









DCUSA Change Declaration		At what stage is this document in the process?
<h1>DCP 299</h1> <p>DCP Title: Clarify Distributor reporting requirement to the ETTOS Service Provider</p> <p>Date raised: 10 May 2017</p> <p>Status of Change: Standard</p>		01 – Change Proposal
		02 – Consultation
		03 – Change Report
		04 – Change Declaration
<p>Purpose of Change Proposal:</p> <p>The intent of this Change Proposal is to add a requirement for Electricity Distributors to notify the ETTOS Service Provider of instances where tip-offs cannot be linked with a currently traded MPAN.</p>		
	<p>DCUSA Parties voted on the Change Report and recommend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that the change solution is accepted • that the implementation date is accepted <p>The consolidated party votes are provided as Attachment 1.</p>	
	<p>DCUSA Parties voted to accept the implementation of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCP 299 	
	<p>Impacted Parties: All DCUSA Parties</p>	
	<p>Impacted Clauses: DCUSA Schedule 26</p>	

Contents		 Any questions?
1	Summary	3
2	Governance	3
3	Why Change?	3
4	Solution	3
5	Relevant Objectives	4
6	Impacts & Other Considerations	4
7	Implementation	5
8	Legal Text	5
9	Voting	5
10	Recommendations	6
Timeline		 07875 112757
The timetable for the progression of the CP is as follows:		
Change Proposal timetable		
Activity	Date	
Initial Assessment Report Approved by Panel	17 May 2017	
Change Report Approved by Panel	21 June 2017	
Change Report issued for Voting	23 June 2017	
Party Voting Closes	14 July 2017	
Change Declaration Issued to Parties	18 July 2017	
Implementation	02 November 2017 ¹	

Contact:


Fungai Madzivadondo

 **DCUSA@electralink.co.uk**

 **0207 432 3008**

Proposer:

Peter Waymont

 **peter.waymont@ukpowernetworks.co.uk**

¹ To align with SPAA CP17 396

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 This Change Proposal has been raised to add a requirement for Electricity Distributors to notify the Energy Theft Tip Off Service (ETTOS) Service Provider of instances where tip-offs cannot be linked with a currently traded MPAN.

How

- 1.3 It is proposed that a requirement be added to the ETTOS Schedule 26 clause 8.5 setting out the Electricity Distributor reporting requirement to the ETTOS Service Provider as follows.

Where a DNO/IDNO Party receives a tip-off for a premises for which it is the electricity distributor, the DNO/IDNO Party shall:

b) identify the electricity supplier and notify this to the ETTOS Service Provider or identify that there is no currently traded MPAN and notify this to the ETTOS Service Provider.

2 Governance

Justification for Part 2 Matter

- 2.1 This Change Proposal has no material impact on DCUSA Parties and therefore has been classed as a Part 2 matter.

3 Why Change?

Background of DCP 299

- 3.1 During a review of the ETTOS reporting process, the TIG identified that the ETTOS process does not place an obligation on Electricity Distributors to inform the ETTOS Service Provider when tip-offs cannot be linked with a currently traded MPAN. Where the Distributor is unable to identify the Supplier, due to the absence of a currently traded MPAN the ETTOS Service Provider should be informed accordingly. The TIG has recommended for Schedule 26 of the DCUSA be updated to clarify the Distributors' reporting requirements.

- 3.2 Paragraph 8.5(b) of DCUSA Schedule 26 will be updated to add a further requirement stating that Distributors notify the ETTOS Service Provider when a tip-off cannot be linked with a currently traded MPAN.

4 Solution

DCP 299 Assessment

- 4.1 With recommendation from the Theft Issues Group (TIG), the DCP 299 Change Proposal was raised by UK Power Networks to add a reporting requirement for Electricity Distributors to the ETTOS Service Provider.
- 4.2 The CP has been raised to clarify the ETTOS service reporting requirements. Where network operators are unable to identify a Supplier or address for a received tip off, the ETTOS Service Provider should be notified. As part of the ETTOS reporting process DNO/IDNO Parties should inform the ETTOS Service Provider that a tip-off cannot be linked to a currently traded MPAN.
- 4.3 The DCUSA legal text has been updated with the proposed changes to ensure that Electricity Distributors provide feedback on all received tip offs.

5 Relevant Objectives

Evaluation Against the DCUSA Objectives

- 5.1 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 six Charging Objectives. The full list of objectives is documented in the CP form provided as Attachment 3.
- 5.2 The Theft Issues Group and DCP 299 proposer consider that the following DCUSA Objective is better facilitated by DCP299:

General Objective four - The promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the DCUSA

- 5.3 General Objective 4 is better facilitated as this change will help to ensure the effective operation of ETTOS arrangements and provide Parties with clear reporting processes.

6 Impacts & Other Considerations

Consumer Impacts

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

Environmental Impacts

- 6.2 In accordance with DCUSA Clause 11.14.6, the Proposer assessed whether there would be a material impact on greenhouse gas emissions if DCP 299 were implemented. The Proposer did not identify any material impact on greenhouse gas emissions from the implementation of this CP.

7 Implementation

- 7.1 Subject to Party approval, the DCP 299 change will be implemented on **02 November 2017**.
- 7.2 DCP 299 is classified as a Part 2 matter and therefore Authority determination is not required.

8 Legal Text

- 8.1 The proposed legal text acts as Attachment 1. In respect of Schedule 26, a reporting requirement has been added to clause 8.5 as follows:

Where a DNO/IDNO Party receives a tip-off for a premises for which it is the electricity distributor, the DNO/IDNO Party shall:

- (a) identify the full address and notify this to the ETTOS Service Provider;
 - (b) identify the electricity supplier and notify this to the ETTOS Service Provider or identify that there is no currently traded MPAN and notify this to the ETTOS Service Provider;
 - (c) (where applicable) comply with its obligations under the Revenue Protection Code of Practice;
 - (d) if none of the above apply, then feed back to the ETTOS Service Provider that no action can be taken, with the reason the tip-off could not be matched, so that the tip-off can be logged as unmatched.
- 8.2 The proposed legal text was reviewed by the TIG who agreed that the amended text met the intent of the CP.

9 Voting

- 9.1 DCP 299 was issued to DCUSA Parties for Voting on 23 June 2017.

DCP 299 – Voting Outcome

Part 2 Matter: Authority Determination Not Required

Change Solution – Accept

- 9.2 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

9.3 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%.

10 Recommendations

DCUSA Parties Recommendation

DCUSA Parties recommend:

- that DCP 299 should be implemented
- that DCP 299 better facilitates the Relevant Objectives

Attachments

- Attachment 1 – DCP 299 Consolidated Party Votes
- Attachment 2 – DCP 299 Legal Text