

| <b>DCUSA CHANGE REPORT</b>               |   |
|--|---|
| <b>CHANGE PROPOSAL</b>                   | DCP 008 - Provision of Urgent Metering Services                                     |
| <b>DATE OF ISSUE</b>                     | 28 May 2008   |
| <b>ISSUED TO</b>                         | DCUSA Contract Managers<br>Ofgem (For Information)                                  |
| <b>PARTIES ENTITLED TO VOTE</b>          | All Supplier, DNO and IDNO Parties  |
| <b>RETURN DEADLINE (Voting End Date)</b> | 18 June 2008 – <a href="mailto:DCUSA@electralink.co.uk">DCUSA@electralink.co.uk</a> |

## 1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 This document is issued in accordance with Clause 11.20 of the DCUSA. The Change Report details DCP 008 – Provision of Urgent Metering Services (UMETS). 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 Section 9 of this Change Report sets out a summary of the three variations on which Parties are invited to vote: DCP 008A, DCP 008B and DCP 008D (attached in full as Appendices A, B and C). Parties are invited to vote to accept one variation and reject the other two, or to reject all three variations.
- 1.3 Parties are invited to consider the proposed amendment attached and submit votes using the form attached as Appendix H to [dcusa@electralink.co.uk](mailto:dcusa@electralink.co.uk) by 18 June 2008.

## 2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 DCP 008 was raised by Electricity North West Limited (formerly United Utilities Electricity Limited) on 04 September 2007. The CP was considered by the DCUSA Panel at its meeting on 19 September 2007. The Panel determined that the CP was a non-urgent change that should be progressed through the Definition Procedure. The Panel agreed that the CP should be progressed as a Part One matter as it is likely to have significant impact on the interests of electricity consumers and it is directly related to the safety and security of the Distribution Network.
- 2.2 The DCUSA Panel established a Working Group DCP 008 to consider the Change Proposal. The Working Group held 8 meetings to consider DCP 008 and evaluate it against the applicable DCUSA Objectives.<sup>1</sup>
- 2.3 The content of this Change Report was approved by the Panel on 21 May 2008.

## 3 SUMMARY OF DCP 008 - PROVISION OF URGENT METERING SERVICES

- 3.1 The issue of UMETs arises when a Distributor receives a call from a customer which it believes is related to a supply fault but subsequently discovers, either when on site with a customer or during the telephone call from the customer, that there is a metering fault. DCP 008 seeks to prescribe what activity the Distributor should take in such circumstances.
- 3.2 The need for UMETs was extensively discussed as part of the REMA Project in 2002/3 but no mandatory obligations were placed on any parties at that time. The drafting of the original DCP 008 was based on the principles

---

<sup>1</sup> The papers and minutes of all Working group meetings are available on the DCUSA Website – [www.dcusa.co.uk](http://www.dcusa.co.uk)

documented in the REMA Emergency Services Expert Group paper issued by Ofgem on 6 December 2002.

#### **4 DCP 008 WORKING GROUP**

4.1 The DCP 008 Working Group comprised the following members:

- Francesca Dixon (Independent Power Networks)
- Gill Burrage (SSE Distribution)
- Glenn Sheern (E.ON UK)
- Jen Daines/Bill Gunshon (RWE Npower)
- John Dallimore/Billy Horne (ScottishPower Energy Retail)
- John Lawton (Electricity North West)
- Julie L'abraham/Nicki Johnson/John Hill (Central Networks)
- Kevin Woollard (British Gas)
- Lynne Hargrave/Chris Allanson (CE Electric UK)
- Mike Harding (The Electricity Network Company)
- Mike Smith (Western Power Distribution)
- Nigel Menzies (EDF Energy Customers)
- Peter Waymont (EDF Energy Networks)

4.2 The Working Group was chaired by Nigel Menzies. In view of the wider implications of UMETS and its potential impact on external parties including Customers and Meter Operators, the Working Group invited representatives of Ofgem, energywatch and the Association of Meter Operators to participate as Observers at its meetings. The Working Group met 9 times from October 2007 – May 2008 to consider DCP 008, evaluate it against the applicable DCUSA Objectives, refine the drafting and develop Alternative Proposals. The minutes of the Working Group Meetings are attached as Appendix F.

#### **5 WORKING GROUP CONSIDERATIONS**

5.1 The Working Group considered DCP 008 against the DCUSA objectives and also considered the relevance of including UMETS as a new obligation in the DCUSA. The Working Group concluded by majority that DCUSA could reasonably be considered the appropriate place to set any UMETS obligations and this did not conflict with any Licence Conditions, a view which was shared by Ofgem. However, the Working Group was unable to conclude that the Change Proposal better facilitated achievement of the relevant objectives although it did conclude that it did not hinder them.

- 5.2 The Working Group also considered the equivalent "Post Emergency Metering Services" or "PEMS" arrangements in the gas industry and noted recent open letters from Ofgem which referred to PEMS and UMETS. The different structure of the gas and electricity industries meant that only the broad principle of PEMS was applicable i.e. the distributor restoring supply at the first visit by replacing a faulty meter.
- 5.3 The Working Group identified that since the work of the REMA Emergency Services Expert Group there have been significant changes in the electricity industry which potentially affect the delivery of UMETS. These changes include:
- The introduction of full competition in metering services. Some Suppliers have chosen to remain on the "JPW" contracts; others have taken a commercial decision to use alternative metering service providers;
  - The Distribution Licence obligation on Distributors to offer metering services has ended, other than "Legacy" meter asset provision by DNOs;
  - DNOs have separated their metering businesses, in some cases into separate companies or as part of an affiliated supply business;
  - Some DNOs no longer have any metering business within their company group; consequently the expertise to work on meters and arrangements to manage stocks of meters may not exist or are reducing;
  - There has never been a licence obligation on IDNOs to offer metering services and generally they have not done so. Each IDNO has established (or can establish) networks on a GB wide footprint.
- 5.4 The Working Group considered a number of scenarios, depending on:
- Whether the customer contacted the Distributor about a loss of supply during normal working hours or outside normal working hours;
  - Whether a meter fault was identified at the time of the customer's telephone call or during a site visit resulting from the call; and
  - Whether the customer was vulnerable.
- 5.5 The Working Group agreed from the start that all half-hourly meters and all current transformer operated meters would be excluded from UMETS. Remotely read and all other "Smart" whole current non half-hourly meters would be included but Distributors would not be expected to replace these with similar full functionality.
- 5.6 The Working Group agreed that the UMETS service would be limited to replacing a faulty meter and/or tails between the cut-out and meter. In particular it excludes adding credit to or re-programming pre-payment meters.

5.7 The Working Group considered how charges for UMETS would be applied. It was recognised that costs on Distributors fell into two areas:

- Charges which were largely independent of volume of UMETS services, including the cost of setting up the service provision including training;
- Transactional costs for the additional time spent on site replacing a meter and the cost of the meter and/or meter tails.

5.8 It was noted that these costs may be considered to fall outside the scope of Distribution Price Controls. It was also noted that Suppliers are obliged to pay for any UMETS services provided without having any control on when they are incurred.

5.9 The Working Group considered each of the possible scenarios and the majority view was that the Distributor should either refer the problem to the appropriate Supplier (or their Meter Operator) or carry out UMETS work as follows:

|   |                |                   |
|---|----------------|-------------------|
| Telephone Call – Metering Fault identified – Not Vulnerable | 1 In hours     | Refer to Supplier |
|   | 2 Out of hours | Refer to Supplier |
| Telephone Call – Metering Fault identified – Vulnerable     | 3 In hours     | Refer to Supplier |
|   | 4 Out of hours | UMETS applies     |
| Site Visit – Metering Fault identified – Not Vulnerable     | 5 In hours     | Refer to Supplier |
|   | 6 Out of hours | UMETS applies     |
| Site Visit – Metering Fault identified – Vulnerable         | 7 In hours     | UMETS applies     |
|   | 8 Out of hours | UMETS applies     |

5.10 The Working Group considered a number of possible definitions for “Vulnerable Customers”, including links to the Priority Service Registers held separately by Suppliers and Distributors, categories defined in the D0225 Dataflow and definitions used elsewhere in the industry. It was agreed that none of these was appropriate for UMETS. The result was the following agreed new definition:

*Vulnerable Customer: means a Customer who, for reasons of age, health or disability, is likely to be vulnerable in the event of a Supply Failure (and a person shall be considered to be “vulnerable” if he or she is unable to safeguard their own welfare, or that of dependant members of their household).*

5.11 Having considered the practical and cost impact of Distributors providing an UMETS service, the Working Group concluded that DCUSA should only oblige the Distributor to provide the minimum basic service of restoring the Customer’s supply by replacing a faulty meter in the agreed scenarios with a single rate credit meter.

5.12 The Working Group concluded that it was not appropriate for DCUSA to specify the manner by which Distributors should meet the UMETS obligations. It also noted that there should be nothing to prevent parties

entering into bilateral agreements outside of DCUSA for the provision of any enhanced or additional services.

## 6 DCP 008 CONSULTATION

- 6.1 The Working Group reviewed the drafting attached to the original proposal, resulting in the attached refined version DCP 008A (Appendix A) which reflects the agreed position of the majority of the Working Group. Three Alternative versions were proposed by individual members of the Working Group. The Working Group agreed to issue all four variations to Parties as part of the DCP 008 Consultation. The DCP 008 Consultation was issued to Parties on 31 March 2008 for a period of 15 Working Days. The Working Group met on 25 April 2008 to consider the 15 responses received.
- 6.2 The significant majority of respondents indicated that none of the variations better facilitated, or were detrimental to, the DCUSA Objectives. The majority of respondents considered either that the Objectives were not applicable or that the impact on the DCUSA Objectives was neutral. However representations made by some Parties from all categories via the consultation responses (attached as Appendix G) indicated that these parties did not consider the DCUSA the appropriate governance mechanism for UMETS and that the introduction of an obligation to provide such services would be detrimental to the DCUSA Objectives overall.
- 6.3 The Electricity Networks Company (ENC) put forward a fifth variation which suggested that Parties could develop a process to legally 'by-pass' the meter and restore supply without the fitting of metering. Under the proposal an obligation would be placed on Suppliers to ensure that the site is revisited within a prescribed timescale following restoration of supply to fit an appropriate meter. ENC argued that this approach:
- Provided a mechanism to distributors for restoring supply to Vulnerable Customers without having to engage in metering activities
  - Has the same consequence as that in respect of CT metered customers when a CT meter or a CT fails but the customer's installation is not de-energised;
  - Was something that parties probably already did on occasion;
  - In respect of the very small number of Vulnerable Customers impacted, did not materially impact on settlement and that any unrecorded consumption could be estimated.
- 6.4 The Working Group noted the proposal but agreed that formalising a process of by-passing a meter to get customers back on a supply was not an acceptable solution to put forward as a recommendation from the Working Group.
- 6.5 The majority of respondents indicated that they were unable to provide any cost analysis on the proposed variations until the final solution was known. However a number of Distributors indicated that they would incur 'significant' costs if they were required to establish a metering service for UMETS and that there would be a fixed cost to all Suppliers using the services to cover the cost of the recruiting and training staff and overheads associated with running such a business regardless of the number of jobs

carried out. Responses indicated that for DNOs with existing metering businesses costs would be dependent on the level and complexity of the service provided by the DNO.

- 6.6 Respondent views on whether the proposed implementation date of November 2008 was appropriate were divided. This was primarily because Distributors that do not provide metering services currently considered that it would take longer than 6 months to recruit and train the necessary staff to provide a UMETS service.
- 6.7 Consultation comments indicated that almost all respondents agreed that the CP had been correctly classified as a Part One matter in accordance with Clause 9.4 of the DCUSA because of the potential impact on customers and competition in the market. Parties also agreed that the proposed designation of the clauses was appropriate.
- 6.8 Consultation responses indicated that Parties considered that vulnerable customers do require a higher level of service in UMETS cases, although some believed the same level of service should be applied to all customers if the Distributor was capable of doing so. It was recognised that any solution must allow the Distributor operatives to use their discretion when dealing with customers on the phone and on site and that although vulnerable customers do require an enhanced service Distributors should retain the right to determine whether customers were vulnerable 'in the Company's reasonable opinion'.
- 6.9 There was very little consensus amongst Parties as to which scenarios should result in UMETS services and responses were linked to the preferred variation of the respondent, their ability to provide a service, existing contractual arrangements and their view on the appropriate level of service required by each customer time in each scenario.
- 6.10 Responses indicated that DCP 008B was supported by at least one Party from each category, and that DCP 008C was favoured by some Suppliers and energywatch. DCP 008A was typically ranked as the second preferred option. No small Suppliers participated in the Working Group or Consultation but the Working Group recognised that it was unlikely that such companies would have contracts in place with MOPs for the provision of a UMETS service. When ranked in order, DCP 008B was the most preferred option, followed by A, D and C.

## **7 WORKING GROUP CONCLUSIONS**

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

- 7.1 The Working Group considered that in accordance with its Terms of Reference (Appendix E) its primary task had been to evaluate the proposal against the DCUSA Objectives. In doing so, the Working Group developed an alternative variation which the majority of members consider best meets the industry requirements and 3 further variations were put forward by Working Group members.

7.2 The Working Group was also required by its Terms of Reference to:

- Consider the relevance / suitability of procedure documents being developed for the Post Emergency Metering Services (PEMS) process in the Gas industry for the Electricity model;
- Provide an indication of the volumes of UMETS issues; and
- Consider the impact of the development of SMART Metering on UMETS

7.3 The Working Group concluded that the different structure of the gas and electricity industries meant that only the broad principle of PEMS (the provision of the service) was applicable. Members considered that in the gas market all Transporters have an obligation to provide metering services which fundamentally differs to the electricity model. Members noted that there are differences between the gas and electricity market which mean that the requirement for all DNOs to provide a one stop service and for Suppliers to accept that service documented in PEMS would be harder to achieve. Members agreed that competition in metering and the fact that not all DNOs provide metering services would mean that the service could only be provided at a basic level and that the PEMS guidelines could not be considered suitable for UMETS.

7.4 The Working Group sought feedback from Distributor Parties regarding the numbers of UMETS jobs dealt with by each company. The figures received were extremely varied as each company recorded its data differently and no Party specifically records UMETS incidents as a distinct category of jobs. Information from one DNO indicated that the number of UMETS jobs dealt with was at worst 500 incidents a month where a metering fault was discovered on site but the figures provided did not include split of in and out of hours and vulnerable customers. The Working Group generally considered that whilst the incidence of UMETS was relatively small the risk associated with UMETS scenarios, in particular for vulnerable customers, was high.

7.5 The Working Group also considered the potential impact of Smart Metering. Members noted that although the introduction of Smart meters may reduce the number of calls received by DNOs it is likely to add complexity to the types of meters available and meter exchanges causing increased problems for DNOs in UMETS cases. Members agreed to base its variation on the current position and known technology as the full Smart metering solution has not yet been determined and the use of the technology will not be widespread in the immediate future. The Working Group agreed that to define basic principles of a minimum UMETS standard accepting that the DCUSA may need to make subsequent changes when Smart Metering is introduced.

## **SCOPE**

7.6 The Working Group considered the fact that some group members and some respondents to the consultation had questioned whether it was appropriate to consider Urgent Metering under the DCUSA given that Distributors no longer have an obligation to provide Metering Services. The Working Group considered a letter issued by Ofgem to energywatch on 30 January 2008 which stated that "we consider that the scope of the DCUSA (as set out in SLC 9B(5) of the Distribution Licence) is broad and does not preclude the raising of this modification... we are comfortable with the



modification process for DCP 008 carrying on" and concluded, by majority decision, that as Ofgem had advised that it was appropriate for the CP to be considered within the scope of the Agreement it should be progressed by the group.

## **OBJECTIVES**

- 7.7 The Working Group concluded that the original Proposal as developed by the Group and the Alternatives do not materially improve the achievement of the DCUSA Objectives, but they do not hinder them. The Working Group concluded that the Proposal and Alternative Proposals would have a positive impact on Customers by restoring supply in many cases at the first visit. The Working Group noted that Ofgem had indicated that it would take into account its wider obligations to Customers when considering the Proposal when it is referred to it for determination.

## **COMPETITION**

- 7.8 The Working Group noted that some Parties had questioned whether there were any competition issues associated with the potential implementation of each of the DCP 008 variations and whether the requirement would discriminate against Distributors without Metering Businesses. The Working Group noted the feedback provided by Ofgem which stated its initial view that Competition Law would probably not apply in this case. Members noted that Ofgem would fully assess the impact on competition in line with its principal objective "to protect the interests of consumers...wherever appropriate by promoting effective competition between persons engaged in, or in commercial activities connected with, the generation, transmission, distribution or supply of electricity" as part of its determination process.

## **COSTS**

- 7.9 The Working Group concluded that it was not for DCUSA to describe how charges should be calculated or where they should be published. However the Working group considered that it was likely that UMETS charges would either be covered under the Miscellaneous Charging Statement as defined in the DCUSA if the service falls within DCUSA, or if the arrangements are managed on a purely commercial basis outside DCUSA then the charges would be catered for in that contractual arrangement.

## **IMPLEMENTATION DATE**

- 7.10 The group considered that in order to allow a minimum of a six month implementation following Authority determination it would be appropriate to set an implementation date of June 2009. The Working Group agreed that it would not build any transition period into the DCUSA and that any Party which was not compliant at that the time of implementation would be required to apply to the Panel for a derogation. The Working Group agreed that this implementation date would be applied to all variations.

## **DCP 008 VARIATIONS**

- 7.11 The Working Group noted that in accordance with Clause 11 of the DCUSA it could put forward its preferred variation to the DCUSA but that the Panel

could also add up to two further variations to be issued to the Parties for voting.

- 7.12 The Working Group considered that when ranked in order, DCP 008B was the most preferred option and agreed that DCP 008B should also be recommended to the Panel as it scored most highly in the consultation responses. The Working Group concluded that DCP 008D would have to be put forward under the DCUSA rules as the originator's (modified) proposal. The Working Group was divided as to whether DCP 008A or DCP 008C should be recommended to the Panel. A vote was taken amongst the Working Group members to resolve this issue and by a majority variation DCP 008A was favoured.
- 7.13 The Working Group recommended to the Panel that DCP 008A, DCP 008B and DCP 008D be issued to the Parties for a 15 Working Day voting period. The Working Group agreed that all categories of Parties should be entitled to vote on the CPs and that if accepted the implementation date for any of the variations should be June 2009.

## **8 PANEL DECISION**

- 8.1 The DCUSA Panel considered the DCP 008 Working Group's recommendations at its meeting on 21 May 2008. The Panel noted that the Distribution Licence does not restrict the addition of new areas to the DCUSA and considered that the Agreement provides a suitable framework for UMETS governance. The Panel noted that although Parties generally consider DCP 008 to have a neutral impact on the DCUSA Objectives, guidance from Ofgem has indicated that such changes to the DCUSA are valid for consideration. The Panel noted that Ofgem will consider the wider impact on its statutory duties and the impact on Consumers as part of the determination process.
- 8.2 The Panel noted that in accordance with Clause 11 of the DCUSA the Working Group had put forward its preferred variation to the DCUSA and had further recommended that DCP 008D be taken forward as the originators modified proposal and that DCP 008B be taken forward as the most favoured response to the consultation. The Panel noted that it had not received any valid reason to justify overturning the Working Group's recommendation and approved the recommendation. In accordance with Clause 11.24 the Panel directed that Parties may vote to accept one proposal and reject the other two, or to reject all three proposals.

- 8.3 The Panel requested that in order to assist Ofgem in its determination Parties should provide as much supporting information and substantive commentary as possible with their votes.
- 8.4 The Panel approved the recommendations put forward by the Working Group and agreed:
- To include DCP 008A, DCP 008B and DCP00D in the Change Report
  - To issue the Change Report to DNO, IDNO and Supplier Parties for a voting period of 15 Working Days
  - To direct Parties to vote to accept one proposal and reject the other two, or to reject all three proposals.

## **9 SUMMARY OF DCP 008A, DCP 008B AND DCP 008D**

- 9.1 The high level principle of all the variations seeks to introduce a new Clause to the DCUSA together with associated definitions and consequential changes to other Clauses. Depending on the chosen solution, Distributors will be required to carry out certain emergency work on meters in order to restore the supply of electricity in response to certain no-supply calls from Customers where the loss of supply was found to be due to a faulty meter rather than a fault on the Distribution System.
- 9.2 The key features of the Group's refined proposal and the Alternatives are as follows:
- 9.3 DCP 008A – refined draft developed by the Working Group
- UMETS applies when a meter fault is identified for a vulnerable customer either during an out of hours telephone call to a Distributor or during a site visit, in or out of hours.
  - UMETS only applies for a non-vulnerable customer when a meter fault is identified during an out of hours site visit.
  - In all other circumstances the Distributor would refer the meter fault to the Supplier or their MOP, either direct or by requesting the Customer to call them using contact details provided by the Supplier.
  - Under this proposal, all Distributors would be required to provide the same basic service, and all Suppliers to accept the service and resulting charges.
- 9.4 DCP 008B proposed by CE Electric UK
- This Alternative differs significantly from the Working Group proposal (DCP 008A) across all 8 scenarios.
  - This Alternative supports the competitive market in metering services championed by Ofgem and set out in the Distribution Licence. It

recognises that not all Distributors run metering businesses and that the provision of UMETS by these Distributors may be more costly than other alternatives such as the provision by meter operators and commercial service providers. It also supports Suppliers who wish to source these services via other commercial service providers.

- There are no obligations within the Distribution Licence for Distributors to provide metering services and this Alternative reflects this licence position by giving all Distributors the choice whether to offer UMETS.
- In line with competition in the provision of metering services, this Alternative also offers Suppliers the choice of accepting the services offered by Distributors or opting out and purchasing alternative services from a preferred service provider.
- Opt in and opt out of the service for both Suppliers and Distributors is by six-month written notice. To ensure the correct position at go-live the lead period prior to go-live will be used by Distributors to specify the service they intend to offer and the associated prices, and by Suppliers to indicate to Distributors whether they will accept these services. This process will take place outside the DCUSA prior to go-live to ensure a successful start-up.
- Distributors choosing to offer UMETS will publish details of the service and associated charges in the Relevant Charging Statement.
- Any Supplier who opts to accept the service offered by the Distributor will be obliged to pay for all services provided.
- No price controls are required as charges will be set within a competitive market and driven by market forces.
- Any Supplier requiring a higher level of service than that offered by the Distributor will be able to make commercial arrangements with alternative service providers for either the full service or the additional services they require.

#### 9.5 DCP 008D proposed by Electricity North West Limited

- The ENW alternate proposal differs in three ways to that of the Working Group proposal (DCP008A) - Scenario 4, Scenario 5 and the UMETS service that should be provided.
- The Working Group proposal mandates that Distributors should visit metering faults if the call is received out of hours for vulnerable customers (Scenario 4). Such a responsibility should be with the Supplier to decide what service he wishes his Meter Operator Agent to undertake rather than request a Distributor to do so. Therefore if the Distributor identifies, at the time of the call from a Customer, that it is a meter fault, the Distributor should pass all such calls to the Supplier or their appointed Meter Operator Agent (Scenario 1-4 – Pass to Supplier).

- If the Distributor is on site and identifies a meter fault, then the Distributor should undertake UMETS. This applies at any time of day and there should be no discrimination between Customer Class (Scenarios 5-8). This is consistent with the principle of getting the Customer back on supply rather than the Working Group proposal of walking away for non vulnerable Customers during normal working hours (Scenario 5).
- As provided within the Working Group proposal, the UMETS service should be a mandated basic level of service, this being a single rate credit meter. However, the Distributor should be given flexibility for what meter functionality it installs i.e. if the Distributor can install a 'like for like' meter he should be allowed to do so rather than be drawn into separate bi-lateral agreements.

9.6 The following features are common to all proposals:

- Ownership of any replacement meters installed as part of UMETS will pass to the Supplier at the point at which the meter is re-energised. Suppliers will be responsible for passing this to their MAP or MOP as appropriate.
- If the replacement meter does not have the same functionality as the removed faulty meter, a subsequent visit by the Supplier's MOP may be required. Any consequential contractual, billing and settlement issues are the responsibility of the Supplier.

9.7 Appendix D provides a summary sheet showing the attributes of each CP against the UMETS scenarios table in Section 5.9 and the services offered under each variation.

## 10 VOTING PROCESS

10.1 DCP 008 was raised as a Part One matter and was assessed as such by the DCUSA Panel. This view also was supported by Working Group members and Parties via the consultation response. In accordance with the Change Control process set out in the DCUSA, Parties are invited to vote on the variations put forward in this report. The Panel has directed that Parties may vote to accept one variation and reject the other two, or to reject all three variations. The voting form is attached as Appendix H.

10.2 As a Part One matter a variation will be deemed to be 'recommended to be accepted' by Parties if it achieves greater than 50% of the weighted votes cast by voting Parties in each category of Parties entitled to vote. The Parties' recommendation for each variation will be issued to the Authority for determination.

## 11 TIMETABLE

11.1 In accordance with Clause 12.4 of the DCUSA the Panel has determined a 15 Working Day voting period.

11.2 The timetable for the progression of the Change Proposal is set out below:

| <b>Date</b>  | <b>Activity</b>         | <b>Purpose</b>  | <b>Responsibility</b> |
|--------------|-------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| 28 May 2008  | Change Report Issued    | Change Report issued to all Parties for 15 WD                         | Secretariat           |
| 18 June 2008 | Voting End Date         | Last date for submission of votes                                     | Parties               |
| 19 June 2008 | Change Declaration      | Outcome of voting published to Parties and Authority                  | Secretariat           |
| 24 July 2008 | Authority Determination | Authority to accept / reject CP following recommendation from Parties | Ofgem                 |
| June 2009    | DCUSA Release           | DCUSA updated to reflect CP drafting (if approved by Authority)       | Secretariat           |

**Appendices:**

- A. DCP 008 – Variation A
- B. DCP 008 – Variation B
- C. DCP 008 – Variation D
- D. DCP 008 Variations Summary Sheet
- E. DCP 008 Working Group Terms of Reference
- F. DCP 008 Working Group Meeting Minutes
- G. DCP 008 Consultation Responses
- H. DCP 008 - Voting Form
- I. Original CP forms – For Information