

DCUSA DCP 406 Declaration

Voting end date: 11 January 2023

DCP 406	WEIGHTED VOTING				
	DNO	IDNO	SUPPLIER	CVA REGISTRANT	GAS SUPPLIER
DCP 406 ORIGINAL PROPOSAL	Reject	Reject	Reject	No votes received	n/a
DCP 406 ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL	Accept	Accept	Accept	No votes received	n/a
IMPLEMENTATION DATE	Accept	Accept	Accept	No votes received	n/a
RECOMMENDATION	<p>DCP 406 Original Proposal</p> <p>Part 1 Matter: Authority Decision Required</p> <p>DCP 406 Original Proposal – Reject</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 accordance with Clause 13.5, the Parties have been deemed to recommend to the Authority that the change solution be Rejected.</p> <p>DCP 406 Alternative Proposal</p> <p>Part 1 Matter: Authority Decision Required</p> <p>DCP 406 Alternative Proposal – Accept</p>				

	<p>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.</p> <p>1.4 In accordance with Clause 13.5, the Parties have been deemed to recommend to the Authority that the change solution be Accepted.</p> <p>Implementation</p> <p>DCP 406 Implementation Date – Accept</p> <p>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.</p>
PART ONE / PART TWO	Part One – Authority Determination Required

PARTY	DCP 406 ORIGINAL PROPOSAL (A / R)	DCP 406 ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL (A / R)	DCP 406 IMPLEMENTATION DATE (A / R)	WHICH DCUSA OBJECTIVE(S) IS BETTER FACILITATED?	COMMENTS
Eastern Power Networks	Reject	Accept	Accept	Charging Objective 1	We urge the Authority to make a decision on this Change Report and notify us of the outcome at the earliest opportunity.
London Power Networks	Reject	Accept	Accept	Whilst implementing the proposals outlined within this Change Report will enable each DNO party to be able to comply with the Charging Methodologies and discharge the obligations imposed on it under the Act and by its Distribution Licence, we have rejected the proposal as we consider it to be less effective at facilitating this objective than DCP 406A which we consider will better assist DNOs' compliance with standard licence condition 19.	
South Eastern Power Networks	Reject	Accept	Accept		
Electricity North West Ltd	Reject	Accept	Accept	Charging Objective 1 is better facilitated as this change puts in place the requirements of Ofgem's Direction in relation to Access SCR. Charging Objective 2 is neutral but avoids a negative impact that would be introduced if the Original Proposal was adopted as it gives the potential for some generators to avoid the locational signal through reinforcement charges by including some Final Demand and therefore has the potential to cause a distortion	
National Grid Electricity Distribution (East Midlands) plc	Reject	Accept	Accept	National Grid Electricity Distribution believe this CP better facilitates objective 1 below. This CP will allow us to implement the changes required to adhere to Ofgem's Access SCR which enables all parties to run an efficient and economical distribution system.	None.
National Grid Electricity Distribution (West Midlands) plc	Reject	Accept	Accept		

National Grid Electricity Distribution (South Wales) plc	Reject	Accept	Accept		
National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) plc	Reject	Accept	Accept		
SP Distribution plc	Reject	Accept	Accept	We agree that the Alternative Proposal better facilitates the DCUSA Objectives for the reasons given in the Change Report.	We have concerns with the definition of Generation Connection, as defined in the Original Proposal (hence our preference is the Alternative Proposal). We believe that the Original Proposal may have a significant impact on customer behaviour (predominantly by larger, generation customers to avoid contributing to reinforcement costs), which is likely to result in a substantial increase in reinforcement costs borne by the wider DUoS customer base. We believe that in the current economic climate, this solution may have a significantly detrimental impact on customer relations – particularly with small customers – and not just for DNOs but for the industry as a whole.
SP Manweb plc	Reject	Accept	Accept		
Southern Electric Power Distribution plc	Reject	Accept	Accept	Objective 1 – Working group has undertaken task to meet objective as given by Ofgem in the SCR decision and direction.	Due to the delay in decision of the change report and rework required as per OFGEM's request the Implementation date for access SCR is at risk from being implemented effectively.
Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc	Reject	Accept	Accept		
Northern Powergrid (Northeast) plc	Reject	Accept	Accept	We agree with the Working Group that DCUSA Charging Objective 1 is better facilitated and DCUSA Charging Objective 6 is negatively impacted by this Change Proposal for both the Original Proposal and	None.
Northern Powergrid (Yorkshire) plc	Reject	Accept	Accept		

				the Alternative, and for the reasons set out in the Change Report. We also agree with the Working Group that, for the Original Proposal, this Change Proposal would also have a negative impact on DCUSA Charging Objective 2, and for the reasons set out in the Change Report.	
IDNO PARTIES					
The Electricity Network Company	Reject	Accept	Accept	We agree with the Working group's assessment that charging objective 1 is better facilitated by this change proposal	Although we have shown preference for the alternative proposal, we believe that both variations of DCP 406 better facilitate that charging objectives. WE believe that, in the end, the alternative is more pragmatic than the original.
ESP Electricity	Reject	Accept	Accept	We agree that objective 1 is better facilitated by this change.	
SUPPLIER PARTIES					
British Gas	Reject	Accept	Accept	DCP 406 (Alternative Proposal) better facilitates DCUSA Charging Objective 1. In our view DCP 406 (Original Solution) would lead to perverse outcomes where generation connections could seek to avoid reinforcement costs by adding a nominal amount of final demand to the connection request or by connecting behind the meter of an existing final demand site.	
CVA REGISTRANT PARTIES					
No votes received					
GAS SUPPLIER PARTIES					
Not Eligible					