# **ATTACHMENT A- RESPONSE FORM**

To: Rosalind Timperley

Email: [DCUSA@electralink.co.uk](mailto:dcusa@electralink.co.uk)

**Name:**

**Organisation:**

**Role:** Please Specify: Supplier/DNO/IDNO/DG/OTSO/Generator/Customer/Other

**Email Address:**

**Phone Number:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Do you understand the intent of the CP?** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Are you supportive of the principles of the CP?** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Do you consider that the proposal better facilitates the DCUSA Objectives? Please provide supporting information.** CDCM Objectives:   1. That compliance by each DNO Party with the Charging Methodologies facilitates the discharge by the DNO Party of the obligations imposed on it under the Act and by its Distribution Licence 2. 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) 3. 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 4. That, so far as is consistent with paragraphs 13A.6A to 13A.9, the CDCM, so far as is reasonably practicable, properly take account of developments in each DNO Party’s Distribution Business 5. That compliance by each DNO Party with the Charging Methodologies facilitates 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.   General Objectives:   1. The development, maintenance and operation by the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of efficient, co-ordinated, and economical Distribution Networks 2. 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 3. The efficient discharge by the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of obligations imposed upon them in their Distribution Licences 4. The promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of this Agreement 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. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Where there is a Change of Measurement Class (CoMC) currently the proposal is for DCUSA to state that the Supplier should provide the DNO with notification of the proposed tariff associated with the Change of Measurement Class within 5 working days of the CoMC. Do you agree with the proposer that tariff information should be provided within 5 working days?** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Should a process be defined in DCUSA for the provision of notification of the proposed tariff associated with a Change of Measurement Class to DNOs? For instance, via spreadsheet?** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Suppliers: The Working Group would like to gain an understanding of the volumes of notifications expected. Do you foresee making notifications on a daily basis (high volume), weekly basis (medium volume) or an as and when basis (low volume)?** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **The draft legal text proposes to remove the CDCM model number from the DCUSA and state that the latest version of the model should be used. Do you agree with this proposal? If not, should the existing wording be retained and the model number incremented each time there is a model change or do you have an alternative method for maintaining the version number?** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Should ‘HH site specific’ and ‘HH aggregated’ be defined within DCUSA or is this covered off within the BSC by the definition for each Measurement Class?** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **DCP 151 is an interim solution that will allow for the new Measurement Classes introduced by P280 to be used. Would you prefer to wait for the conclusions of the MIG NHH/HH (MIG 22) subgroup before establishing an enduring solution or proceed with implementing DCP 151? Please provide your rationale.** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **In addition to the work of the MIG NHH/HH subgroup, are you aware of any other wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP? If so, please give details, and comment on whether the benefit of the change may outweigh the potential impact and whether the duration of the change is likely to be limited.** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Assuming that P280 is accepted and implemented, the options are:**  **The use of the DCP 151 solution****Not using the new Measurement Classes introduced by P280 as there would be no tariffs associated with them****An alternative option (please define how this alternative would work)** **To support the working group in performing a cost benefit analysis, can you please list the pros and cons that you believe are associated with the above options.** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Do you have any comments on the proposed legal text?** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Are there any alternative solutions or matters that should be considered by the Working Group?** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Are you supportive of the proposed implementation date of 1 October 2013?** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Do you have any further comments?** |
|  |

**This form should be submitted to** [**DCUSA@electralink.co.uk**](mailto:DCUSA@electralink.co.ukl) **no later than Friday 21 September 2012.**