DCUSA CHANGE DECLARATION

DCP 162 and DCP 162A -Non-Secure Connections in the Common Connections Charging Methodology

VOTING END DATE: 08 September 2014

DCP 162	WEIGHTED VOTING				
	DNO	**IDNO**	**SUPPLIER**	**DISTRIBUTED GENERATOR**	**GAS SUPPLIER**
CHANGE SOLUTION	Accept	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
RECOMMENDATION	**Change Solution – ACCEPT** In respect of each Party Category that was eligible to vote, the sum of the Weighted Votes of the Groups in that Party Category which voted to accept the change solution was more than 50% in all Categories.				
PART ONE	**Part One** – Authority Determination Required				

DCP 162A	WEIGHTED VOTING				
	DNO	**IDNO**	**SUPPLIER**	**DISTRIBUTED GENERATOR**	**GAS SUPPLIER**
CHANGE SOLUTION	Reject	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
RECOMMENDATION	**Change Solution – REJECT.** In respect of each Party Category that was eligible to vote, the sum of the Weighted Votes of the Groups in that Party Category which voted to accept the change solution was less than 50% in all Categories.				
PART ONE	**Part One** – Authority Determination Required				

DCP 162 and DCP 162A	WEIGHTED VOTING				
	DNO	**IDNO**	**SUPPLIER**	**DISTRIBUTED GENERATOR**	**GAS SUPPLIER**
IMPLEMENTATION DATE	Accept	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
RECOMMENDATION	**Implementation Date – ACCEPT** In respect of each Party Category that was eligible to vote, the sum of the Weighted Votes of the Groups in that Party Category which voted to accept the implementation date was more than 50% in all Categories.				
PART ONE	**Part One** – Authority Determination Required				

PARTY	DCP 162 SOLUTION	DCP 162A ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION	DCP 162 and DCP 162A IMPLEMENTATION DATE[1]	WHICH DCUSA OBJECTIVE(S) IS BETTER FACILITATED?	COMMENTS
DNO PARTIES					
Electricity North West Ltd	Reject	Accept	Accept	Charging Objectives 1 & 2 as ensures a consistent treatment across DNOs for non secure capacity and adds clarity and transparency for customers.	We are supportive of the principle of specifying the number of feeders taken into account in determining the New Network Capacity. We found it difficult to assess the two options of 3 or 4 circuits being used between the two change proposals. Whilst 3 circuits aligns with our current approach in terms of the number of switching operations we could not clearly differential why this better facilitated the objectives. On that basis we have supported 162A on a very marginal basis as it reduces the charge to the customer.
Northern Powergrid - Northern Electric Distribution Ltd **Northern Powergrid** - Yorkshire Electricity Distribution plc	Accept	Reject	Accept	DCUSA Charging Objective 1 through enabling the consistent application by DNOs of connection charges where a 'non-secure' connection is provided and where distribution network reinforcement is required. The current methodology has no specific pricing principles for such cases and it is therefore possible that varying approaches may be applied. DCUSA Charging Objective 4 as it would enable DNOs to apply the charging principles set out by Ofgem in Determination RBA/TR/A/DET/160 (dated 7 July 2011) in relation to reinforcement costs associated with the provision of a 'non-	None

[1] The implementation date for both DCP 162 and DCP 162A is the next DCUSA release following Authority consent.

				secure' connection. The Change Proposal would facilitate implementation by all DNOs of these charging principles by mandating them within the Connection Charging Methodology.	
Scottish Power - Manweb	Accept	Reject	Accept	This CP better facilitates DCUSA Charging Objectives 1 and 2.	n/a
Scottish Power - Distribution					
SSE - Scottish Hydro-Electric Power Distribution plc	Accept	Reject	Accept	We agree with the statement in the Change Report that DCUSA Charging Objective 4 is better facilitated as the CP would allow network operators to implement the principles established by Ofgem determination DET160.	We believe that it is very important to place a reasonable limit on the number of feeders taken into account in the CAF calculation, where multiple feeders apply, to ensure that use of system customers do not bear an unreasonable and disproportionate burden of reinforcement costs in such situations. In our view, a reasonable limit is a maximum of three feeders as proposed by DCP162.
SSE - Southern Electric Power Distribution plc	Accept	Reject	Accept		
UKPN - Eastern Power Networks	Accept	Reject	Accept	DCUSA Charging Objectives 1 and 2 are better facilitated by this change, by better explaining the methodology and enhancing consistency.	n/a
UKPN - London Power Networks					
UKPN - South Eastern Power Networks					
Western Power Distribution - East Midlands	Accept	Reject	Accept	We believe DCUSA Charging Objective 1 is better facilitated by the change. The expansion of the definitions and the provision of the examples	None.

plc **Western Power Distribution** - South Wales plc **Western Power Distribution** - South West plc **Western Power Distribution** - West Midlands plc				showing the charging arrangements for non-secure connections will bring clarity to an area of the methodology that was not previously explicitly covered and therefore remained open to interpretation.	
IDNO PARTIES					
N/A					
SUPPLIER PARTIES					
N/A					
DISTRIBUTED GENERATOR PARTIES					
N/A					
GAS SUPPLIER PARTIES					
N/A					