIGHTED VOTING		
	DNO	IDNO/OTSO	SUPPLIER
CHANGE SOLUTION	Accept	Accept	Accept
IMPLEMENTATION DATE	Accept	Accept	Accept
RECOMMENDATION	Categories that voted. Implementation Date - In respect of each Party of the Weighted Votes	 Category that was elige of the Groups in that Parage solution was greated. ACCEPT Category that was eligen 	erty Category which er than 50% in all ible to vote, the sum arty Category which
PART ONE / PART TWO	Part One – Authority Determination Required		

07 June 2012 Page 1 of 8 Version 1.0

PARTY	SOLUTION (A / R)	IMPLEMENTATION DATE (A/R)	COMMENTS
DNO PARTIES			
Eastern Power Networks	Accept	Reject	The date of the model within the legal text will need to reflect the actual publication date.
			Cell A3 of the overview sheet of the model suggests this is a draft version for testing only. This text will need to be removed at publication.
			We are concerned about the proposed implementation date. The change is to the methodology and so must be effective on 1 October or 1 April in order that DNOs are compliant with charging prices based on their methodology. As the methodology directly references the model used this would not be the case at any other date. Our preference would be for a 1 April 2013 implementation, giving a consistent approach to the model through a full regulatory year.
London Power Networks	Accept	Reject	See response for Eastern Power Networks.
South Eastern Power Networks	Accept	Reject	See response for Eastern Power Networks.

07 June 2012 Page 2 of 8 Version 1.0

Electricity North West Limited	Accept	Accept	N/A
Northern Powergrid (Northeast) Limited	Accept	Accept	We fully support the introduction of a mid-year CDCM charging model. It will improve transparency and consistency across DNOs. It will ensure that suppliers are able to extract the same consistent information across all DNOs should a mid-year change be needed. Currently there is no model available so all calculations have to be done outside of the model. This leads to a lack of transparency. The development of the model has undergone several iterations and has also provided an opportunity to address some minor formatting issues. One point that was raised was that, in order to ensure commonality in the calculation of the new inputs, particularly the extra column in table 1076 (Target Revenue), it would be beneficial to provide some guidance notes. This could potentially be added to the CDCM user manual. This should be passed to the DCMF MIG for further review.
Northern Powergrid (Yorkshire) plc	Accept	Accept	See response for Northern Powergrid (Northeast) Limited

07 June 2012 Page 3 of 8 Version 1.0

SP Distribution	Accept	Accept	N/A
SP Manweb	Accept	Accept	N/A
Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and	Accept	Accept	N/A
Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc	Accept	Accept	N/A
Western Power Distribution (East Midlands) plc;	Accept	Accept	N/A
Western Power Distribution (West Midlands) plc;	Accept	Accept	N/A
Western Power Distribution (South Wales) plc;	Accept	Accept	N/A
Western Power Distribution (South West) plc	Accept	Accept	N/A
IDNO PARTIES			
Independent Power Networks Limited	Accept	Accept	N/A
ESP Electricity	Accept	Accept	N/A
The Electricity Network Company	Accept	Accept	N/A
UK Power Networks (IDNO)	Accept	Reject	See response for Eastern Power Networks.
SUPPLIER PARTIES			

British Gas	Reject	Accept	Unfortunately, whilst we are supportive of the intent of this change proposal and of implementing a working solution as soon as practicable, on reviewing the proposed legal text we have identified a number of errors which have led us to reject the proposal.
			Below is a list of the issues identified with the legal text:
			Paragraph 7 should refer to a full year
			We do not believe paragraphs 25 and 29 are in line with the intention of the change proposal: we don't expect DNOs to change their service models or review their customer contributions for a mid-year price change.
			Paragraphs 38 and 39 should refer to a full year.
			The proposed change to paragraph 54 is not valid: the licence conditions do not provide a way of preparing that forecast.
			Paragraphs 68, 71 and 78 are wrong, they should refer to the number of days in a year.
			Paragraph 89 is wrong: adding (a) and

			(b) gives a measure of revenue in a year, not in the tariff applicability period.We believe the changes required to correct for the above are more than 'housekeeping' changes since they will result in different CDCM charges.
GDF SUEZ Marketing Limited	Accept	Accept	We support this change as it should mean that charging calculations from DNOs are more accurate. We would however like to register our concern that in combination with the rejection of DCP105 (Fixed bi-annual amendment of DUoS tariffs) this change, were it implemented, has the potential to increase the volatility of DUoS tariffs by making it easier for DNOs to amend them within-year.
			In this context we note the comments made by Ofgem in their letter rejecting DCP105 and reproduced below:
			"Throughout the RIIO price control review process10 (for gas distribution companies and transmission owners), which is currently ongoing, stakeholders have discussed with us the impact of network charging volatility. Some useful options,

SSE Energy Supply	Accept	Accept	N/A
Npower	Accept	Accept	Should be mindful that Ofgem is currently consulting on charging volatility. One option is to move to DNOs tariffs changing on 1 April only. If that is accepted, then this CP is not required.
EDF Energy	Accept	Accept	The new model will enable suppliers to have transparency of mid year changes.

07 June 2012 Page 8 of 8 Version 1.0