

## DCUSA DCP 407 Declaration

Voting end date: 12pm, 21 November 2022

DCP 407	WEIGHTED VOTING				
	DNO	IDNO	SUPPLIER	CVA REGISTRANT	GAS SUPPLIER
DCP 407 CHANGE SOLUTION 1	Accept	Reject	No votes received	n/a	n/a
DCP 407 CHANGE SOLUTION 2	Reject	Reject	No votes received	n/a	n/a
IMPLEMENTATION DATE	Accept	Accept	No votes received	n/a	n/a
RECOMMENDATION	<p><b>DCP 407 Solution 1 – Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>Part 1 Matter:</b> Authority Decision Required</p> <p><b>DCP 407 Solution 1 – Reject</b></p> <p>1.1 In accordance with Clause 13.5, for Parties to have been deemed to recommend to the Authority that the change solution be Accepted there needs to be a majority of Party Categories whose votes to accept, when summed together, equate to more than 50% of the total votes of Parties or Groups within in each category.</p> <p>1.2 In the case where only two Party Categories vote on a Change Proposal, and one Category votes to accept and the other votes to reject, there can be no such majority and therefore, in accordance with Clause 13.5, the Parties have been deemed to recommend to the Authority that the change solution be Rejected.</p> <p><b>DCP 407 Solution 2 – Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>Part 1 Matter:</b> Authority Decision Required</p>				

**Change Solution – Reject**

- 1.3 In accordance with Clause 13.5, for Parties to have been deemed to recommend to the Authority that the change solution be Accepted there needs to be a majority of Party Categories whose votes to accept, when summed together, equate to more than 50% of the total votes of Parties or Groups within in each category.
- 1.4 In the case where only two Party Categories vote on a Change Proposal, and one Category votes to accept and the other votes to reject, there can be no such majority and therefore, in accordance with Clause 13.5, the Parties have been deemed to recommend to the Authority that the change solution be Rejected.

**Implementation**

**DCP 407 Implementation Date – Accept**

- 1.5 For the majority of the Party Categories that were eligible to vote, the sum of the Weighted Votes of the Groups in each Party Category which voted to accept the proposal was more than 50% and in accordance with Clause 13.5, the Parties have been deemed to recommend to the Authority that the Implementation Date be Accepted.

**Notes**

- 1.6 It should be noted that most DNO Parties were in favour of DCP 407 Solution 1. Of the fourteen (14) DNO Parties that voted twelve (12) were in favour of Solution 1 and two were in favour of DCP 407 Solution 2. Of the two IDNO Parties that voted one was in favour of DCP 407 Solution 2 and one was in favour of Solution 1.
- 1.7 Therefore, taking the above into consideration, across all two Party categories that voted, Solution 1 was the most favourable solution 81%.
- 1.8 It should be noted that no Party voted to reject both solutions.

**PART ONE / PART TWO**

**Part One – Authority Determination Required**

PARTY	DCP 407 SOLUTION 1 (A / R)	DCP 407 SOLUTION 2 (A / R)	DCP 407 IMPLEMENTATION DATE (A / R)	WHICH DCUSA OBJECTIVE(S) IS BETTER FACILITATED?	COMMENTS
Eastern Power Networks	Accept	Reject	Accept	<p><b>DCUSA Charging Objective 1</b></p> <p>The proposal promotes a process that will assist DNOs' compliance with standard licence condition 19.</p> <p>This is aligned to the Ofgem Direction that is in the interest of all stakeholders.</p> <p><b>DCUSA Charging Objective 2</b></p> <p>The implementation of a more structured and consistent approach such as the Speculative Scoring Methodology better supports this objective by reducing the risk of any unintended distortion of the treatment of customers speculative connection applications between DNOs and between different geographical areas within a DNO.</p> <p><b>DCUSA Charging Objective 3</b></p> <p>DCUSA charging objective 3 will also be better served by these proposals as a result of the charges levied to customers more accurately reflecting the chargeable costs incurred, or reasonably expected to be incurred, by the DNO Party in its Distribution Business.</p>	<p>We endorse the proposed changes set out in this proposal and urge Ofgem to approve them at the earliest opportunity. This will enable us to modify our systems, revise processes and train staff in sufficient time to ensure a smooth and efficient implementation of the proposals in readiness for the proposed implementation date.</p>
London Power Networks	Accept	Reject	Accept		
South Eastern Power Networks	Accept	Reject	Accept		
Electricity North West Ltd	Accept	Reject	Accept	Objective 1 of the DCUSA Charging Objectives will be better facilitated as this change is complying with an Ofgem direction.	None
National Grid Electricity Distribution (East Midlands) plc	Accept	Reject	Accept	<p>We believe this change better facilitates charging objective 1 from the below. This will allow for a different charging arrangement for speculative and non-speculative connections</p>	<p>None provided.</p>
National Grid Electricity Distribution	Accept	Reject	Accept		

(West Midlands) plc					
National Grid Electricity Distribution (South Wales) plc	Accept	Reject	Accept		
National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) plc	Accept	Reject	Accept		
SP Distribution plc	Accept	Reject	Accept	We agree that the change proposal better facilitates Charging Objective 1 for the reason given in the change report.	None provided
SP Manweb plc	Accept	Reject	Accept		
Southern Electric Power Distribution plc	Rejected	Accept	Accept	Charging objective 1 is better facilitated by the change proposal as we fulfil the requirements as set out in the objective	We think that option 1 in the change proposal is more cumbersome than option 2 as by requesting a commitment to future DUOS based on the final capacity of the phased capacity is superfluous as any charges for network use will be levied upon said connection of capacity. Therefore, this commitment may put off potential customer from applying unless they have a clear business strategy that looks significantly into the future. Given the current political and global environment this may or may not be achievable
Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc	Rejected	Accept	Accept		
Northern Powergrid (Northeast) plc	Accept	Reject	Accept	We agree with the Working Group that DCUSA Charging Objective 1 is better facilitated, and for the reasons set out in the Change Report.	None provided
Northern Powergrid (Yorkshire) plc	Accept	Reject	Accept		

IDNO PARTIES					
Independent Power Networks Ltd & The Electricity Network Company	Reject	Accept	Accept	That the DNO's will comply with the charging methodologies and the obligations under the Act	We have voted for solution 2 because Solution 1 does not allow for mixed use sites to score non-speculative points under criterion 3. They cannot meet the definition of a final demand site within the main body of DCUSA and are, therefore, not able to be defined as a phased capacity site. Under solution 2, these customers can provide a load profile for their development and so can score non-speculative points.
ESP Electricity	Accept	Reject	Accept	We believe Objective 1. is better facilitated by this change.	None provided

**SUPPLIER PARTIES**

No votes received

**CVA REGISTRANT PARTIES**

Not Eligible

**GAS SUPPLIER PARTIES**

Not Eligible