





DCUSA Change Declaration		At what stage is this document in the process?
<h1>DCP 290:</h1> <h2>Housekeeping Change to Update PCDM Model References</h2> <p><i>Date Raised: 17 January 2017</i></p> <p><i>Standard Change</i></p>		01 – Change Proposal
		02 – Consultation
		03 – Change Report
		04 – Change Declaration
<h3>Purpose of Change Proposal</h3> <p>The intent of this Change Proposal is to facilitate the updating of the title, model number and issue date of the PCDM as referenced in Schedules 16, 17 and 18, which was not correctly applied in the legal text of DCP 234.</p>		
	DCUSA Parties voted on the Change Report and recommend: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that the change solution is accepted • that the implementation date is accepted 	
	The DCUSA Parties determined that this Change Proposal should be implemented. DCUSA Parties voted to accept the implementation of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCP 290 	
	Impacted Parties: DNOs and IDNOs	
	Impacted Clauses: Schedule 16 Clause 1, Schedules 17 and 18 Clause 1.3.	

Contents

1

Summary

3

2

Governance

3

3

Why Change?

3

4

Code Specific Matters

4

5

Solution

4

6

Relevant Objectives

4

7

Impacts & Other Considerations

5

8

Implementation

5

9

Legal Text

5

10

Voting

5

11

Recommendations

6

?

Any questions?

Contact:

Code Administrator

DCUSA@electralink.co.uk

02074323000

Proposer:

Peter Waymont

peter.waymont@ukpowernetworks.co.uk

07875 112757

Timeline

The timetable for the progression of the CP is as follows:

Change Proposal timetable

Activity

Date

Initial Assessment Report Approved by Panel

18 January 2017

Change Report Approved by Panel

15 February 2017

Change Report issued for Voting

17 February 2017

Party Voting Closes

10 March 2017

Change Declaration Issued to Parties

14 March 2017

1 Summary

What?

- 1.1 The Distribution Connection and Use of System Agreement (DCUSA) is a multi-party contract between electricity Distributors and electricity Suppliers and large Generators. Parties to the DCUSA can raise Change Proposals (CPs) to amend the Agreement with the consent of other Parties and (where applicable) the Authority.

Why?

- 1.2 References to the Price Control Disaggregation Model (PCDM) in the Charging Methodologies need to be changed. These necessary changes were not identified as part of DCP 234.

How?

- 1.3 This will be achieved by updating the references to the model, model number and issue date.

2 Governance

Justification for Part 2 Matter

- 2.1 DCP 290 has been classed as a Part 2 Matter therefore, Authority consent is not required as it is a housekeeping change to correct references to the model.

Requested Next Steps

- 2.2 DCUSA Parties voted that DCP 290 be accepted.

3 Why Change?

Background of DCP 290

- 3.1 In August 2016 the Authority approved DCP 234 - '*Merging the PCDM and extended PCDM*' which replaced the PCDM and extended PCDM models with one model and created a new schedule in DCUSA which contains the legal text that relates to IDNO charging that is currently contained in Schedules 16, 17 and 18.
- 3.2 DCP 234 did not include the provision to update the references to the PCDM in the Charging Methodologies. DCP 290 seeks to facilitate the updating of the title, model number and issue date of the PCDM as referenced in Schedules 16, 17 and 18.

4 Code Specific Matters

Modelling Specification Documents

4.1 N/A

Reference Documents

4.2 N/A

5 Solution

DCP 290 Assessment

5.1 The DCUSA Panel recommended that the CP be progressed to the Change Report Phase. As a Housekeeping change to update references as result of a Change Proposal that is currently awaiting implementation on 01 April 2018 following a Working Group (DCP 234), this change is not considered to require a Working Group.

DCP 290 Impact Assessment

5.2 It is not considered that DCP 290 will have an impact as this is a housekeeping change.

6 Relevant Objectives

Assessment Against the DCUSA Objectives

6.1 For a DCUSA Change Proposal to be approved it must be demonstrated that it better meets the DCUSA Objectives. There are five General DCUSA Objectives and five Charging Objectives. The full list of objectives is documented in the CP form provided as Attachment 1.

6.2 The Proposer considers that the following DCUSA Objectives are better facilitated by DCP 290.

Impact of the Change Proposal on the Relevant Objectives:

Relevant General Objective	Identified impact
1. The promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the DCUSA	Positive

6.3 General Objective One is better facilitated by DCP 290 because although this change impacts Schedules 16,17 and 18, it is not a change to the methodologies but is merely a housekeeping change to correct references to the model.

7 Impacts & Other Considerations

Does this Change Proposal impact a Significant Code Review (SCR) or other significant industry change projects, if so, how?

- 7.1 This Change Proposal does not impact a Significant Code Review or other significant industry change project.

Consumer Impacts

- 7.2 The Proposer did not identify any material impact on consumers from the implementation of this CP.

Environmental Impacts

- 7.3 In accordance with DCUSA Clause 11.14.6, the Proposer assessed whether there would be a material impact on greenhouse gas emissions if DCP 290 were implemented. The Proposer did not identify any material impact on greenhouse gas emissions from the implementation of this CP.

8 Implementation

- 8.1 To align with DCP 234, the proposed implementation date for DCP 290 is 1 April 2018.

9 Legal Text

- 9.1 The legal text for DCP 290 is provided as Attachment 2.
- 9.2 The legal text sets out the required updates to the model number and issue date of the PCDM as referenced in Schedules 16, 17 and 18.

10 Voting

- 10.1 DCP 290 was issued to DCUSA Parties for Voting on 17 February 2017.

DCP 290 – Recommendation

Part 2 Matter

Change Solution – Accept

- 10.2 For the majority of the Party Categories that were eligible to vote:

The number of groups in each Party Category which voted to accept the proposal was more than 65% of the total number of Groups in that Party Category which voted; and the sum of the

Weighted Votes of the Groups in each Party Category which voted to accept the proposal was more than 65%.

Implementation Date – Accept

10.3 For the majority of the Party Categories that were eligible to vote:

The number of groups in each Party Category which voted to accept the implementation date was more than 65% of the total number of Groups in that Party Category which voted; and the sum of the Weighted Votes of the Groups in each Party Category which voted to accept the implementation date was more than 65%.

DCP 290	WEIGHTED VOTING (%)									
	DNO		IDNO/OTSO ¹		Supplier		DG ²		Gas Supplier ³	
	A	R	A	R	A	R	A	R	A	R
Change Solution	100%	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Implementation Date	100%	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

11 Recommendations

DCUSA Parties Recommendation

DCUSA Parties recommend:

- that DCP 290 should be implemented
- that DCP 290 better facilitates the Relevant Objectives

Attachments

- Attachment 1 – DCP 290 Legal Text
- Attachment 2 – Consolidated Responses

¹ No votes were cast in this category of Parties

² No votes were cast in this category of Parties

³ No votes were cast in this category of Parties