

DCUSA Action Plan: Ofgem’s CGR3 Final Proposals

| Item | Ofgem Headline | Requirement | Initial Comment / Impact on DCUSA | Panel Recommendations | Status |
|------|---|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | Significant Code Review (SCR) (Section 2) | <p>Introduce ability for Ofgem to raise SCR modification proposals (at the end of the SCR) which follows standard industry code processes</p> <p>Introduce provisions for Ofgem-led end-to-end SCR process where the standard industry code process would not apply. Ofgem would lead consultation and engagement for code modification development</p> | <p>DCUSA already includes an SCR mechanism however proposed changes to the Electricity Distribution Licence will impact on current code governance.</p> <p>A legal review may be required to ensure that the DCUSA SCR mechanism aligns to any changes introduced as part of the CGR review.</p> | <p>The Panel initially agreed to wait for the outcome of Ofgem’s statutory consultation on proposed licence changes to the Electricity Distribution Licence (which closed on 7 June 2016).</p> <p>Upon close of the statutory consultation, the Panel instigated a legal review in order to develop the necessary changes to the DCUSA, which was raised subsequently under DCP 275.</p> <p>The Ofgem representative at the July Panel meeting felt that the DCP 275 Change Report lacked a clear explanation of the licence condition changes and proposed that the legal text be reviewed.</p> | <p>Implementation date: Q1 2017: Ofgem published its decision to modify the Electricity Distribution Licence (SLC 22/22A. DCUSA) on 14 June 2016.</p> <p>A new DCP 275 ‘Code Governance Review 3 & SLC 22’ was raised at the June Panel meeting, it’s intent is to implement the distribution licence changes to the DCUSA by March 2017.</p> <p>The DCP 275 legal text was developed by the DCUSA legal advisor and the Change Report was submitted to the July Panel meeting for the Panel’s approval. Ofgem advised</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>The DCUSA Panel recommended that the Change Report be updated and legal text reviewed.</p> | <p>that the legal text and Change Report be updated.</p> <p>The DCP 275 Change Report has been issued for Voting with a deadline of 11 November 2016.</p> <p>The DCP 275 was approved by DCUSA Parties on 15 November 2016 for implementation on 23 February 2017</p> <p>Status: </p> |
| 2 | Self-Governance (Section 3) | Modifications should be assessed as to whether they require an Authority decision – i.e. why they are material | <p>Under DCUSA, the Panel already assesses whether an Authority Decision is required through taking into account the view put forward by the proposer.</p> <p>Ofgem note that they anticipate an increased use of the self-governance route for charging modifications (where appropriate) would create a more effective</p> | <p>The Secretariat, in conjunction with the DCUSA Panel, have illustratively developed proposed changes to the DCUSA main document (Clause 9.4) to clarify the presumption that all Modifications will be Part 2 Matters unless determined otherwise by the DCUSA Panel.</p> <p>The DCUSA Panel have agreed to wait to raise the change until the development of guidance</p> | <p>Implementation date: Q3 2016.</p> <p>The Secretariat has invited Ofgem to confirm whether adding materiality guidance in to the CP form is sufficient to meet the CGR3 requirement around defining materiality, in which Ofgem has provisionally agreed</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>balance to the decision-making framework.</p> | <p>on codes modification criteria by code administrators.</p> <p>In their November meeting the DCUSA Panel agreed to add the Cross Code self-governance document to the DCUSA website once the following amendments were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • remove copyright from bottom of document; • Party 2 Matter decisions “by the Panel” should say “by Parties”; • the sentence “most self-governance CPs go straight to the change report phase” should be removed as this is not the case for DCUSA changes; and • Approved and rejected changes can be appealed, not just rejected. | <p>subject to further review of the definition.</p> <p>At the August meeting the DCUSA Panel advised that a common guidance document should be produced for all industry changes and an appendix with code specific elements should be provided.</p> <p>At their meeting in November the Code Administrators approved the Cross Code self-governance guidance document. The document with the DCUSA specific self-governance has submitted to the Panel for approval.</p> <p>At the November Panel Meeting the Panel agreed to add the self-governance document to the DCUSA website along with the</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>Cross Code self-governance document.</p> <p>The Secretariat has published the Cross Code Self-governance and DCUSA Self Governance on the DCUSA Website.</p> <p>Status: </p> |
| 3 | <p>Self-Governance Guidance on modification criteria (Section 3)</p> | <p>Code administrators to work together to produce guidance that can be applied across codes to help proposers assess whether their change should follow a self-governance path.</p> | <p>The Secretariat will seek input from the DCUSA Panel and on guidance developed by code administrators collectively.</p> | <p>At joint code administrators meeting on 3 June 2016, it was agreed for code administrators to develop guidance alongside the respective code Panel, before including the guidance in an all-encompassing document.</p> <p>As a result, the Secretariat will develop guidance for review at the July Panel meeting.</p> <p>At the July Panel meeting the DCUSA Panel reviewed the self-governance guidance document and advised that this be revised to guidance on the end to end process of raising of a self-governance change, rather than</p> | <p>Implementation date: Q3 2016, subject to review and approval of the guidance document by the Panel during the November meeting.</p> <p>At their meeting in November the Code Administrators approved the Cross Code self-governance guidance document. The document with the DCUSA specific self-governance has submitted to the Panel for approval.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| | | | | <p>the current focus of a proposer declaring whether a change was a Part 1 or Part 2 Matter.</p> <p>The Self Governance document is being reviewed and updated by Code Administrators, this will be finalised at the Code Administrators meeting in November.</p> | <p>At the November Panel Meeting the Panel agreed to add the Cross Code self-governance document to the DCUSA website once amendments had been made.</p> <p>The Secretariat has published the Cross Code Self-governance document and DCUSA Self Governance document on the DCUSA website.</p> <p>Status: </p> |
| 4 | Code Administration Qualitative Surveys (Section 4) | <p>Qualitative survey is for Ofgem to commission an independent third party to undertake a cross-code survey, with the final report to be published on the Ofgem website.</p> <p>Ofgem consider code administrators should fund this survey and are consulting on five potential options for</p> | <p>ElectraLink is not currently obligated by DCUSA to deliver a survey however ElectraLink annually undertakes a Customer Satisfaction Survey for its own purposes.</p> <p>The output will be dependent on the responses to Ofgem's consultation and there may be cost/</p> | <p>The Panel noted that Ofgem will be progressing the Quantitative survey.</p> <p>The Secretariat will be maintaining a watching brief on any outputs. Upon any further developments, a paper/proposal will be brought to the Panel for consideration at the next appropriate meeting.</p> | <p>Implementation date: December 2016.</p> <p>Ofgem has commissioned an independent third party to undertake a cross-code survey where the summary of responses to the report would be published on the Ofgem website.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | allocating the costs across the various code bodies in the consultation in respect of the surveys and metrics ¹ . | contractual implications for DCUSA. | In September the Secretariat requested for Parties to approve for their details to be passed on the survey company Future Thinking. | <p>An update of progress made by Ofgem and the charging of the survey is being provided to the Panel within its September meeting.</p> <p>At the September meeting the Panel noted that Ofgem has appointed a third party to conduct a cross code survey for all industry codes and signed a CRF to fund the third party survey activities.</p> <p>On 9 September Ofgem issued an invitation to participate in the code administrators' performance survey.</p> <p>November 2016 – Ofgem issued a consultation on their survey questionnaire</p> |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|

¹ <https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications-and-updates/code-governance-review-phase-3-final-proposals-consultation-code-administration-reporting-metrics-and-performance-surveys>

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>with a deadline of 11 November 2016.</p> <p>In their November meeting the Panel agreed that once the customer contacts list has been shared, this item can be closed.</p> <p>Customer Contacts list was shared with Panel.</p> <p>Status: </p> |
| 5 | Charging Methodologies Pre-Modification Process | <p>(i) Code parties, code administrators (as Critical Friends) and code panels should make more effective use of the existing pre-modification processes to enable well-defined charging modification proposals to be developed and then raised in the formal process.</p> <p>(ii) The recent introduction of guidance on when to refer matters to pre-modification processes in the UNC should be explored for the other</p> | The majority of DCUSA Charging Methodology proposals come through the Distribution Methodology Charging Forum (DCMF). | <p>(i) With regards to guidance on pre-modification, the Panel instructed the Secretariat to prepare pre-modification guidance for all DCUSA changes, including charging methodologies.</p> <p>A guidance document has since been developed, ready for DCUSA Panel review during the June 2016 Panel meeting.</p> <p>(ii) The Panel also considered that a change could potentially be raised to implement the Methodologies Issues Group</p> | <p>(i) Implementation Date: Complete (June 2016)</p> <p>Status: </p> <p>(ii) Implementation Date: 25 July 2017 which is 5 Working Days following Approval</p> <p>DCP 289 'Creation of Distribution Charging Methodology Development Group' has been raised. At the January ex-committee meeting the DCUSA Panel</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | codes which incorporate charging methodologies. | | <p>(MIG) under DCUSA to act as a DCUSA governed pre-modification forum for charging methodology changes. On behalf of the DCUSA Panel, ElectraLink has contacted DNOs to seek their views on this suggestion.</p> <p>Progression of this proposal will require a Change Proposal and will also have governance support contractual implications which will require consideration by DCUSA Panel before implementation.</p> | <p>agreed that DCP 289 will be progressed to the definition phase and a Working Group will be set up to consider this DCP.</p> <p>Status: </p> |
| 6 | <p>Charging Methodologies</p> <p>Development of a forward work plan by panels for charging modifications</p> | <p>Individual code administrators, with support from their respective code panels, to initiate work to explore how to develop an effective forward work plan for charging methodology changes for their code (and subject to the CMA's final decision), which would incorporate input from Ofgem, in respect of developing a strategic view, and industry as appropriate.</p> | <p>DCUSA Working Groups each individually produce a forward work plan which could form the basis of any strategic charging methodology work plan.</p> | <p>During the code administrator meeting on 3 June 2016, code representatives agreed to jointly develop a work plan which could be tailored across all codes, including a timeline of industry activity over the next 3-5 years.</p> <p>The SEC/MRA code administrator has taken an action to develop a template before sharing with code administrators.</p> | <p>(iv) Implementation date: Q3-Q4 2016, following code administrators agreeing a standard template and content of a code work plans (with input from code Panels).</p> <p>A number of changes were agreed upon at the November Code Administrators meeting. This included, aligning the existing central code modification spreadsheet to the format of the Forward Work Plan, as the</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>nature of the data is the same, in order for the two documents to be combined in the future. A Forward Work Plan was created and presented to Code Administrators at the January meeting. At 47 pages, it was agreed that too much detail was provided. Code Administrators agreed the plan needs to be reduced to a more manageable summary.</p> <p>Status: </p> |
| 7 | <p>Specific Proposals for DCUSA Charging</p> <p>DCMF, MIG & COG</p> | <p>(i) All relevant papers for the DCMF, the DCMF MIG and the COG currently published on the ENA website should be accessible on the DCUSA website through appropriate document links which are prominent and visible to those parties who access the DCUSA website.</p> <p>(ii) As a next step, we would encourage the relevant parties to explore how to bring the DCMF and DCMF</p> | <p>A change to the DCUSA website would be needed to be introduced in order to prominently link to papers for the DCMF, the DCMF MIG and the COG.</p> | <p>(i) On behalf of the DCUSA Panel, the Secretariat has contacted DNOs to seek their views on the suggestion that all relevant papers for the DCMF, the DCMF MIG and the COG (currently published on the ENA website) should be accessible on the DCUSA website. Subject to DNO feedback, the DCUSA website will be updated to provide links to these items. To ensure that the items are easily</p> | <p>(i) Implementation Date:</p> <p>The DCUSA Panel agreed for the secretariat to add a link from the DCUSA website to the DCMF, DCMF MIG and the COG (currently published on the ENA)</p> <p>Status: </p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| | | <p>MIG under DCUSA governance to align with the DCUSA Standing Issues Group (SIG) which currently falls under DCUSA governance.</p> | | <p>accessible, a new DCUSA web page will be required.</p> <p>(ii) With regards to bringing the DCMF and DCMF MIG under DCUSA governance, the Panel determined that this may be appropriate for the MIG, however, the Panel would like to seek further views relating to the DCMF On behalf of the DCUSA Panel, the Secretariat has contacted DNOs to seek their views on this suggestion.</p> <p>It is noted that progression of this proposal will require a Change Proposal and will also have contractual implications (both for the ENA and DCUSA Ltd) which will require consideration by the DCUSA Panel.</p> <p>At the August Panel meeting the Panel noted that the MIG finalised a paper to be approved through the ENA and that a meeting will then need to set up with Ofgem. The general theme is that the MIG should go under DCUSA. The Secretariat has</p> | <p>Implementation Date: Subject to DNO views being received, a timetable/approach will be prepared. At</p> <p>Status: </p> |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | been advised to expect a decision in September. | |
| 8 | Specific Proposals for DCUSA Charging Panel Sponsors | DCUSA panel to explore mechanisms under current DCUSA governance arrangements to allocate panel members as panel sponsors to each of the existing charging forums (DCMF, MIG and COG). | A sponsor will be required to be appointed in order to provide feedback to the DCUSA Panel when appropriate. | <p>(i) A sponsor has been appointed during the April DCUSA Panel meeting for the DCMF and MIG. The sponsor will regularly attend DCMF and MIG meetings and report back to the Panel.</p> <p>(ii) The Panel noted that the COG is a commercial group and as such, are awaiting feedback from DNOs on whether it is appropriate to appoint a COG sponsor. The Chair of the COG has been contacted to confirm that the COG is out of scope for this type of</p> | <p>(i) Implementation: DCMF and MIG Completed (April 2016).</p> <p>Status: </p> <p>(ii) COG: The Chair of the COG has been contacted to confirm that the COG is out of scope for this type of arrangement</p> <p>Status: </p> |
| 9 | Code Administration Managing code change and cross-code coordination (Section 4) | <p>(i) code administrators to continue to develop and implement the modifications register;</p> <p>(ii) code administrators to publish on code websites, and to use, the joint</p> | (i) a live/closed modification tool is in the process of being developed and has been previously allocated to a code administrator to lead on, upon completion | <p>(i) The Panel has agreed for the Secretariat to continue to liaise with other code administrators, and report back to the DCUSA Panel accordingly.</p> <p>A joint code administrator meeting was held on 3 June 2016 where code administrators finalised</p> | <p>(i) Implementation date: Complete (August 2016.)</p> <p>Status: </p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| | | <p>process for cross-code modifications;</p> <p>(iii) code administrators to monitor the performance of the process when modifications follow it;</p> <p>(iv) individual code administrators, with support from their respective code panels, to initiate work to explore how to develop an effective forward work plan, going forward (and subject to the CMA's final decision) these will also take into account the work taken forward by Ofgem to develop a strategic view</p> <p>(v) for each panel to consider and to establish project management and assurance provisions (i.e. to coordinate major change)</p> | <p>this will be made available to the industry.</p> <p>(ii) The document is available on the CACoP page of the DCUSA website.</p> <p>(iii) No further DCUSA impact.</p> <p>(iv) The Secretariat is to develop, alongside the DCUSA Panel, a DCUSA forward work plan building on the existing working group work plans.</p> <p>(v) Ofgem have cited expectations of the CMA to expand the role of code administrators to take on project management responsibilities via licence conditions on code administrators.</p> | <p>discussions on the modification register, agreeing the hosting of the register on the MRA website with all code websites linking to the register.</p> <p>(ii) the joint code process was published on the code website in April 2016.</p> <p>The Secretariat has also developed an internal process for helping to identify cross code impacts, including an internal spreadsheet to track industry changes.</p> <p>(iii) The Secretariat has developed an internal spreadsheet which tracks cross code changes and monitors the performance and timescales of modifications which arise with cross code impacts.</p> <p>(iv) During the code administrator meeting on 3 June 2016, code representatives agreed to jointly develop a work plan which could be tailored across all codes, including a timeline of industry activity over the next 3-5 years. The SEC/MRA code administrator has taken an action to develop a</p> | <p>(ii) Completed (April 2016)</p> <p>Status: </p> <p>(iii) Completed (May 2016)</p> <p>Status: </p> <p>(iv) Implementation date: Q4 2016, following code administrators finalising a standard template and content of a forward work plans (with input from code Panels). was created and presented to Code Administrators at the January meeting. At 47 pages, it was agreed that too much detail was provided. Code Administrators agreed the</p> |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | <p>template before sharing with code administrators.</p> <p>(v) The Panel considered Ofgem’s clarification in this area, as provided to the Secretariat, which outlined how each code could be amended to allow the Panel to appoint a body to undertake project management and assurance services if required in the future.</p> <p>The DCUSA Panel discussed that no change was required when DCUSA services were not necessarily exclusive to ElectraLink and could be obtained by other Service Providers as demonstrated with the contracted arrangements put in place for a Theft Risk Assessment Service (TRAS) Service Provider.</p> | <p>plan needs to be reduced to a more manageable</p> <p>Status: </p> <p>(v) Implementation date: No further change required at this point in time. (Closed)</p> <p>Status: </p> |
| 10 | Code Administration Guidance on Critical friend role | Code administrators to continue to share best practice in line with development ‘Critical Friend – Top 5’. | The Secretariat provided feedback in the development of the Critical Friend – Top 5 document | The DCUSA Panel agreed for ElectraLink, as the code administrator, to continue engaging with code administrators including participation at the joint code | <p>Implementation date: Complete (June 2016).</p> <p>Status: </p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|--|--|
| | (Section 4) | | <p>which is now available on the DCUSA CACoP website.</p> <p>The Secretariat is already developing a further 'Critical Friend' page on the DCUSA website to help demonstrate services and available support.</p> | <p>administrator meeting on 3 June 2016.</p> <p>A new DCUSA webpage has also been designed in May 2016, ready for deployment in June 2016 to highlight the Secretariats support services as part of code administrator's role as a 'critical friend'.</p> | |
| 11 | <p>Code Administration</p> <p>Visibility of CACoP and Critical Friend role</p> | <p>(i) 'Critical Friend – Top 5' to remain highly visible on the DCUSA website.</p> <p>(ii) DCUSA website is to have a dedicated CACoP page which provides information as to how the code administrator meets each of the CACoP Principles.</p> | <p>The DCUSA website already contains a dedicated CACoP page.</p> <p>The webpage will require amendments by the Secretariat to outline how the CACoP Principals are met.</p> | <p>(i) Although the 'Critical Friend – Top 5' document is already available of the DCUSA website, the DCUSA Panel (during its May 2016 meeting), agreed the creation of a new page to provide parties with further guidance on how the code administrator provides support under its role as a 'Critical Friend'. The website page is under development and will be implemented by the end of June 2016.</p> | <p>(i) Implementation date: Complete (June 2016).</p> <p>Status: </p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | (ii) The Secretariat undertook a scoping exercise on the required changes to the existing CACoP page on the DCUSA website. A cost proposal for undertaking the work was approved by the Panel in May 2016 and the Secretariat has since begun development work which is due to be completed by the end of June 2016. | (ii) Implementation date: Complete. Website updates went live at the end of June 2016. Status:  |
| 12 | Code Administration Self-governance and review of CACoP (Section 4) | Ofgem have outlined that a self-governance process for CACoP changes should not be introduced at this time | Withdrawn, so no impact. | No change required. | Implementation date: No change required. (Closed) Status:  |
| 13 | Code administration Modification voting (Section) | (i) Ofgem are not to mandate change to the panel voting arrangements under DCUSA governance. (ii) Ofgem however highlight the expectation on the industry to review whether party voting is achieving the necessary outcomes that | Rational for supporting the DCUSA objectives is explicitly documented within current DCUSA Change Reports. | The DCUSA Panel noted the first point and put in place the following actions to support the second point: (a) The DCUSA Panel agreed to update the DCUSA Voting form to state that 'Ofgem value the feedback that you provide so | (ii) Implementation: Subject to party consultation feedback in Q3 2016. The DCUSA Panel reviewed the Voting Consultation responses at the September meeting and |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| | | <p>ensure that modification recommendations and decisions are accompanied by clear reasons against the code objectives.</p> | | <p>please do provide comments and your view of how the objectives are better facilitated’.</p> <p>(b) The DCUSA Panel agreed for the Secretariat to undertake analysis of Change Proposal data to ascertain the number Change Proposals that the Authority’s decision aligns to Party Voting and recommendations. The exercise was completed in May 2016, ready for the DCUSA Panel to consider during its June Panel meeting.</p> <p>(c) A Request for Information is due to be issued to DCUSA Parties in Q3 2016 for feedback into the analysis and whether any changes are required to party voting arrangements.</p> <p>d) A consultation on the DCUSA Voting process was issued to DCUSA Parties on 19 August 2016 for a period of three</p> | <p>advised that the Secretariat draft a letter thanking DCUSA Parties for their responses to the Voting consultation.</p> <p>At the October Panel meeting the DCUSA Panel reviewed the letter drafted to thank Parties for their responses to the voting consultation.</p> <p>The Voting Consultation response letter has been issued to DCUSA Parties.</p> <p>At the February 2017 Panel meeting it was agreed that this action Item can be closed as Parties are supportive of the voting arrangements.</p> <p>Status: </p> |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | | | weeks. 12 Responses were received and the majority of respondents were supportive of the current DCUSA Voting Party arrangements | |
| 14 | Code Administration Quantitative Metrics (Section 4) | Ofgem is to prescribe the exact data to be collected by code administrators via collection forms on a quarterly basis which is to be published on Ofgem's website. | Ofgem expect to implement the proposals through approving an appropriate change to CACoP Principle 12. The DCUSA Secretariat will be required to provide quarterly quantitative data metrics to Ofgem. | The Panel agreed to wait for further direction from Ofgem although it was noted Ofgem have since updated the CACoP data metrics following consultation and circulated to code administrators for final comment. The Secretariat will be maintaining a watching brief on any outputs however it is expected that a final version of the metrics will be circulated to code administrators for completion for the period 1 January to 31 March 2016 shortly. Upon any further developments from Ofgem, an update will be | Implementation date: Complete (June 2016). Ofgem has put forward quantitative reporting metrics to be completed by all code administrators. The first and second Quarterly Metrics Report have been submitted to Ofgem. Status:  |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | provided to the DCUSA Panel due to the contractual implications associated to the introduction of code administrator production of quarterly metrics. | |
| 15 | Code Administration Standardisation of modification template (Section 4) | <p>A standard modification template to be used across all codes (as developed by the Code administrators following the December 2015 workshop).</p> <p>The template developed is colour-coded template for the four main stages of the modification process (e.g. for initial proposal, workgroup report etc.).</p> | <p>A set of templates have been developed by code administrators with input by the DCUSA Secretariat.</p> <p>The new templates would be rolled out to DCUSA parties, subject to approval by the Panel.</p> | <p>The Secretariat and the DCUSA Panel undertook a review of the four modification templates during the May DCUSA Panel meeting. A number of questions regarding the ability to amend the templates and their ongoing flexibility were raised. Ofgem (who were in attendance) clarified the ability for the templates to be modified to align to current DCUSA terminology/ processes, although the templates should maintain a standardised feel across all codes.</p> <p>The Secretariat updated the modification templates, aligning to DCUSA terminology, ready for further DCUSA Panel during the June 2016 meeting.</p> <p>The DCUSA Panel reviewed the proposed templates and consulted with DCUSA Parties in</p> | <p>Implementation date: Complete (September 2016)</p> <p>Status: </p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | July 2016 to make sure the templates align with the DCUSA Change Process. The templates were updated based on feedback from DCUSA Parties and the DCUSA Panel. | |
| 16 | Code Administration Identifying consumer impacts (Section 4) | A consumer impacts section is to be included in all code modification templates, and should be continually assessed throughout the modification process. | Code administrators have included a section that will cover consumer impacts within the standardised modification template however updates could be made to the DCUSA Working Group Terms of Reference to capture consumer impacts. | The DCUSA Panel agreed to update the Working Group Terms of Reference and the existing Change Report template to capture consumer impacts until the standardised templates are introduced. | Implementation Date: Completed (June 2016) Status:  |
| 17 | Code administration coordination (Section 4) | A 'lead' code administrator to coordinate across all codes the implementation of the Final Proposals and lead on cross code coordination on an enduring basis. Ofgem consider that this role should be held on an annual basis by the host CACoP code administrator. | The Secretariat will work with Code administrators to understand the work plan of events. | During the joint code administrator meeting on 3 June 2016, it was agreed that the 'lead' code administrator should be aligned to the annual rotation of the lead CACoP code administrator. As a result, the Distribution Code Secretariat will act as the 'lead' code administrator. | Implementation Date: Completed (June 2016) Status:  |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|--|
| 18 | Code administration Independent Panel Chairs (Section 4) | Ofgem will not be adding a licence requirement for appointing panel chairs where this does not already exist (e.g. DCUSA), but careful consideration should be given in the appointment process on candidate's ability to act independently (i.e. impartially). | No initial DCUSA impact identified. Panel members must act independently. | No impact. | No impact (Closed). Status:  |
| 19 | Code administration Independent Panel members (Section 4) | Ofgem will not be mandating a change to those codes where panel members are appointed to represent constituencies of code parties. Panel members should provide clear reasons for their views on code modifications, assessed against the code objectives, in order to help the Authority understand how a voting decision was reached. | No initial DCUSA impact identified. Panel members are not appointed to represent constituencies. | No impact. | No impact (Closed). Status:  |
| 20 | Code administration Independent Working Group Chairs (Section 4) | Code administrators at to undertake the workgroup chair role, unless there is a conflict of interest (e.g. Code Administrator is affected), | DCUSA Working Group's Terms of Reference are the means to specify whether the Secretariat is to Chair the Working Group. In the past, the standard approach has | During the May DCUSA Panel meeting, the DCUSA Panel agreed a proposal from the Secretariat to chair all DCUSA Working groups on an enduring basis from July 2016. | Implementation: Complete (July 2016) Status:  |

| | | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|--|---|
| | | and workgroup member should then to this role. | been industry representatives chairing all DCUSA Working Groups. | Due to the impacts to the DCUSA budget for 2016/17, a notification is to be issued to DCUSA Parties in June 2016. | |
| 21 | Charging Methodologies Use of the self-governance route for charging modifications | Ofgem consider that non-material charging modifications can follow the self-governance route when judged against the existing self-governance criteria. Ofgem also expect further work on producing guidance on defining 'material' to be undertaken. | A definition for 'material' is not currently in existence in relation to charging methodology Change Proposals. | The Secretariat has drafted a definition of "material" for Panel consideration. At the June Panel meeting a view will be taken as to whether this adds value to the current criteria in the DCUSA for determining what should be a part 1/part 2 matter. At the August Panel meeting the DCUSA Panel recommended that the following definition should be used to determine whether charging change proposals have a material impact: <i>"In respect of proposals to vary one or more of the Charging Methodologies, such proposals shall be deemed to be "material" if they might</i> | Implementation: October 2016 Release, Subject to review and approval the definition will be added as guidance to the Change Proposal Template In September 2016, Ofgem considered the Panel's recommendation and agreed with the proposed wording. The definition will be added to DCUSA Guidance documents including the Change Proposal Form and the Self Governance form. Status:  |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p><i>reasonably be expected to have a significant impact on the tariffs calculated under one or more of the methodologies.”</i></p> <p>Ofgem agreed with the proposed definition.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|