

**DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP
COMMENTS**

| Company | Confidential/ Anonymous | Q1: Do you understand the intent of DCP 345? | Working Group Comments |
|--|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| British Gas | Non-confidential | Yes, we understand the intent of DCP 345 as it is noted that the current DCUSA derogation process is not flexible enough to cater for sandbox applications that are received via OFGEM to trial innovations in a live environment without having to comply with all industry obligations. | Noted |
| Electricity North West | Non-confidential | We do understand the intent of this change proposal. | Noted |
| ESP Electricity Ltd | Non-confidential | Yes. | Noted |
| Npower | Non-confidential | Yes | Noted |
| Northern Powergrid | Non-confidential | Yes. | Noted |
| Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc and Southern Electric Power | Non-confidential | Yes | Noted |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

| | | | |
|--|------------------|-----|-------|
| Distribution plc | | | |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | Yes | Noted |
| Western Power Distribution | Non-confidential | Yes | Noted |
| Working Group Conclusions: The Working Group concluded that all respondents to the consultation understood the intent of DCP 345. | | | |

| Company | Confidential/ Anonymous | Q2: Are you supportive of the principles of DCP 345? | Working Group Comments |
|------------------------|-------------------------|--|------------------------|
| British Gas | Non-confidential | Centrica are supportive of the principles of DCP 345 and welcome the activities to progress a sandbox process across each of the applicable codes. | Noted |
| Electricity North West | Non-confidential | We are supportive of the principles of this change proposal. | Noted |
| ESP Electricity Ltd | Non-confidential | Yes, introducing a regulatory framework to support innovation in the energy markets will have a positive impact and enable consumer and wider system benefits. | Noted |
| Npower | Non-confidential | Yes | Noted |

**DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP
COMMENTS**

| | | | |
|--|------------------|------|-------|
| Northern Powergrid | Non-confidential | Yes. | Noted |
| Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc and Southern Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | Yes | Noted |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | Yes | Noted |
| Western Power Distribution | Non-confidential | Yes | Noted |
| Working Group Conclusions: The Working Group concluded that all respondents to the consultation were supportive of the principles of DCP 345. | | | |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP

COMMENTS

| Company | Confidential/ Anonymous | Q3: Do Parties believe that there should be a pre-Panel consultation period whereby Parties will be able to provide comments or feedback to the DCUSA Panel on each Sandbox Application? Please provide your rationale. | Working Group Comments |
|------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| British Gas | Non-confidential | We support the view that a short pre-Panel consultation period is implemented for parties to provide views to aid Panel's determination. This would allow industry parties to provide an opportunity to share expertise and identify potential solutions to the application that may not be included in the initial submission. | Noted Supportive of pre-Panel consultation period. |
| Electricity North West | Non-confidential | As long as Parties are provided with the opportunity to review and provide comments either pre-Panel or post Panel meetings should be acceptable. However, it may be useful to have the Panel's view prior to any consultation, so potentially post Panel may be more appropriate. | Noted Supportive of post-Panel review, this aligns with the current drafting of the legal text |
| ESP Electricity Ltd | Non-confidential | <p>Yes, DCUSA Parties should be given the opportunity to review and provide comment on sandbox applications. Those Parties may have sight of activity underway under other industry codes, new technologies, commercially led investigations and research. It would be prudent to ascertain any 'lessons learn' from similar or complementary trials elsewhere in the market that could assist an applicant who is unaware of the work.</p> <p>Though strictly not part of the consultation, we would like the code to acknowledge the potential sensitivities that may arise related to the protection of intellectual property rights (IPR) during the pre-consultation period for the applicants.</p> | Noted IPR needs to be considered when reviewing the access to information, e.g. on the website. |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP

COMMENTS

| | | | |
|---|------------------|---|---|
| Npower | Non-confidential | N/A | N/A |
| Northern Powergrid | Non-confidential | Yes, in principle, although if the applicant is proposing a significant innovation and wishes that the initial assessments are done confidentially, we would have no objection to that. | Noted The detail of the derogation will be consulted on, not the details of the innovation idea (if there are commercially sensitive aspects to it). |
| Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc and Southern Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | Yes, this would seem reasonable, as Parties will have an opportunity to assess their preparedness for any impacts of the derogation/Sandbox. | Noted Supportive of pre-Panel consultation. |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | Yes, this approach would allow the panel to consider the views of other DCUSA parties when considering the application, prior to making their decision on the sandbox application. | Noted Supportive of pre-Panel consultation. |
| Western Power Distribution | Non-confidential | Yes, because the applicant may be new to or unfamiliar with the industry and this would allow a wider audience to provide any comments or feedback on the application before it is considered by the panel. | Noted Supportive of pre-Panel consultation. |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP

COMMENTS

Working Group Conclusions: The Working Group concluded that they are supportive of a pre-Panel communication process and agreed that there should be a standard consultation document seeking Party views which would aid the Applicant and the production of the Sandbox Report for discussion at the DCUSA Panel.

| Company | Confidential/ Anonymous | Q4: Should the detail of all Sandbox Applications be accessible to all industry Parties, DCUSA Parties only or the DCUSA Panel only? If you have a preference, please provide your rationale. If you believe there is an alternative, please provide details. | Working Group Comments |
|------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| British Gas | Non-confidential | Centrica's current view is that it is reasonable that the detail of all sandbox applications should be accessible to all DCUSA parties as it is they that could be directly impacted by the proposed derogation(s). | Noted Supportive of all DCUSA Parties having access to the detail of the Sandbox Applications. |
| Electricity North West | Non-confidential | <p>This being specifically for the DCUSA, it would seem reasonable for DCUSA Parties to be able to have access to all Sandbox Applications, early sight of applications for Parties could potentially be beneficial and demonstrates the transparency of the process.</p> <p>However, with these applications containing new ideas/innovations some protection should be afforded, so it will be more appropriate for all Sandbox Application to only be accessible to the DCUSA Panel.</p> | Noted Supportive of all DCUSA Parties having access to the detail of the Sandbox Applications depending on the detail of the innovation idea. |
| ESP Electricity Ltd | Non-confidential | With regards to our response to Q3 (including reference to IPR) and the fact that we believe that DCUSA Parties should be given an opportunity to comment on sandbox applications pre-Panel determination, we would support maintaining a register of | Noted Supportive of all DCUSA Parties having access to the information. |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP

COMMENTS

| | | | |
|---|------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>sandbox applications on the DCUSA website accessible by all DCUSA Parties.</p> <p>For the register to be accessible to <u>all</u> industry parties, including those not signed up to DCUSA, it may be more suitable to hold the register on the Authority's website with links to the sandbox trials on relevant code administrator's websites.</p> | |
| Npower | Non-confidential | N/A | N/A |
| Northern Powergrid | Non-confidential | For the reason stated in our response to question 3 we would be happy for accessibility to be limited to the DCUSA panel initially prior to ultimately sharing with DCUSA Parties. | Noted Supportive of the DCUSA Panel having access to the information before sharing with DCUSA Parties. |
| Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc and Southern Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | DCUSA Panel only – this seems to maintain equivalence with the BSC requirements for the Transmission Sandbox process. | Noted Support for the information to be accessible by the DCUSA Panel only. |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | We believe that such information should be accessible to all, unless there is a clear confidentiality consideration which would need to be clearly stated in the initial application. | Noted Support for the information should be accessible to all industry |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP

COMMENTS

| | | | |
|--|------------------|---|---|
| | | | parties unless the information is commercially sensitive. |
| Western Power Distribution | Non-confidential | Generally, yes, but not in all cases. There may be scenarios where the details of a Sandbox Application could be commercially sensitive, and the applicant should have the option that the details only be seen by the panel. | Noted Support for the information being accessible to all industry parties unless the information is commercially sensitive. |
| <p>Working Group Conclusions: The Working Group concluded that application forms should only be accessible by the DCUSA Panel if the innovator highlights that there is commercially sensitive information included. If there is not, then the application form will be accessible to all industry parties. The consultation to DCUSA Parties will only contain information regarding the rationale as to why a derogation to the legal text is being requested and not how the innovation will be delivered. Any information received back from the DCUSA Panel and the Authority will equally be available to all industry parties via the DCUSA website.</p> | | | |

| Company | Confidential/ Anonymous | Q5: Do you agree with the proposed solution for this CP? Please provide your rationale. | Working Group Comments |
|------------------------|-------------------------|--|------------------------|
| British Gas | Non-confidential | Yes, the proposed solution is aligned to other code changes to support a sandbox application and therefore provides a consistent framework to progress | Noted |
| Electricity North West | Non-confidential | It is important to enable innovators to have the opportunity to at least put forward ideas that can be tested within a controlled environment to enhance the way in which industry processes under the DCUSA work, so we agree with the proposed solution. | Noted |
| ESP Electricity Ltd | Non-confidential | ESPE supports the proposed solution. It introduces a concise regulatory process for the progression of sandbox applications and delivers a clear guidance document. | Noted |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP

COMMENTS

| | | | |
|---|------------------|--|---|
| Npower | Non-confidential | Yes, however there should be principles which prevent other industry parties being exposed to undue costs or other form of risk as part of this modification | Noted The applicant will be responsible for any administration costs. There may well be costs incurred that the Applicant is not aware of and the Panel will consider such before a recommendation on a derogation is sent to the Authority. |
| Northern Powergrid | Non-confidential | Yes. | Noted |
| Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc and Southern Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | Yes | Noted |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | Yes, we are comfortable with the approach suggested, this also closely aligns to the arrangements under the BSC. | Noted |
| Western Power Distribution | Non-confidential | Yes, because it meets the Ofgem requirements | Noted |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP

COMMENTS

Working Group Conclusions: The Working Group concluded that all respondents to the consultation agreed with the proposed solution for DCP 345. The Applicant will be responsible for any administration costs and parties will have an opportunity in the consultation to provide the Panel with any costs they believe they may incur.

| Company | Confidential/ Anonymous | Q6: Do you believe the Working Group should consider a different solution? If so, please provide your rationale. | Working Group Comments |
|------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| British Gas | Non-confidential | We believe that the solution is appropriate and are in broad agreement with the solution proposed. | Noted |
| Electricity North West | Non-confidential | We believe the working group should continue to progress the current solution. | Noted |
| ESP Electricity Ltd | Non-confidential | ESPE supports the proposed solution but would like the working group to consider how sandbox applications could be efficiently managed where they affect more than one code e.g. DCUSA and BSC. There may be instances where the change could be progressed quickly under the DCUSA but introduce complexities to the BSC that halts the progression. It may be outside the scope of this DCUSA change however. | Noted Principle 14 of the Code Administrators Code of Practice states that "Collaborate with other code administrators (as per Principle 13) to identify issues that overlap with multiple codes, for the purposes of enabling innovative trials" therefore, cross-code impacts are already catered for. |
| Npower | Non-confidential | N/A | N/A |
| Northern Powergrid | Non-confidential | No. | Noted |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP

COMMENTS

| | | | |
|--|------------------|--|-------|
| Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc and Southern Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | No – the Sandbox process has been approved for Transmission networks and has entered CUSC. It seems logical to have the same/similar process in DCUSA to the same end. | Noted |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | No. | Noted |
| Western Power Distribution | Non-confidential | No, as we agree that the proposed solution is suitable. | Noted |
| <p>Working Group Conclusions: The Working Group agree that the respondents to the consultation did not believe that the Working Group should consider an alternative solution than the one being proposed for DCP 345. Working Group members also clarified that CACoP Principle 14 caters for cross-code impacts for Applications.</p> | | | |

| Company | Confidential/ Anonymous | Q7: Do you agree with the inclusion of an Administrator fee to process the Sandbox Applications? Please provide your rationale. | Working Group Comments |
|-------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| British Gas | Non-confidential | Centrica agrees that there should be the option of an administration fee to process any sandbox applications received. | Noted Supportive of an administration fee so long as they are cost |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP

COMMENTS

| | | | |
|------------------------|------------------|--|---|
| | | We would suggest that a methodology common to the BSC standards is considered. Most notably, that the fee should be cost reflective rather than an arbitrary barrier to entry. | reflective. Current drafting of the legal text provides detail of "reasonable costs" that will be agreed by the Panel from time-to-time. |
| Electricity North West | Non-confidential | As this is in essence not business as usual but value adding a fee does seem reasonable, but there isn't an indication of what the fee might be in the consultation documents and that needs to be balanced against the intent of the change. We wouldn't want to put applications off by having a prohibitive Administrator fee, consequently any fee would need to be cost reflective. | Noted Supportive of an administration fee so long as they are cost reflective. |
| ESP Electricity Ltd | Non-confidential | Yes, processing sandbox applications will require additional work by the Secretariat and reasonable administrations costs should be recoverable. | Noted Supportive of administration fee. |
| Npower | Non-confidential | As it will be set at zero initially, I'm not sure we can provide detailed comment on this at present. If it is determined that the fee is to increase from zero, detail about how long it would take to increase the cost and how this applies to retrospective requests may need to be addressed | Noted Costs will be addressed as a bilateral arrangement between the DCUSA Administration and the Applicant and the DCUSA Panel will establish whether the work required will go above and beyond what is already covered in the Code Administrators contract. |
| Northern Powergrid | Non-confidential | Yes, but only if the potential costs are shown to be considerable. | Noted |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP

COMMENTS

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------|---|--|
| <p>Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc and Southern Electric Power Distribution plc</p> | <p>Non-confidential</p> | <p>Yes – the level of the fee will have to be assessed, in order that it's fair and prevents speculative requests. It should be clear that the Sandbox is not a means of avoiding DCUSA requirements and rules.</p> | <p>Noted Supportive of an administration cost.</p> |
| <p>UK Power Networks</p> | <p>Non-confidential</p> | <p>We do, as should there be a cost it is only correct that this should be paid by the requesting party and not shared amongst all DCUSA signatories.</p> | <p>Noted Supportive of an administration fee. Clarification made to state that the Applicant will be responsible for paying the fee.</p> |
| <p>Western Power Distribution</p> | <p>Non-confidential</p> | <p>Yes, because if this were free of charges there may be a tendency for a lot of speculative applications potentially wasting the time of the Panel and secretariat.</p> | <p>Noted</p> |
| <p>Working Group Conclusions: The Working Group concluded that that all respondents who provided a preference to this question agreed that an administrator fee would be supported so long as any fees are cost reflective. The Working Group also noted that the drafting of the legal text in this area has only been slightly amended (parties involved in the process) from that which has already been approved by the Authority as part of the BSC Innovation Sandbox Modification.</p> | | | |

**DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP
COMMENTS**

| Company | Confidential/ Anonymous | Q8: Do Parties have any suggested amendments on the DCUSA Sandbox Application Guidance Document? | Working Group Comments |
|---|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| British Gas | Non-confidential | We have reviewed and feel the Guidance Document meets the initial requirements. | Noted |
| Electricity North West | Non-confidential | The guidance document seems concise and informative and it is useful being split into the different sections. | Noted |
| ESP Electricity Ltd | Non-confidential | No | Noted |
| Npower | Non-confidential | N/A | N/A |
| Northern Powergrid | Non-confidential | No. | Noted |
| Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc and Southern Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | No | Noted |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP

COMMENTS

| | | | |
|---|------------------|--|-------|
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | No, we believe that this guidance document is a useful document and will greatly assist parties in further understanding the arrangements. | Noted |
| Western Power Distribution | Non-confidential | No | Noted |
| Working Group Conclusions: The Working Group concluded that all respondents to the consultation were happy with the DCUSA Sandbox Application Guidance Document and they did not have any further amendments or comments on the content. | | | |

| Company | Confidential/Anonymous | Q9: Do you have any comments on the proposed legal text for DCP 345? Please provide your rationale. | Working Group Comments |
|------------------------|------------------------|---|------------------------|
| British Gas | Non-confidential | No comments on the legal text have been identified. | Noted |
| Electricity North West | Non-confidential | We believe the legal text will deliver the intent of this change proposal. | Noted |
| ESP Electricity Ltd | Non-confidential | No | Noted |
| Npower | Non-confidential | N/A | N/A |
| Northern Powergrid | Non-confidential | No. | Noted |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP

COMMENTS

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------|---|---|
| <p>Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc and Southern Electric Power Distribution plc</p> | <p>Non-confidential</p> | <p>Cl 56.17.1 [In making a determination under Clause 56.16, the Authority:] "May follow such procedure as it considers appropriate". Should this not be pre-defined, so that the Applicant knows the criterion being applied. It would not be particularly helpful for the Applicant and Authority to go through an iterative process whilst the Authority arrives at its determination.</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>No different to the send back clause already included in clause 13.10 of DCUSA. The Authority will already have the criteria for the Applicants regarding their decision process. The Applicant will also need to go through the Authority in the initial stages of their Application so the Authority procedures should be accessible at that stage.</p> |
| <p>UK Power Networks</p> | <p>Non-confidential</p> | <p>No, we are comfortable with the proposed changes.</p> | <p>Noted</p> |
| <p>Western Power Distribution</p> | <p>Non-confidential</p> | <p>Yes, Paragraph 56.12.7 is unclear.</p> <p>We would suggest the following amendment:</p> <p>56.12.7 State the length of time the derogation is required, the end of which should be no greater than two years from the Authority approval;</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>The Working Group did not have a preference as to whether to include this suggestion or not. The Working Group have agreed to leave the legal text as currently drafted but include a comment when they send the document to Gowlings to ask their advice.</p> |
| <p>Working Group Conclusions: The Working Group concluded that the majority of the respondents did not provide any comments or amendments to the drafted legal text. One respondent suggested that the Authority procedures should be pre-defined in the legal text, however, the Working Group agreed that the text was no different to the send back clause that is already included in clause 13.10 of DCUSA. It was also suggested that a minor amendment be made to state that</p> | | | |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP

COMMENTS

the length of the derogation should be no longer than two years when it is completed. The Working Group did not have a preference whether to include this and so have left a comment within their legal text drafting to request advice from the DCUSA Legal Advisors as part of their review.

| Company | Confidential/ Anonymous | Q10: Which of the DCUSA General Objectives does this CP better facilitate? Please provide supporting comments. | Working Group Comments |
|------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| British Gas | Non-confidential | <p>Centrica supports the workgroup observations that this CP better facilitates DCUSA General Objective 4:</p> <p>The promotion and efficiency in the implementation and administration of the DCUSA.</p> <p>The rationale is that it mitigates the identified risks in the current process outlined in the Why Change text, contained in Section 3 of the change proposal.</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>Support for DCUSA General Objective 4</p> |
| Electricity North West | Non-confidential | <p>This change will better facilitate General Objective 4 enabling new and innovative ideas/solutions to be put forward resulting in 'The promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the DCUSA'</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>Support for DCUSA General Objective 4.</p> |
| ESP Electricity Ltd | Non-confidential | <p>ESPE agrees with the proposer in that Objective 4 will be better facilitated.</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>Support for DCUSA General Objective 4.</p> |
| Npower | Non-confidential | <p>Agree that it supports the promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the DCUSA</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>Support for DCUSA General Objective 4.</p> |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP

COMMENTS

| | | | |
|---|------------------|---|---|
| Northern Powergrid | Non-confidential | No comment. | Noted |
| Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc and Southern Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | We agree with the Working Group/Proposer – DCUSA General Objective 4 | Noted Support for DCUSA General Objective 4. |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | We believe that DCUSA General Objective four will be better facilitated by the implementation of this change as it will provide a more robust and transparent process for handling sandbox applications received from innovators. | Noted Support for DCUSA General Objective 4. |
| Western Power Distribution | Non-confidential | We agree that DCUSA General Objective four will be better facilitated for the same reasons set out in the consultation document. | Noted Support for DCUSA General Objective 4. |
| <p>Working Group Conclusions: The Working Group concluded that all of the respondents that commented to this question of the consultation agreed with the Proposer of DCP 345 that DCUSA General Objective 4 would be better facilitated by the implementation of this Change Proposal. One respondent did not provide a comment. Further Working Group conclusions can be found in the DCP 345 Change Report.</p> | | | |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP

COMMENTS

| Company | Confidential/ Anonymous | Q11: Are you aware of any wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP? | Working Group Comments |
|---|----------------------------|--|------------------------|
| British Gas | Non-confidential | No impacts have been identified. | Noted |
| Electricity North West | Non-confidential | We are not aware of any wider industry developments impacting this proposed change. | Noted |
| ESP Electricity Ltd | Non-confidential | ESPE is not aware of other industry developments over and above those obligations under CACoP. ESPE are aware of the current application under discussion with the DCUSA Panel and also a sandbox application progressing under the BSC. | Noted |
| Npower | Non-confidential | N/A | N/A |
| Northern Powergrid | Non-confidential | No. | Noted |
| Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc and Southern Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | It's unclear how widely used the Sandbox will be during the current industry reviews (Access SCR, TCR etc), but we'd think it likely. | Noted |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP

COMMENTS

| | | | |
|--|------------------|----|-------|
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | No | Noted |
| Western Power Distribution | Non-confidential | No | Noted |
| Working Group Conclusions: The Working Group concluded that all respondents who provided comments on this question did not believe that there were any wider industry developments that the Working Group needed to consider. | | | |

| Company | Confidential/Anonymous | Q12: The proposed implementation data for DCP 345 is the first DCUSA Release following Authority approval. Do you agree with the proposed implementation date? Please provide your rationale. | Working Group Comments |
|------------------------|------------------------|--|------------------------|
| British Gas | Non-confidential | Yes, we agree with the proposed implementation date. | Noted |
| Electricity North West | Non-confidential | Yes, this seems a reasonable approach to take for implementation. | Noted |
| ESP Electricity Ltd | Non-confidential | Yes, we agree with the proposed implementation date. We do not foresee the need to implement system changes to facilitate this change, so a lead time is not necessary. Given the potential benefits that could be realised for consumers and industry, we support implementation of this change as the next release following Authority Approval. | Noted |
| Npower | Non-confidential | Yes | Noted |

DCP 345 'SANDBOX APPLICATION' COLLATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP

COMMENTS

| | | | |
|---|------------------|---|-------|
| Northern Powergrid | Non-confidential | Yes, we see no reason for delay. | Noted |
| Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc and Southern Electric Power Distribution plc | Non-confidential | Yes – this sits separately from normal tariff setting activities and that timetable, so early implementation should not prove disruptive. | Noted |
| UK Power Networks | Non-confidential | Yes, there is no reason to not progress with this change ASAP once it has been approved. | Noted |
| Western Power Distribution | Non-confidential | Yes, there are no other dependents and so no reason to delay when agreed. | Noted |
| <p>Working Group Conclusions: The Working Group concluded that all respondents to the consultation agree that the implementation date for DCP 345 should be the first DCUSA Release following Authority approval. As the timetable for the CP may miss the 07 November DCUSA Release, the Working Group agreed that the implementation date should be changed to 5WD following Authority approval to avoid any unnecessary delay. However, if the Authority decision is received in time for the November DCUSA Release then the changes will be implemented then.</p> | | | |