



## **DCUSA CHANGE REPORT**

### **DCP 179 - Amending the CDCM Tariff Structure**

#### **Executive Summary**

DCP 179 seeks to amend the existing tariff structure within CDCM by introducing half hourly metered tariffs for Current Transformer (CT) metered customers and Whole Current (WC) metered customers.

This document presents the Change Report for DCP 179 and invites respondents to vote on the proposed change.

## 1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 This document is issued in accordance with Clause 11.20 of the DCUSA, and details DCP 179 - Amending the CDCM Tariff Structure. The voting process for the proposed variation and the timetable of the progression of the Change Proposal (CP) through the DCUSA Change Control Process is set out in this document.
- 1.2 Parties are invited to consider the proposed amendment (Attachment 1) and submit their votes using the Voting form (Attachment 2) to [dcusa@electralink.co.uk](mailto:dcusa@electralink.co.uk) by **DATE**

## 2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The current tariff structure within the Common Distribution Charging Methodology (CDCM) contains a range of half hourly (HH) and non-half hourly (NHH) tariffs. In 2011 a Distribution Charging Methodologies Forum (DCMF) Methodologies Issues Group (MIG) subgroup was established to address the anomalies between the two different cost allocation mechanisms for HH and NHH tariffs in the CDCM. DCP 179 was one of the DCUSA Change Proposals that was raised following on from the work of this DCMF MIG subgroup.
- 2.2 DCP 179 was raised by Electricity North West and seeks to amend the existing tariff structure within CDCM by introducing half hourly metered tariffs for Current Transformer (CT) metered customers and Whole Current (WC) metered customers. The purpose of this change is to address two issues:
- Customers under 100kW with half hourly metering can elect to be settled on a NHH or HH basis. As the tariff structure for NHH and HH customers is different, there will be a difference in the Distribution Use of System (DUoS) bill depending on whether the customer is settled HH or NHH. As DNOs have an obligation to provide cost reflective charges, there should not be a material difference in charges as a result of this choice.
  - The introduction of SMART metering will facilitate customers to be settled half hourly in the future. However, the only available half hourly tariff at present contains a capacity charge and therefore assumes that the customer has an agreed Maximum

Import Capacity within a Connection Agreement. Most small LV customers do not have an agreed capacity and it would therefore not be appropriate to levy an explicit capacity charge to these customers.

- 2.3 Additional information on the Change Proposal can be found in the CP form which is provided as Attachment 3.

### 3 THE INTENT OF DCP 179

3.1

### 4 THE DCP 179 CHANGE PROPOSAL

4.1

### 5 THE DCP 179 WORKING GROUP

- 5.1 The DCUSA Panel established a Working Group to assess DCP 179. The group consists of Distributor, Supplier, Consumer and Ofgem representatives. Meetings were held in open session and the minutes and papers of each meeting are available on the DCUSA website – [www.dcusa.co.uk](http://www.dcusa.co.uk).

### 6 DCP 179 – CONSULTATION

- 6.1 The Working Group carried out a consultation to give DCUSA Parties and other interested organisations an opportunity to review and comment on DCP 179.
- 6.2 There were sixteen responses received, each of which were reviewed and discussed by the Working Group. The consultation responses, along with the Working Group's comments and the consultation document can be found in Attachment 4.

#### **Question 1 - Do you understand the intent of the CP?**

- 6.3 The Working Group noted that fifteen of the sixteen respondents understood the intent of the CP. One respondent explained that they would appreciate clarity on the intent of the CP, accordingly the Working Group agreed to ensure that this Change Report is clear on the intent (see section 3 above).

**Comment [RT1]:** The Working Group agreed to include a plain English summary of the intent within the Change Report to add clarity.

(See British Gas response to consultation question 1 for more details)

Clarify the interaction between DCP 179 and P300, what will DCP 179 be doing and what will the BSC Change do?

Where will measurement classes be set? SF to discuss whether there is an inconsistency between P300 and DCP 179 at the next P300 meeting. ACTION

**Comment [RT2]:** What will mandate what – make it clear in the change report

**Comment [RT3]:** Capture in this section what is actually going to change under DCP 179. Summary explain what we are doing, why we are doing it and the interaction with P300, P272. Explain at a high level about migration. This should be a plain English Summary.

**Question 2 - Are you supportive of the principles established by this proposal?**

- 6.4 The Working Group noted that all respondents were supportive of the principles of the proposal, however, four of the sixteen respondents did express concerns with the proposed solution.
- 6.5 Two respondents expressed concerns around the introduction of the new CT/whole current boundary; with one cautioning that care needs to be taken to make sure this change is fully understood and the other suggested that such a boundary should be by reference to the size of the customer as measured by their demand.
- 6.6 A Supplier respondent stated that they are not supportive of the attempt by DNO's to alter central settlement systems to satisfy their own billing requirements. In response, the Working Group noted that new measurement classes will need to be introduced for the efficient implementation of DCP 179, as this will allow differentiation between the customer types.
- 6.7 Another respondent expressed concern about the impact on low load factor customers in Profiles 5 & 6 who may see an increase in distribution costs under DCP 179. The Working Group acknowledged that there will be some impact on customers, however, the HH and NHH tariffs have been aligned to try and minimise this impact. Ultimately, the charges that result will be more cost reflective toward customers over time.

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

- 6.8 A number of respondents provided comments on the legal text and the Working Group agreed to update the text accordingly. More detail on these changes can be found in Attachment 4.

**Question 4 - Do you agree with the Working Group's approach to remove the inconsistency between the standing charge factors for the HV non-domestic tariff in the legal text and the CDCM model by setting the values to that currently used in the CDCM model?**

- 6.9 The Working Group noted that all respondents agreed with this principle.

**Question 5 - Do you need to make any system changes to accommodate this change? If yes, please provide information on the following points:**

- **What systems are impacted?**
- **How much time you believe you need to implement these changes?**

- What do you believe they will cost?
- Please describe the nature of the changes required?

6.10 The following table provides summary of the responses received by respondent type.

| Respondent Type | Response |    |                    |       |
|-----------------|----------|----|--------------------|-------|
|                 | Yes      | No | In Part Supportive | Total |
| Anonymous       |          |    |                    |       |
| DNO             |          |    |                    |       |
| IDNO            |          |    |                    |       |
| Other           |          |    |                    |       |
| Supplier        |          |    |                    |       |
| Total           |          |    |                    |       |

6.11

Question 6 - Do you have any comments on the structure of the tariffs? For instance, do you think it is appropriate for all HH customers to have three rates but not for all customers to have an explicit capacity charge?

6.12

Question 7 - Do you agree with the Working Group's proposal to amend the name of the LV Generation NHH tariff rather than introduce a new tariff?

6.13

Question 8 - Do you believe that Whole Current and CT is the appropriate boundary for HH site specific settlement and HH aggregated settlement?

6.14

Question 9 - Do you agree with the Working Group proposal that WC customers currently on the LV HH metered tariff should automatically migrate to the new LV non-domestic, non-CT tariff? If not, please explain why.

6.15

Question 10 - Are there any unintended consequences of this proposal?

6.16

Question 11- Do you consider that the proposal better facilitates the DCUSA objectives?

6.17 X respondents answered this question, with X agreeing that the proposal better facilitates the DCUSA objectives and five disagreeing. Of the respondents that agreed the following table lists the DCUSA Objectives that they specifically mentioned as being better facilitated.

| DCUSA General Objectives | No. Of Respondents that agree it is better facilitated | DCUSA Charging Objectives | No. Of Respondents that agree it is better facilitated |
|--------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|
| Objective 1              | 0  | Objective 1               | 0  |
| Objective 2              | 15   | Objective 2               | 15   |
| Objective 3              | 0  | Objective 3               | 1  |
| Objective 4              | 0  | Objective 4               | 0  |
| Objective 5              | 0  | Objective 5               | 0  |

**Question 12 - Are there any alternative solutions or matters that should be considered?**

6.18

**Question 13 - The proposed implementation is date 1 April 2015, do you agree with this proposed date?**

6.19

**Question 14 - Please state any other comments or views on the Change Proposal.**

6.20

## **7 WORKING GROUP ASSESSMENT OF DCP 179**

- 7.1 The DCP 179 Working Group discussed the proposal over a number of meetings, taking into account the responses received to the DCP 179 industry consultation. The topics discussed by the Working Group and the group's conclusions are detailed below.

### **Interaction of DCP 179 with other DCUSA Change Proposals**

- 7.2 The DCP 179 Working Group noted that a previous DCUSA Change Proposal (DCP 103<sup>1</sup>) was raised to enable Half Hourly (HH) Settlement for domestic customers. The proposed DCP 103 solution was to extend site specific billing to any customers that were moved on to the HH settled tariffs. The DCP 103 Working Group consulted on this option but identified that the DNOs' billing systems were constrained by the number of customers that could be billed on a site specific basis. The Working Group concluded that there would be a substantial cost to extend billing systems and consequently this Change Proposal was withdrawn. DCP 179 builds upon DCP 103 and proposes that the majority of customers can be settled HH on an aggregate basis rather than site specific. The DCP 103 consultation documents and the responses received are provided as Attachment 5.

---

<sup>1</sup> DCP 103 - Duos Charges for sub 100kw HH settled sites

7.3 Following the withdrawal of DCP 103, the Distribution Charging Methodologies Forum (DCMF) Methodologies Issues Group (MIG) subgroup identified a number of changes to the CDCM which would address the discrepancy between HH and NHH tariffs. At the time there was debate within this subgroup as to whether the changes should be submitted together as a single CP or separately. It was decided that as some CPs were ready for submission before others they should be submitted separately. Accordingly, the subgroup raised the following DCUSA Change Proposals:

- DCP 130 - Remove the discrepancy between non-half hourly (NHH) and half hourly (HH) Un-metered Supplies (UMS) tariffs
- DCP 160 - Non-Half Hourly (NHH) Notional Capacity
- DCP 165 - Voltage Level Approach to Unit Charges in the CDCM
- DCP 179 - Amending the CDCM Tariff Structure

7.4 DCP 130, which was the first CP to be raised based on the work of the DCMF MIG subgroup, was implemented on 1 April 2013. DCP 160, DCP 165 and DCP 179 are currently in the definition phase of the DCUSA change process.

7.5 The DCP 160, DCP 165 and DCP 179 Working Groups identified that these CPs are highly interdependent and sought permission from the DCUSA Panel to consider all three under the scope of DCP 179. After undertaking an impact analysis of the combined change proposals the Working Group decided that the impact on tariffs was material and, therefore, it would not be feasible to implement a solution that incorporated all three change proposals for April 2015. The Working Group received a steer from Ofgem that the new tariffs needed to be in place for April 2015 to enable the benefits of smart metering to be gained as soon as possible<sup>2</sup>. Consequently the Working Group has decided to implement the new aggregated tariffs as specified in the original intent of DCP 179, and DCPs 160 and 165 will be progressed by their respective Working Groups. The CP forms

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/ofgem-publications/85909/letteronindustryroleinsupportingdelivertofsmartmeteringbenefits.pdf>



for DCP 160 and DCP 165 are provided for information as Attachment 6 and Attachment 7.

**Comment [RT4]:** Move into background section?

### Introduction of New Tariffs

**Comment [RT5]:** Move into the new description section and make it clearer to address issues around lack of clarity

7.6 Under DCP 179 it is proposed that the CDCM be modified to create two new tariffs as follows:

- LV Network Domestic
- LV Network Non-Domestic Non-CT

7.7 The new tariffs are derived to be consistent with a weighted average of the most appropriate existing CDCM tariffs:

- The LV Network Domestic tariff is derived from the existing Profile Class (PC) 1 and PC2 CDCM tariffs i.e. Domestic Unrestricted and Domestic Two Rate and Domestic Off Peak
- The LV Network Non-Domestic Non-CT tariff is derived from the existing PC3 and PC4 CDCM tariffs i.e. Small Non Domestic Unrestricted, Small Non Domestic Two Rate and Small Non Domestic Off Peak

7.8 In addition, in order to cater for aggregate HH settled generation, the existing LV Generation NHH tariff has been relabelled to:

- LV Generation NHH / Aggregate HH

7.9 Additional information is contained within the specification document provided as Attachment 8.

7.10 These new tariffs will be available to WC metered customers. The majority of these customers are currently on PC 1 to 8, although a small number of the larger non-domestic customers are settled half hourly. Whilst the new tariffs introduced by DCP 179 are HH tariffs it is proposed under this Change Proposal for them to be settled in aggregate and this will be facilitated via the new Measurement Classes that have been proposed under BSC change P300.

### **Customer Migration to New Tariffs**

**Comment [RT6]:** Move to the Issues Section.

- 7.11 An indication of the number of customers on each tariff is provided in Attachment 9 which shows the number of customers that are CT metered and non-CT metered split down by profile class. It should be noted that the figures in this attachment are still being validated by DNOs.
- 7.12 This Change Proposal will make available new tariffs but there will be no immediate migration to these tariffs as the proposed new Measurement Classes under P300 are not yet available. Therefore it is anticipated that Suppliers may instigate a change to their customers' Measurement Class which will move them on to the new tariffs post the implementation of P300. Change of Measurement Class is not a simple process, therefore Suppliers will need to be aware of the timeline. It is expected that Smart meters will allow remote switching of Measurement Classes in the future.

### **Tariff Structure**

**Comment [RT7]:** Move to section 4 – the description of the change section

- 7.13 Currently, Suppliers can elect to settle customers with a maximum demand of less than 100kW either HH or NHH. Within DCUSA the tariffs available for HH settled customers contain 3 unit rates (red/amber/green), a fixed charge, capacity charge, excess capacity charge and reactive charge. However, the structure of NHH tariffs contains either one or two unit rates and a fixed charge. This different tariff structure between HH and NHH tariffs means that where a Supplier moves a customer from HH to NHH settlement, or vice versa, there will be an impact on the customer's bill. To reduce this impact, the capacity charge for HH settled customers is currently factored into the unit rate for NHH settled customers. However, this only reduces the discrepancy, it does not eliminate it.
- 7.14 This change proposal reduces the discrepancy by introducing a new HH tariff for WC metered customers which follows the same charging structure as the current NHH tariffs (fixed and units). The new tariffs have three unit rates and a fixed charge. There is no capacity, excess capacity or reactive charge for these customers. Under this change proposal there will be little or no impact if a customer is settled NHH or HH as the only impact is the move from one or two unit rates under the NHH tariff to three unit rates

under the HH tariffs. The unit rates for each tariff will be derived on the same basis and thereby reduces any discrepancy.

#### **Boundary between HH and NHH Settlement**

**Comment [RT8]:** Move to issues section

7.15 Under the current methodology customers are allocated to NHH or HH tariffs based on whether they are settled NHH or HH under the BSC. However, the BSC allows non-domestic customers with a maximum demand of less than 100kW to elect to be settled either half hourly or non-half hourly. Consequently, the boundary between NHH and HH settlement is not fixed and customers can move between NHH and HH settlement and therefore DUoS tariffs. To overcome this issue, once P300 has been implemented, this Change Proposal proposes to set the boundary for NHH and HH tariffs based on the type of metering installed. This is a clear and unambiguous boundary that will be much more stable as an enduring solution. Under this proposal, customers that have WC metering installed will either be settled on a non-half hourly basis or on an aggregated HH basis. Customers that have CT metering installed will be settled on a site specific HH basis.

7.16 A further issue for NHH customers that elect to be settled HH is the requirement to have an agreed capacity to enable the application of the capacity element of the HH metered tariff. Many of the non-CT metered customers do not currently have an agreed capacity in a Connection agreement and this could act as a barrier to these customers moving to HH settlement under the current arrangements. The DCP179 proposed solution removes this barrier by not applying a capacity charge to these customers if they elect to be HH settled.

#### **Existing WC Metered Customers on the LV HH Metered Tariff**

**Comment [RT9]:** Move to issues section

7.17 There are currently customers with WC metering installed that are settled on the LV HH metered tariff and therefore pick up capacity and reactive charges. Under this Change Proposal, these customers will be required to move to one of the new Measurement Classes and therefore be moved to the new LV non-domestic, non-CT tariff. This will mean that these customers will no longer incur an explicit capacity or reactive charge. The number of customers that will transfer onto the new tariffs from the LV HH metered tariff is around 21,000 customers (an estimate of customer numbers can be viewed in

Attachment 9). The Working Group believes that this is the best approach to implement an enduring solution with a clear and simple boundary between aggregated HH settlement and site specific HH settlement. The Working Group seeks views on whether these customers should automatically migrate and any unintended consequences of this change.

- 7.18 To assist stakeholders assess the impact of this migration, the Working Group has undertaken an impact analysis which determines the percentage change in DUoS charge for a range of WC metered customers that are currently on the LV HH metered tariff. This analysis is based on ten WC metered customers with a range of MICs (between 10 and 60) and a range of total consumption. Each customer's DUoS charge has been worked out on the existing LV HH metered tariff and the new LV non-domestic, non-CT tariff for each DNO and the results of this analysis is contained within Attachment 10. This analysis shows that on average WC customers that are migrated will experience a reduction in their DUoS charge and a summary of this analysis is shown below:

|                 | Impact of moving WC customers from LV HH Metered tariff to LV network, non-CT, non-domestic tariff |
|-----------------|--|
| Maximum         | 30.8%  |
| 95% Upper Limit | 17.0%  |
| Average         | -12.8%   |
| 95% Lower Limit | -48.4%   |
| Minimum         | -69.0%   |

#### **Existing WC Metered PC 5-8 Customers on the LV Medium Non-domestic Tariff**

- 7.19 The Working Group recognises that customers on PC 5-8 on the NHH LV medium non-domestic tariff will experience an impact on their charge when their Supplier moves them to Half Hourly settlement. This change proposal facilitates such a change but does not mandate it. However, BSC change P272 mandates that customers on PC 5-8 are settled half hourly and to assist stakeholders, the Working Group has undertaken an impact analysis. This analysis uses the volume data from each DNO's CDCM model and splits it into the red/amber/green timebands using each DNO's percentage split of rate 1 and rate

**Comment [RT10]:** During the review of the consultation responses an action was taken to extend this sample. AP to pull out spare capacity work carried out by Gavin

**Comment [RT11]:** Move to issues section

2 for each timeband. This enables an average bill to be determined for each DNO on the LV medium non-domestic tariff and the new LV network, non-CT, non-domestic tariff.

- 7.20 The impact analysis is contained in Attachment 11 and a summary of the results are shown below. On average these customers receive a reduction of 3.7% and the spread across DNOs is from -31% to +12.1%. The actual impact on each customer will depend on their consumption within the timebands. Although the impact across the DNOs is large, the Working Group believes that moving from 2 to 3 timebands and basing the settlement of these customers on half hourly data, will enable more cost reflective price signals to be generated for these customers.

| DNO          | Average Charge (LV Medium non-domestic) | Average Charge (LV Network Non-Domestic Non-CT) | % Change (Impact of moving to new tariff) |
|--------------|---|---|---|
| ENWL         | £2,529                                  | £2,777  | 9.8%                                      |
| NPG - NEDL   | £1,793                                  | £2,006  | 11.9%                                     |
| NPG - YEDL   | £2,114                                  | £2,369  | 12.1%                                     |
| SPEN - SPD   | £1,827                                  | £1,905  | 4.2%                                      |
| SPEN - SPM   | £3,245                                  | £3,388  | 4.4%                                      |
| SSE-SEPD     | £1,802                                  | £1,755  | -2.6%                                     |
| SSE - SHEPD  | £4,129                                  | £3,508  | -15.0%                                    |
| UKPN - EPN   | £1,407                                  | £1,107  | -21.3%                                    |
| UKPN - LPN   | £1,440                                  | £995  | -30.9%                                    |
| UKPN - SPN   | £1,916                                  | £1,320  | -31.1%                                    |
| WPD - EastM  | £1,950                                  | £2,029  | 4.1%                                      |
| WPD - SWales | £3,167                                  | £3,092  | -2.3%                                     |
| WPD - SWest  | £2,327                                  | £2,420  | 4.0%                                      |
| WPD - WestM  | £1,759                                  | £1,786  | 1.5%                                      |

### LV Generation Tariff

- 7.21 The Working Group discussed whether a new HH aggregate tariff for LV generation should be introduced into the methodology for consistency with the import tariff structure. The Working Group decided that instead of creating a new tariff, the existing tariff name could be amended to allow customers on this tariff to be settled either NHH or HH. The Working Group decided that this would be the most efficient and practical solution as the

**Comment [RT12]:** Want to show that the number of customers on the LVS generation tariffs is not large

**Comment [RT13]:** Move to issues section

tariff unit rate and fixed charge should be the same for both tariffs and separating the tariffs could introduce a discrepancy where this is currently none.

- 7.22 A further issue for the NHH generation tariff is that it does not contain a reactive charge. The Working Group considered whether the introduction of a HH aggregated tariff would incur a reactive charge. The Working Group agreed that there should not be a difference in tariff structure between NHH and aggregate HH and this was another reason why the Working Group decided to rename the tariff rather than introduce a new HH tariff. The Working Group seeks industry views on whether this approach is acceptable.

#### **Interaction with Balancing and Settlement Code Changes**

**Comment [RT14]:** Move to background section

- 7.23 It has been identified that DCP 179 interacts with two currently on going Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC) changes, namely:
- [P272 'Mandatory Half Hourly Settlement for Profile Classes 5-8'](#) which seeks to make Half Hourly Settlement mandatory for Profile Classes 5-8; and
  - [P300 'Introduction of new Measurement Classes to support Half Hourly DCUSA Tariff Changes \(DCP179\)'](#) which has been raised to introduce new Measurement Classes for aggregated Half Hourly-settled customers as a consequence of this Change Proposal.
- 7.24 DCP 179 is dependent upon P300 being implemented, as this CP introduces HH aggregated tariffs that will require new Measurement Classes in the BSC to facilitate aggregated data used for billing customers currently on PCs 1 to 8 based on whether they are CT metered or not. **New measurement classes are need for the efficient implementation of DCP 179, as this will allow differentiation between the customer types.**
- 7.25 DCP 179 will support P272 by removing the perceived discrepancy between HH and NHH tariffs, thus facilitating the move to HH settlement for PC 5 to 8 customers.
- 7.26 The Working Group notes that DCP 179 is also related to rejected BSC change [P280 'Introduction of new Measurement Classes'](#). This proposed change sought to introduce new Measurement Classes for Half Hourly-settled customers in the Domestic and SME markets, and to require that Distributors be provided with aggregated Half Hourly

**Comment [RT15]:** Ofgem action to feedback views on Measurement Class "H"

consumption data for Metering Systems registered to those new Measurement Classes.

This CP was rejected by Ofgem in November 2012, with Ofgem stating that:

*“The P280 proposal alone does not facilitate any change to the way sites will be settled and charged for UoS. A change to the UoS charging methodology is required in order for any benefits to be realised. Until we are able to make an assessment of the most appropriate UoS charging structure for sites with demand below 100kW that wish to be settled HH, we do not consider we can approve this modification. This is because it is not certain whether the P280 proposed change will be required if a different approach is taken in developing the UoS charging methodology. Approving the P280 proposal may therefore result in wasted costs to the industry.”*

- 7.27 Following the rejection of P280, P300 was raised with a similar intent. Ofgem rejected P280 because there was no charging methodology that it could be measured against. DCP 179 would bring in this methodology. The DCP 179 and P300 Working Groups have sought to work together to ensure that these two changes are developed with reference to each other.

#### **Line Loss Factor Classes for the New Tariffs**

**Comment [RT16]:** Move to issues section

- 7.28 All DNOs have confirmed that, should DCP 179 be implemented, they will use separate Line Loss Factor Classes (LLFCs) for the aggregated tariffs introduced by DCP 179.

#### **Customer Capacity Values**

**Comment [RT17]:** Move to issues section

- 7.29 The Working Group notes that, should DCP 179 be implemented, the current process for updating Suppliers on capacity changes may need to be reviewed as DCP 179 would increase the numbers. The DCP 179 Working Group acknowledges this is a potential issue and it has been raised within the DCMF MIG. The conclusion of the MIG was that this was an MRA issue and should be progressed via that route.

**Comment [RT18]:** Should more detail be added to this section? For example, what is the current process and why will numbers increase?

- 7.30 DNOs may not currently hold capacity values for all CT customers, however, under DCP 179 a value will be needed for these customers. The DNOs agreed to adopt a common approach in deriving the capacity values where one is not held. This approach is as follows:

- ...
- ...

**Comment [RT19]:** Approach to be determined. Action

**Cost Reflectivity of Tariffs**

- 7.31 The Working Group discussed the impact that DCP 179 will have on the cost reflectivity of tariffs and noted that ...

**Comment [RT20]:** The Working Group agreed that there will need to be text added into the Change Report that discusses the cost reflectivity of tariffs. In particular, one Working Group member raised concern that there may some reduction in cost reflectivity for PC 5-8 customers whose price will be derived from NHH PC 3 and 4.

Action

**Comment [RT21]:** Issue section

**Comment [RT22]:** Move to issued and put next to the existing generation section.

**New Heading – add table**

With regards to ENWL's consultation response stating for Schedule 16 Para 146 table: *"Please confirm whether or not the "LV Sub Generation NHH" will also be renamed to include Aggregated HH within the title. If so the change also needs to be reflected in the IDNO tariff tables. "*

The Working Group agreed to get the number of customers of this type, and explain within the CR that it was not significant enough to change.

**8 TRANSITIONAL INFORMATION**

- 8.1 As a transitional arrangement to assist during the implementation of DCP 179, the Working Group recommends that DNOs issue a list of MPANs with CT metering installed to all Suppliers.

- 8.2 The DCMF MIG has also discussed what capacity data could be provided to Suppliers to assist in the transition to the new tariffs. The MIG proposes that...

**Comment [RT23]:** To be discussed at July DCMF MIG.

**9 FACILITATING THE SMART PROGRAMME**

- 9.1 The Working Group notes that the UK is investing a significant amount of resources to bring about Smart Metering, and DCP 179 will enable Time of Use tariffs to be applied to these meters; this should be to the benefit of consumers.

**Comment [RT24]:** Move to background and mention again in benefits

**Comment [RT25]:** Pull out the NPV and Ofgem objectives of the Smart Metering programme for the CR. Action



## 10 BENEFITS OF DCP 179

10.1 The Working Group has identified the benefits of the proposed DCP 179 solution are as follows:

- The anomaly that exists between HH and NHH tariffs will be removed, thus reducing a barrier which is currently incentivising some customers not to Settle HH;
- The CP will ensure that HH and NHH tariffs are calculated on a consistent basis;
- There will be tariffs specifically to facilitate the introduction of smart meters. Introducing three rate tariffs will provide Suppliers with the opportunity to offer cost reflective time of day tariffs which would allow domestic customers to manage their energy bills by responding to cost signals. This is in line with Ofgem's stated policy that *"it is in consumers' interests to be settled against their half-hourly consumption data"*<sup>3</sup>;
- Suppliers will have a HH tariff available for all customers which will enable them to offer time of use tariffs and allow them to manage their energy bill;
- It will be a simplified tariff structure once all customers have migrated; and
- The CP will facilitate BSC modification P272 'Mandatory Half Hourly Settlement for Profile Classes 5-8'.

## 11 POTENTIAL ISSUES

11.1 The Working Group has also identified the following potential issues and areas that require further consideration:

- A number of anomalies have been identified in the CT data and Whole Current Data, thus the data provided as Attachment 9 needs further validation.
- There is a need to adopt default positions if the data proves to be incorrect. For example, if thousands of sites are found to have incorrect CT/Whole Current data it would not be possible to carry out site visits to determine the correct data.

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/ofgem-publications/87053/electricitysettlementlaunchstatement.pdf>

- The timing of P300 'Introduction of new Measurement Classes to support Half Hourly DCUSA Tariff Changes (DCP179)'. Currently, the final modification report is due to be issued to Ofgem in September 2014 with expected decision by end of October/ beginning November 2014. The notice period requested by participants is at least 12 months after decision, making implementation November 2015 at the earliest, however, as a mid-season change to Line Loss Factors would not be desirable the implementation may be April 2016. This timeline may be subject to change.
- It will only be possible for customers to be assigned to the new DCP 179 tariffs when P300 is implemented.

**Comment [RT26]:** To be addressed before change report is issued?

## 12 IMPACT OF DCP 179

12.1 The DCP 179 Working Group has carried out an impact assessment on the proposed solution. A revised CDCM model and spreadsheets showing the impact on tariffs, pence per unit and DNO revenue are provided as Attachment 10. It should be noted that there is no revenue impact on existing tariffs.

**Comment [RT27]:** One Working Group member raised concern that there may be some reduction in cost reflectivity for PC 5-8 customers whose price will be derived from NHH PC 3 and 4. However, this will be offset by the introduction of Time of Use tariff, but it is difficult to ascertain whether the overall effect is a reduction in cost reflectivity; however, in the longer term as all customers move to HH settlement there should be an overall gain in cost reflectivity.

**Action:** This needs to be explained in more detail within the CR

12.2 As customers migrate to the new tariffs it will have an impact on tariffs, as the model aims to ensure that the new HH tariffs and existing HH tariffs remain in line with each other. Consequently, as more customers move to the HH tariffs and the more accurate HH data is reflected in the assumptions the tariffs will change. The Working Group has undertaken a further impact analysis assuming 50% of the customers have migrated on to the HH tariffs to show the impact of this. The results of this can be seen in Attachment 12. Note, this is a hypothetical scenario and is for demonstration purposes only.

**Comment [RT28]:** Move the transitional information to the end of this section as "other issues associated with implementation".

12.3 A summary of this impact analysis is shown in the table below. This table summarises the percent change in the average p/kWh rate (which incorporates all tariff elements) across all tariffs and all DNOs. The average tariff impact is an increase of 0.6% with 95% of the changes between -1.4% and +3.2%. The data behind this analysis can be viewed in Attachment 12.

|         | % Change across all DNO tariffs |
|---------|---------------------------------|
| Maximum | 6.7%                            |

|                 |       |
|-----------------|-------|
| 95% Upper Limit | 3.2%  |
| Average         | 0.6%  |
| 95% Lower Limit | -1.4% |
| Minimum         | -4.9% |

### 13 PROPOSED LEGAL TEXT

**Comment [RT29]:** This section may need to be revised once the legal text has been finalised.

13.1 The draft legal text has been reviewed by the DCUSA Legal Advisor and is provided as Attachment 1.

13.2 During the development of the legal text by the Working Group an inconsistency was identified between the legal text and the current version of the CDCM model (v102). In the current DCUSA, paragraph 74 of Schedule 16 states that the standing charge factor for NHH settled users are 100 per cent for the network level at which the end user is supplied and zero for any further network level. The current version of the CDCM model has the standing charge factors for the HV non-domestic tariff at 100% at HV, 100% at EHV/HV and 20% at EHV.

13.3 The percentages in the CDCM model have been the same since it was introduced in April 2010. These percentages were agreed by the DNOs during the development of the CDCM and this model went out for industry consultation. Therefore it is the view of the Working Group that the legal text is incorrect and should be amended as part of this change. If it is felt that the standing charge factors need to be reviewed a separate Change Proposal could be brought forward. It should be noted that there will be no impact on customers of aligning the CDCM legal text to the CDCM model.

### 14 EVALUATION AGAINST THE DCUSA OBJECTIVES

14.1 The Working Group has assessed the CP against the DCUSA objectives and believes that the following DCUSA Objectives are better facilitated by DCP 179.

**Charging Objective Two** - that compliance by each DNO Party with the Charging Methodologies facilitates competition in the generation and supply of electricity and will not restrict, distort, or prevent competition in the transmission or distribution of

electricity or in participation in the operation of an Interconnector (as defined in the Distribution Licences)

- 14.2 The change proposal better meets Charging Objective Two by reducing the differential between the non-half hourly and half hourly tariffs and encouraging customers and suppliers to choose the appropriate settlement approach.

**Charging Objective Three** - that compliance by each DNO Party with the Charging Methodologies results in charges which, so far as is reasonably practicable after taking account of implementation costs, reflect the costs incurred, or reasonably expected to be incurred, by the DNO Party in its Distribution Business

- 14.3 The change proposal better meets Charging Objective Three by ensuring consistency of Use of System charges across non half hourly and half hourly tariffs and thereby enabling a transparent and predictable pricing structure.

**Charging Objective Four** - that, so far as is consistent with Clauses 3.2.1 to 3.2.3, the Charging Methodologies, so far as is reasonably practicable, properly take account of developments in each DNO Party's Distribution Business

- 14.4 The change proposal better meets Charging Objective Four by facilitating the industry requirement to remove the price barrier for customers to trade on a half hourly basis.

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

- 14.5 The change proposal better meets General Objective one by removing the differential between non-half hourly and half hourly tariffs and encouraging customers and suppliers to choose the appropriate settlement approach.

**General Objective Two** - The facilitation of effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity and (so far as is consistent therewith) the promotion of such competition in the sale, distribution and purchase of electricity

- 14.6 The change proposal better meets General Objective two by producing a more transparent pricing structure which enables more efficient and effective settlement.

**General Objective Three - The efficient discharge by the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of obligations imposed upon them in their Distribution Licences**

- 14.7 The change proposal better meets General Objective three by satisfying the licence obligation on DNOs to review the charging methodology and bring about changes to improve the methodology.

## 15 IMPACT ON GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

- 15.1 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 179 were implemented. The Working Group did not identify any material impact on greenhouse gas emissions from the implementation of this Change Proposal.

## 16 ENGAGEMENT WITH THE AUTHORITY

- 16.1 Ofgem has been fully engaged throughout the development of DCP 179 as a member of the Working Group.

## 17 IMPLEMENTATION

- 17.1 The proposed implementation date for DCP 179 is 1 April 2015, so that the CP is in place prior to P272 and P300.
- 17.2 It should be noted that the new tariffs introduced by DCP 179 cannot be used until P300 is implemented, and the decision on the implementation date for P272 needs to consider the potential impact on customers if the date is pre P300 in that some customers may have to move twice. This should be avoided where possible.
- 17.3 The Working Group has discussed the implementation date and notes that there were two options:
- Implement DCP 179 for 1 April 2015 so that the new tariffs are available before the new measurement classes; or
  - Align the implementation dates for DCP 179 and P300, i.e. April 2016
- 17.4 It is the view of the Working Group that implementing the CP for 1 April 2015 is the more logical option as it will provide the new tariffs in advance of the measurement classes

**Comment [RT30]:** During the review of the consultation responses, it was suggested that it may be sensible to delay submission of DCP 179 to Ofgem to align with the submission of P300. This will ensure that the progression made in P300 is fully accounted for within DCP 179.

It was observed that both P300 and DCP 179 will need to be submitted to Ofgem within the next couple of months, however, they do not need to have the same implementation date. The DCP 179 implementation date could be pushed back to permit it to be sent to Ofgem for decision at the same time as P300.

The Working Group will consider the implementation date further when the consultation for P300 has closed.

which will mean that the P300 Working Group is not restricted on when they implement the new measurement classes. It also allows P272 to be implemented in a timely manner.

## 18 PANEL RECOMMENDATION

18.1 The Panel approved this Change Report on **DATE**. The Panel considered that the Working Group had carried out the level of analysis required to enable Parties to understand the impact of the proposed amendment and to vote on DCP 179.

18.2 The timetable for the progression of the Change Proposals is set out below:

| Activity                              | Date         |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| Change Report approved by DCUSA Panel | tbc          |
| Change Report issued for voting       | tbc          |
| Voting closes                         | tbc          |
| Change Declaration                    | tbc          |
| Authority Decision                    | tbc          |
| DCP 179 Implemented                   | 1 April 2015 |

## 19 NEXT STEPS

19.1 Parties are invited to consider the proposed amendment (Attachment 1) and submit their votes using the Voting form (Attachment 2) to [dcusa@electralink.co.uk](mailto:dcusa@electralink.co.uk) by **DATE**

19.2 If you have any questions about this paper or the DCUSA Change Process please contact the DCUSA by email to [dcusa@electralink.co.uk](mailto:dcusa@electralink.co.uk) or telephone 020 7432 2842.

## ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1– DCP 179 Legal Text
- Attachment 2– Voting Form
- Attachment 3 - DCP 179 CP Form
- Attachment 4 – DCP 179 Consultation and Collated Responses
- Attachment 5 – DCP 103 Consultation Document and Collated Responses
- Attachment 6 – DCP 160 CP Form
- Attachment 7 – DCP 165 CP Form
- Attachment 8 – DCP 179 Specification document

- Attachment 9 – Number of Whole Current and CT Customers
- Attachment 10 – Impact analysis of migrating customers from LV medium non-domestic tariff to LV non-domestic, not-CT tariff
- Attachment 11- DCP 179 updated CDCM Model, description of model changes and impact assessment data
- Attachment 12 - 50% scenario impact analysis