

DCUSA Change Declaration		At what stage is this document in the process?
<h1 data-bbox="121 353 550 443">DCP 263</h1> <h2 data-bbox="121 481 571 539">NTC DEH GAP:</h2> <p data-bbox="121 566 890 604"><i>Raised on the 22 January 2016 as a Standard change</i></p>	01 – Change Proposal	
	02 – Consultation	
	03 – Change Report	
	04 – Change Declaration	
<p>Purpose of Change Proposal</p> <p>DCP 263 seeks to amend the National Terms of Connection (NTC) so that they cater for DNOs' connections to non-metered DEH networks.</p>		
	<p>DCUSA Parties voted on the Change Report and recommend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that the change solution is rejected • that the implementation date is rejected 	
	<p>The DCUSA Parties determined that this Change Proposal should not be implemented.</p> <p>DCUSA Parties voted to reject the implementation of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCP 263 	
	<p>Impacted Parties: DNOs and IDNOs</p>	
	<p>Impacted Clauses: Schedule 2B National Terms of Connection</p>	

Contents		 Any questions?
1 Summary	3	Contact: Dan Fittock
2 Governance	3	 dan.fittock@electralink.co.uk
3 Why Change?	3	 0792 129 6613
4 Code Specific Matters	Error! Bookmark not defined.	
5 Solution	4	Proposer: Peter Waymont
6 Relevant Objectives	12	 Peter.waymont@ukpowernetworks.co.uk
7 Impacts & Other Considerations	13	
8 Implementation	13	
9 Legal Text	13	
10 Voting	14	 07875 112757
11 Recommendations	14	
Timeline		
The timetable for the progression of the CP is as follows:		
Change Proposal timetable		
Activity	Date	
Initial Assessment Report Approved by Panel	22 January 2016	
Consultation Issued to Industry Participants	13 May 2016	
Change Report Approved by Panel	16 November 2016	
Change Report issued for Voting	18 November 2016	
Party Voting Closes	09 December 2016	
Change Declaration Issued to Parties	13 December 2016	
Change Declaration Issued to Authority	13 December 2016	
Authority Decision ¹	17 January 2017	
Proposed Implementation Date	First Release following Approval ²	

¹ Subject to change due to Ofgem moratorium

² 23 February 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 DCP 263 has been raised by UK Power Networks to amend the NTC so that they cater for DNOs' connections to non-metered DEH networks.

How

- 1.3 By covering non-metered DEH connections in the NTC which are applicable in the absence of a bilateral connection agreement.

2 Governance

Justification for Part 1 Matter

- 2.1 DCP 263 is classified as a Part 1 matter and therefore will go to the Authority for determination after the voting process has completed.
- 2.2 This CP has been designated as a Part 1 Matter as the proposed change impacts both Distributor and Customers.

Requested Next Steps

- 2.3 DCUSA Parties voted that DCP 263 be rejected. This recommendation has been issued to the Authority for decision.

3 Why Change?

Background of DCP 263

- 3.1 The NTC are the default terms of connection that apply when the Connectee does not have a bilateral connection agreement with the Licensed Distribution Network Operators (LDNO). The NTC sets out terms that the network operator requires the Customer to accept in order to maintain their connection to the LDNO's network.
- 3.2 LDNOs need standard terms to efficiently govern the large numbers of connections to their system and to enable them to be consistent and fair, to be transparent and to be efficient across more than 30 million customers in total. This avoids the need for bilateral connection agreements unless

absolutely necessary and so avoids the need to handle changes of ownership and occupation which would need constant novation or reissue to new owners or occupiers (most of which changes the LDNO is unaware of in advance).

- 3.3 Suppliers generally incorporate the National Terms of Connection by reference within their Supply Contracts. This binds their customer to the terms. In addition, where no supply contract exists but there is a connection, then the NTC apply by virtue of Section 21 of the Electricity Act.
- 3.4 There is a gap in the arrangements whereby not all connections to LDNO networks are covered by the NTC in the absence of a bi-lateral contract. This arises due to the wording in the NTC which contain a number of sections that each have specific applicability. The issue arises because the sections in the NTC refer specifically to metered connections or to specific defined categories of unmetered supplies such as street lighting. However, where a connection is to a network operated by a Distribution Exemption Holder (DEH) and the connection to the LDNO is NOT Supplier Metered and has no bi-lateral connection agreement, then the DEH has no connection terms in place at all for the boundary between it and the LDNO. This means unlimited liabilities for both the DEH and for the LDNO. In addition, key Balancing and Settlement Code compliance controls and distribution licence obligation controls are not in place and there is complete absence of any statement of obligations and protections, which all other classes of customer enjoy and gain confidence from.
- 3.5 This DCUSA Change Proposal seeks to put in place a set of terms in order that these non-metered DEH connections are covered by the NTC in the absence of a bi-lateral connection agreement. The gap in the application of the NTC to DEHs is illustrated by a diagram in Appendix 1.

4 Solution

DCP 263 Working Group Assessment

- 4.1 The DCUSA Panel established a Working Group to assess DCP 263. The Working Group met on three occasions and was comprised of DNO representatives and an Ofgem observer. An open invitation was issued to all DCUSA Parties and persons who have previously expressed interest in DCUSA Working Groups. Under DCUSA there is a continuous open invitation to any experts in the relevant subject matter who wish to join this Working Group.
- 4.2 The Meetings were held in open session and the minutes and papers of each meeting are available on the DCUSA website – www.dcusa.co.uk.

What are Distribution Exemption Holders?

- 4.3 For the purpose of this change DEHs are defined as a person who Owns and / or Operates an electricity distribution system to distribute electricity to other persons (customers/tenants) and who do not need an electricity distribution licence i.e. has no need to apply for a licence under the Electricity Act.

- 4.4 DEHs are often private landlords, local landlords, caravan parks, airport and port operators, or Local Authorities. The most prevalent DEH is a Building Network Operator (BNO). A BNO owns and / or operates an electricity distribution network within a multiple occupancy building between the intake position and the customer's installation.
- 4.5 DEH connections may be metered, for example where the DEH buys and resells the boundary metered electricity to his tenants. More often, the LDNO's system is connected to the private network with no boundary metering because each of the tenants is metered and so buys their own electricity directly from an electricity Supplier.

Working Group Analysis of DCP 263

- 4.6 This change seeks to have the same National Terms of Connection apply to a DEH that would apply if they had a metered boundary. The Working Group developed the following definitions to aid the DEHs application under Section 2 and 3 of the NTC:
- "Licence Exempt System" means an electricity distribution system that is not owned or operated by a holder of an Electricity Distribution Licence and which is used for the purpose of conveying electricity to or from Third Party Customers; and
 - "Third Party Customers" means electricity customers at the Premises other than the Customer.

What does DCP 263 mean for a DEH?

- 4.7 The application of the NTC to the DEH will mean that there are always connection terms in place between the LDNO and the DEH in the absence of a bi-lateral signed connection agreement.
- 4.8 The terms are identical to those that are in place with metered customers. Limitations of liability will apply. The right to be connected and the right to be energised are defined, together with the circumstances where de-energisation or disconnection may occur.
- 4.9 Processes and obligations around the installation of generating equipment, installation of additional equipment and over or under use of the connection are described.

DCP 263 Consultation

4.10 The Working Group carried out a consultation (Attachment 4) to give DCUSA Parties and other interested organisations an opportunity to review and comment on the proposed DCP 263 solution. The consultation was distributed to just under 1000 parties (please see Attachment 5) There were nine responses received to the consultation. Six respondents were DNOs, three respondents were Suppliers, one IDNO respondent, one consultant respondent and one anonymous respondent. The Working Group discussed each response and its comments are summarised alongside the collated consultation responses in Attachment 4.

4.11 A summary of the responses received, and the Working Group's conclusions are set out below:

Question 1: Do you understand the intent of the DCP 263 change?

4.12 All respondents understood the intent of the CP.

Question 2: Are you supportive of the principles of the DCP 263 change?

4.13 All respondents to this question were supportive of the principles of the CP.

Question 3: Do you have any comments on the proposed legal text?

4.14 Two respondents had no comments on the proposed legal text. Seven respondents requested that the draft legal text be clarified on the key points set out in the table below:

Author	Draft Legal Text Comments
Respondent	One respondent advised that <i>“Under this DCP section 3 is intended to apply where the connection could not reasonably be CT metered (where the connection is to a Distribution Exemption Holder (‘DEH’). Under these circumstances our understanding is that section 3 will apply to the DEH’s network and not to any installation connected to the DEH network. So any obligation on the DNO to legally de-energise or disconnect relates to the DNO/DEH boundary and the DNO is not required to de-energise or disconnect customers connected to the DEH’s network”</i> .
Working Group	The Working Group agreed to check with a legal advisor that the NTC refers to the non-metered boundary and not directly to customers connected to the private network beyond. The Working Group clarified that the DEH is responsible for customers connected to its network in so far as they impact on the use of the boundary connection point.
Respondent	Another respondent advised that <i>“in paragraph (D), the proposed use of the phrase “license exempt distribution system” (uncapitalised and not defined anywhere) implies that the rules only apply where the general distribution exemption conditions are met or there is a site-specific exemption from distribution licensing”</i> .
Working Group	The Working Group agreed to reference Section 64 of the Electricity Act’s definition of DEH and the Authority decision on DCP 124 and ask the DCUSA legal advisor to consider what to do if a company is acting like a DEH but does not meet the exemption criteria.
Respondent	The definition of <i>“Licence Exempt System” “appears to include systems that are unlicensed but do not have an exemption or meet the general exemption conditions; it appears to include distribution systems located outside the jurisdiction; it might include embedded transmission systems”</i> .
Working Group	The Working Group agreed to seek guidance on referencing the distribution or transmission licence pursuant to the Electricity Act.

Respondent	One respondent highlighted a contradiction in the drafting of the legal text. The proposed header of Section 2 covers any low-amperage unmetered connection suggesting that there is no express limitation to unmetered distribution systems but there is a limitation to (undefined) licence exempt distribution systems in paragraph (D).
Working Group	The Working Group agreed to clarify in the legal text that unmetered supplies covered by Section 4 are excluded. Members noted that there is a statutory instrument BSCP and BSC Charge Code for unmetered supplies which clearly delineates the difference.
Respondent	The respondent asked whether in the definition of “Third Party Customers”, private networks are treated as “Premises” on their own or whether the entire site served by a private network is treated as a single “Premise”.
Working Group	The Working Group considered that the definition was to set out that Distributors did not have control over the private network other than their interactions at the boundary. The Working Group agreed to confirm with the DCUSA legal advisor.
Respondent	A respondent queried that if distributors are required to give the DEH notice of De-energisation by law, e.g. for planned works under Clause 5.5, how do they comply if they don’t know the identity of the DEH?
Working Group	The Working Group agreed that the legal text should not create additional obligations on Distributors that should not be applicable and agreed to confer with the DCUSA legal advisor on this point.
Respondent	On review of Clause 9.1 the respondent asked should the DEH have an obligation to ensure that Third Party Customers do not interfere with or damage the distributor’s Plant and Apparatus?
Working Group	The Working Group agreed to ask the DCUSA lawyers to ensure that any obligations on the DEH also fall on the management of their customers.
Respondent	One respondent suggested a need to define Licence Exempt System more clearly with reference to the Electricity Act and/or the relevant class exemption regulation.
Working Group	The Working Group agreed that they would define Licence Exempt System more clearly with reference to the Electricity Act.

Group	The scope should include those that operate without a licence or an exemption order as those that have been accepted through custom and practice and it is not for the DNO to police the need for a license following customer load growth etc.
-------	---

Question 4: Which DCUSA General Objectives does the CP better facilitate? Please provide supporting comments.

1. The development, maintenance and operation by each of the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of an efficient, co-ordinated, and economical Distribution System.
2. The facilitation of effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity and (so far as is consistent with that) the promotion of such competition in the sale, distribution and purchase of electricity.
3. The efficient discharge by each of the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of the obligations imposed upon them by their Distribution Licences.
4. The promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of this Agreement and the arrangements under it.
5. Compliance with the Regulation on Cross-Border Exchange in Electricity and any relevant legally binding decisions of the European Commission and/or the Agency for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators.

4.15 The following table provides a summary of the responses to this question.

Respondent Party Type	Objective 1	Objective 2	Objective 3	Objective 4	Objective 5	No Comment	Comment
DNOs	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
IDNO	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Consultant	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Anonymous	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Total	7	0	0	0	0	1	1

4.16 The majority of respondents considered that General Objective 1 was better facilitated by this change for the following reasons:

- *“it will ensure the efficient management of all private networks, not just those where a bi-lateral connection agreement is in place”.*
- *“it is estimated that private networks are in the order of one hundred thousand or more and it is not administratively practical to conduct efficient management of LDNO to DEH arrangements without these changes. It would not be possible to deliver a robust transparent and codified approach to co-ordinating the management of the sum of those distribution networks in an economical way.”*
- *It “would significantly improve the efficiency of administration and application of contractual terms associated with a class of connection which has previously been largely overlooked”*
- *“it would enable distributors to maintain their distribution systems with a greater degree of confidence regarding the DEH networks that are connected to their own distribution systems”.*
- *“Enables a default position to be established and a practical solution to be enacted for the vast number of DEH boundaries that are not metered”.*

- *“it will provide an effective and economical process for administering contractual terms for the significant volume of DNO to DEH connections”.*

4.17 One respondent commented that *“the consultation document provides no source for the claim that this change would affect “one hundred thousand or more” networks”. This respondent considered that “the consultation document does not identify any actual management tasks that cannot currently be performed efficiently”.*

4.18 The Working Group noted the responses. Please refer to Section 5 of this report for the Working Groups rationale on which Objectives are best facilitated by this CP.

Question 5: It is proposed that DCP 263 be implemented in the first practicable DCUSA release following approval, which is likely to be 3 November 2016. Do you have a preference on the date that DCP 263 is implemented into the DCUSA?

4.19 Five respondents agreed with the proposed implementation date for this change. Three respondents did not have a preference on the date that DCP 263 is implemented in to the DCUSA.

4.20 The Working Group noted that all respondents to this question were in agreement with the implementation date of the first DCUSA release following approval for this change.

Question 6: Are you aware of any wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP?

4.21 All respondents were not aware of any wider industry developments that would impact upon this CP.

Question 13: Are there any alternative solutions or unintended consequences that should be considered by the Working Group?

4.22 Seven respondents did not have any alternative solutions or matters to be considered by the Working Group.

4.23 One respondent considered that if the 100,000 or more networks on which DNOs cannot currently perform management tasks efficiently is an unsupported claim then site-specific connection agreements might provide an alternative solution. The Working Group agreed that this change was looking to set out a standard set of terms which DNOs can apply efficiently and consistently across all connectees.

4.24 Another respondent requested that the Working Group *“consider whether s21 of the Electricity Act can be considered to impose the National Terms of Connection on licence exempt distribution system operators and whether all potential classes of licence exempt distribution systems are covered by s21”.* The Working Group agreed to submit this question to the DCUSA legal advisor for consideration.

4.25 This respondent asked that “*If s21 can be construed as applying to licence exempt networks then we would seek clarification and confirmation that the changes which are made to the NTCs will be able to retrospectively cover connections made prior to this change proposal*”. The Working Group advised that the intent is that this change would apply to existing DEHs.

Further Circulation

4.26 In addition to the formal consultation, and following its review, some DNOs sought to provide awareness of this matter through their stakeholder engagement work. They circulated the consultation documents and advised stakeholders to contact themselves or Electralink if they wished to raise any concerns, within a three-week deadline. No further feedback was received following this initiative.

Working Group Conclusions

4.27 The Working Group reviewed each of the responses received to consultation one and concluded that all of the respondents understood the intent of DCP 263.

4.28 The Working Group agreed that all respondents were supportive of the principle of the CP.

4.29 The Working Group noted that the majority of respondents felt that specifically DCUSA General Objectives 1 was better facilitated by this change.

4.30 The Working Group concluded that the primary benefits of this CP is:

- the ability to efficiently manage the licensed distribution networks interactions with the licence exempt distributors arrangements.

5 Relevant Objectives

Assessment 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 five Charging Objectives. The full list of objectives is documented in the CP form provided as Attachment 3. The Working Group considers that DCUSA General Objective 1 is better facilitated by DCP 263. The reasoning against this objective is set out in the table below:

DCUSA General Objective One - The development, maintenance and operation by the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of efficient, co-ordinated, and economical Distribution Networks

DCUSA General Objective 1 is better facilitated as it is known that there are a substantial number of private networks, such as blocks of flats, BNO's, caravan sites etc, and it is not administratively practical to conduct efficient management of LDNO to DEH arrangements without these changes. It would not be possible to deliver a robust transparent and codified approach to co-ordinating the management of the sum of those distribution networks in an economical way.

6 Impacts & Other Considerations

- 6.1 This change impacts both Distributors and Distribution Exemption Holders (DEHs) by ensuring that the same National Terms of Connection apply to a DEH that would apply if they had a metered boundary.

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

- 6.2 No impacts identified.

Environmental Impacts

- 6.3 In accordance with DCUSA Clause 11.14.6, the Working Group assessed whether there would be a material impact on greenhouse gas emissions if DCP 263 were implemented. The Working Group [did/did not identify] any material impact on greenhouse gas emissions from the implementation of this CP.

Engagement with the Authority

- 6.4 *For Part 1 matters* – Ofgem has been fully engaged throughout the development of DCP 263 as an observer of the Working Group.

7 Implementation

- 7.1 Subject to Party approval and Authority consent, DCP 263 will be implemented in the first DCUSA release following Authority approval.

8 Legal Text

- 8.1 The proposed legal text has been reviewed by the DCUSA Legal Advisor and acts as Attachment 2.
- 8.2 The main elements of the legal text are:
- Schedule 2B Section 1 (D) which relates to the application of sections 2, 3 & 4 of the National Terms of Connection dependent on the physical nature of the connection at the premises. This change stipulates that if:
 - You are an unlicensed distribution system that does not have its own settlement meter at the boundary with the network but would most likely be metered with whole current metering if it was metered, section 2 will apply; and
 - the connection is to an unlicensed distribution system that does not have its own settlement meter at the boundary with the network but would most likely be metered with C/T metering if it was metered, then section 3 will apply.

- An amendment to Schedule 2B Section 1 G *'interpretation'* to reflect that unlicensed distribution systems (which includes, but is not limited to, systems owned by distribution exemption holders and unlicensed building network operators) are included under the National Terms of Connection;
- An amendment to Schedule 2B Section 2 summary statement to reflect that Section 2 applies to connections to unlicensed distribution systems that do not have their own settlement meters at the boundary with the network but would most likely be metered with whole current metering if they were metered;
- An amendment to Schedule 2B Section 2 to limit liability to operators of unlicensed distribution systems;
- An amendment to Schedule 2B Section 3 summary statement to reflect that Section 3 applies connections to unlicensed distribution systems that do not have their own settlement meters at the boundary with the network but would most likely be metered with C/T metering if they were metered; and
- Amendments to Schedule 2B Section 3 to reflect that for unlicensed distribution systems there may not be metering at the boundary.

8.3 The DCP 263 Working Group has considered the Legal Text and is satisfied that it meets the intent of the CP.

9 Voting

9.1 DCP 263 was issued to DCUSA Parties for Voting on 18/11/16.

DCP 263 – Recommendation

Part 1 Matter

9.2 With regards to DCP 263, the DCUSA Parties' recommendation to the Authority is that the change solution is rejected. For the majority of the Parties that were eligible to vote, the sum of the Weighted Votes of the Parties which voted to accept the change solution was less than or equal to 50%.

9.3 The DCUSA Parties' recommendation to the Authority is that the implementation date is rejected. For the majority of the Party Categories that were eligible to vote, the sum of the Weighted Votes of the Parties which voted to reject the implementation date was less than or equal to 50%.

9.4 The overall recommendation, in accordance with Clause 13.5 of the DCUSA, is that the CP be rejected.

10 Recommendations

DCUSA Parties Recommendation

DCUSA Parties recommend:

- that DCP 263 should not be implemented
- that DCP 263 better facilitates the Relevant Objectives

10.1 The Authority is invited to note the recommendation put forward by Parties in respect of DCP 263.

Attachments

- Attachment 1 – Consolidated Responses
- Attachment 2 - DCP 263 Proposed Legal Text
- Attachment 3 - DCP 263 Change Proposal
- Attachment 4 - DCP 263 Consultation Documents
- Attachment 5 – DCP 263 Consultation Distribution List

APPENDIX 1 – GAP IN THE APPLICATION OF THE NATIONAL TERMS OF CONNECTION (NTC) TO DISTRIBUTION EXEMPTION HOLDERS (DEHs) DIAGRAM

Fig 1

Fig 2

Fig 3

