DCP 248 CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM

To: Lauren Nicholls

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

Response Deadline: 4 December 2015

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: | Click here to enter text. |
| Organisation: | Click here to enter text. |
| Role: | Choose an item. |
| Email address: | Click here to enter text. |
| Phone number: | Click here to enter text. |
| Response[[1]](#footnote-1): | Choose an item. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Do you understand the intent of the DCP 248? |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Are you supportive of the principles of DCP 248? |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What is your preferred option (please provide your rationale):   • Option 1 - A 12 month grace period to allow retrospective reductions to MIC  • Option 2 – A 12 month grace period. Setting the MIC to zero for the first month, after which the first month’s maximum demand data could be used  • Option 3 – A 12 month grace period. Setting MIC to zero for the duration of the grace period.  • Option 4 – A 12 month grace period setting the MIC using any Maximum Demand data already available or estimated where no Maximum Demand data is available. |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Which option do you consider provides the most/least level of protection against inappropriate capacity charges for customers affected by P272? |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Do you have any comments on the proposed legal text for each of the options? |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Do you consider that each of the four proposals better facilitates the DCUSA Objectives? Please give supporting reasons. |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. It is noted that P272 deadline has been extended which gives more time to liaise with customers to agree a MIC but the task is still a significant one. In light of the delay in P272, do you that agree that the protection of DCP 248 is still required? |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Do you think that the current protection offered by the UOS charging statements with regards to incorrect charges offers the level of protection sought by this Change Proposal? |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Are you supportive of the proposed implementation date - as soon as possible following Authority consent which may require an extra-ordinary release? |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. In the DCP 248 legal text the protection offered by all of the options is limited to 12 months of a change in Measurement Class. Do you agree with this timescale? If not, please provide your rationale. |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Do you believe that there should be an end date within the DCP 248 legal text and, if yes, what date should it be? |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. With regards to Option 1, do you agree with the Working Group’s view that customers that were not occupying the property at the time of the P272 migration are not entitled to back dating of their MIC? |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. With regards to Option 1, if a P272 impacted customer requests a change in MIC shortly before moving out of a property, how best do you see managing this process once the customer has left the property? And how significant an issue do you believe this is? |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. With regards to each option, are there any technical or resource constraints that need to be taken into consideration (and is there an associated cost)? |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. With regards to each option, are there any other constraints, for instance the need for DNOs to potentially agree connection agreements with a large proportion of the customers affected by P272 that you are concerned about? |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. With regards to each option, do you consider there to be a concern in relation to a customer being able to identify the need to amend their maximum import capacity with DNOs? Please provide supporting reasons. |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. With regards to Option 1, do you believe that there should be a materiality threshold such that there will not be a credit rebill if it is less than a certain value? |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. With regards to Option 1, if there were to be a materiality threshold, what do you believe it should be set at? |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Are there any alternative solutions or matters that should be considered by the Working Group? |
| Click here to enter text. |

1. All responses will be treated as non-confidential unless indicated otherwise.

   Anonymous responses will omit the detail of the submitting party but the content of the response will be provided to the Working Group and published on the DCUSA website.

   Confidential responses will not be published on the DCUSA website but submitted solely to the Working Group for the analysis of the CP. For all other confidentiality requirements please contact the secretariat at DCUSA @electralink.co.uk or 0207 7432 3017 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)