





DCUSA Change Declaration		At what stage is this document in the process?
<h2>DCP 421:</h2> <h3>Update the Tables in schedule 15 of DCUSA</h3> <p>Date raised: 12 April 2023</p> <p>Proposer Name: Dave Wornell</p> <p>Company Name: National Grid Electricity Distribution</p> <p>Company Category: DNO</p> <p>Governance: Part 2 Matter</p>	01 – Change Proposal	
	02 – Consultation	
	03 – Change Report	
	04 – Change Declaration	
<p>Purpose of Change Proposal:</p> <p>To amend the current tables within Schedule 15 of DCUSA to correctly represent ED2. .</p>		
	<p>DCUSA Parties have voted on DCUSA Change Proposal (DCP) 421 with the outcome being a decision on whether or not the Change Proposal (CP) is to be accepted and the proposed variation to the DCUSA made accordingly.</p> <p>The DCUSA Parties consolidated votes are provided as Attachment 1.</p>	
	<p>For DCP 421, DCUSA Parties have voted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accept the proposed variation (solution); and • Accept the implementation date. 	
	<p>Impacted Parties:</p> <p>DNOs, IDNOs and Suppliers</p>	
	<p>Impacted Clauses:</p> <p>Schedule 15</p>	

Contents		 Any questions?
1	Summary	3
2	Governance	3
3	Why Change?	4
4	Working Group Assessment	4
5	Consultations	7
6	Working Group Conclusions and Final Soltuion.	14
7	Relevant Objectives	15
8	Impacts & Other Considerations	16
9	Implementation	17
10	Legal Text	17
11	Code Specific Matters	18
12	Voting	18
13	Recommendations	19
14	Attachments	19
Timeline		Contact: Code Administrator  dcusa@electralink.co.uk  020 7432 3011 Proposer: Dave Wornell  dwornell@nationalgrid.co.uk  N/A
Activity	Date	
Initial Assessment Report	17 May 2023	
Consultation 1 Issued to Industry Participants	11 August 2023	
Consultation 2 Issued to Industry Participants	15 July 2024	
Change Report Approved by Panel	27 August 2024	
Change Report issued for Voting	27 August 2024	
Party Voting Closes	17 September 2024	
Change Declaration Issued to the Parties	18 September 2024	
Authority Decision	N/A	
Implementation	5 Working Days post Party approval.	

1 Summary

What?

- 1.1 The Tables in schedule 15 of DCUSA were created to represent the revenue splits for DPCR5 and RIIO-ED1 whereas RIIO-ED2 revenue splits are very different.

Why?

- 1.2 The previous electricity Distribution price control (known as RIIO-ED1) ended on 31 March 2023. The new price control (known as RIIO-ED2) will cover the five-year period from 1 April 2023 to 31 March 2028. The current tables are not suitable to correctly represent RIIO-ED2 revenue.

How?

- 1.3 Amendments to the Cost Information Tables (specifically Table 1 and 2) within Schedule 15 of DCUSA to correctly represent the calculation of allowed revenue under the RIIO-ED2 Special Conditions of the Electricity Distribution Licence. These tables will be provided in a template workbook to be hosted on the DCUSA website with a reference to the template in the legal text, rather than the format of the tables being specified explicitly in the legal text. This will make it easier to implement any updates to the tables in future and ensure all DNOs are using exactly the same format for their submissions. The proposed workbook template for these tables with the updated format is in Attachment 6_ Proposed Cost Information Template.
- 1.4 These amendments are also reflected in the CDCM model and Annual Review Pack (ARP) 'General Inputs'.
- 1.5 It has been highlighted that DCP 3251 'Reviewing the requirements of Sections 35A ('Provision of Cost Information'), 35B ('Production of the Annual Review Pack'), Schedule 15 ('Cost Information Table') and Schedule 20 ('Production of the Annual Review Pack')' will have some interactions with this change which are addressed in section 4.

2 Governance

Justification for Part 2 Matter

- 2.1 This is a part 2 matter as it only effects the representation of allowed revenue and does not affect the calculations or the output tariffs.

¹ [Reviewing the requirements of Sections 35A \('Provision of Cost Information'\), 35B \('Production of the Annual Review Pack'\), Schedule 15 \('Cost Information Table'\) and Schedule 20 \('Production of the Annual Review Pack'\)](#)

- 2.2 DCUSA Parties voted to accept DCP 421 and as such, it will be implemented in line with Section 11 below.

3 Why Change?

- 3.1 The existing Cost Information Tables in Schedule 15 of the DCUSA were set up to represent the allowed revenues as calculated using the Special Conditions of the Electricity Distribution Licence for DPCR5 and RIIO-ED1.
- 3.2 RIIO-ED2 began on 01 April 2023, with new licence conditions coming into force on that date. The breakdown of allowed revenue under the RIIO-ED2 licence conditions is different to the breakdown under RIIO-ED1. This means that the existing table 1 and 2 in Schedule 15 are no longer suitable to represent the breakdown of allowed revenues.
- 3.3 This CP proposes changes to these tables to represent the breakdown of allowed revenue in RIIO-ED2.

4 Working Group Assessment

- 4.1 The DCUSA Panel established a Working Group to assess/develop DCP 421. This Working Group consists of representatives from DNOs, Suppliers, IDNOs and Generators. Meetings were held in open session and the minutes and papers of each meeting are available on the DCUSA website – www.dcusa.co.uk.
- 4.2 The link between this change and DCP 325 was discussed. The working group agree that this change will be focussing on the content of the Tables in Schedule 15 to align them to the RIIO-ED2 licence, whilst DCP 325 will continue to consider the more fundamental aspects of Schedules 15 and 20, such as the overlap between the two schedules and the timing of the submissions, with the contents of Tables 1 and 2 descoped from the change. This will allow the two DCPs to progress and be assessed independently of each other, although each of the two working groups will ensure they are aware of the solution being developed for the other DCP.

DCP 421 Proposed Solution

- 4.3 The RIIO-ED2 licence conditions were published by Ofgem in February 2023², so the purpose of this Change Proposal is to reflect the calculation of allowed revenue under RIIO-ED2 in the Cost Information Tables (Table 1 and 2) of Schedule 15, which is also reflected in the CDCM and ARP 'General Inputs'.

² [Decision on the proposed modifications to the RIIO-2 Electricity Distribution licences | Ofgem](#)

4.4 The proposer provided a proposed template for the revised tables. This was assessed and updated by the working group and is provided in Attachment 6_ Proposed Cost Information Template

4.5 The template consists of the following worksheets:

- 'Table 1 - ED2 Detailed' – Proposed Table 1 to be included in quarterly Schedule 15 submissions, containing breakdown of allowed revenues, including a granular breakdown of base revenues. It is proposed that this table is used for the quarterly Cost Information submissions.
- 'Table 1 – CDCM Input Version' – Proposed Table 1 to be included in the CDCM 'General Inputs' containing breakdown of allowed revenues to the level of granularity required for the CDCM model. It is proposed that this table is used for the inputs to the CDCM.
- 'Table 1 - Delta From Previous' – Proposed additional table providing variance between the values in Table 1 in the current and previous submissions, with commentary explaining any variances. This is to provide additional information to Suppliers which they would currently have to calculate themselves from the two submission packs for each DNO.
- 'Table 2' – Proposed Table 2 to be included in the quarterly Schedule 15 submissions. This is significantly changed from the existing Table 2 with the aim of providing more appropriate and informative sensitivities than those currently included in Table 2
- 'Table 3 – Illustrative Prices' – No change from existing Table 3.

4.6 Both versions of Table 1 in the template can be linked to the Price Control Financial Model (PCFM) and both calculate the allowed revenue in line with the RIIO-ED2 Special Conditions.

Table 1

4.7 The current table 1 includes calculations of allowed revenue for the years t-1 to t+4, where t is the current regulatory year.

4.8 The Working Group considered whether it is appropriate to provide forecasts for years within the next price control period when there has been no submission or determination relating to that period, and the licence conditions for the calculation of allowed revenue within that period are not known.

4.9 It was noted that determinations are not known until a few months before the price control period starts and that allowed revenue calculations will be required to calculate charges within that period significantly earlier because of the requirement to provide 15 months' notice. It was also noted that Suppliers find the forecast of later years useful, even when it is known that it may change significantly when the price control determinations are finalised.

4.10 It was agreed that Table 1 should continue to include the same years as currently (t-1 to t+4) and that for years within the next price control period there will be an assumption that the current licence conditions continue to apply, until such time that the new licence conditions are published by Ofgem.

- 4.11 The Working Group also discussed the two versions of Table 1 ('ED2 Detailed' and 'CDCM Input Version') and whether both are required. It was discussed that some Suppliers have previously requested additional granularity for the base revenue figures.
- 4.12 In the RIIO-ED1 Special Conditions the base revenue was included as a single figure, however in the RIIO-ED2 Special Conditions this is broken down into the categories detailed in 'Table 1 - CDCM Input Version'.
- 4.13 The PCFM contains further granularity, including the breakdown of the calculation of Fast Money, Depreciation and Return, which has been added to 'Table 1 – ED2 Detailed'. As both versions of Table 1 have additional granularity compared to the current Table 1, the Working Group agreed to seek views on the level of granularity preferred by Suppliers and other users of the Cost Information Tables.
- 4.14 It was suggested that the level of detail and complexity contained in 'Table 1 - ED2 detailed' within Attachment 6 was beyond what is needed, adding unnecessary complexity and potential confusion. Some of the Working Group members suggested that only the information in 'Table 1 - ED2 Detailed' was required and others believing it was only the data within 'Table 1 - CDCM Input Version' that was required. As the Working Group were unable to reach consensus, it was agreed to seek party views on whether only one table of the data, or both should be produced and sent to the secretariate for the quarterly submissions.

Table 2

- 4.15 The Working Group discussed Table 2 and whether it was useful for suppliers in its current format. It was discussed that changing the format to allow DNOs to provide sensitivities for changes to revenue which are forecast but not yet formally approved could be beneficial and may provide more meaningful information to Suppliers than is included in the current Table 2.
- 4.16 The Working Group agreed to seek views from suppliers on whether the information within Table 2 is used or of value and whether the proposed new format for Table 2 is an improvement on the current information provided.

Forecast Inflation

- 4.17 In RIIO-ED1 the forecast for inflation was taken from the HM Treasury forecast (as specified in the License Conditions), which was published quarterly, however within RIIO-ED2 the OBR forecast is used (as specified in the License Conditions) which is usually published in Spring and Autumn.
- 4.18 The Working Group agreed to seek party views on what information source could be used for forecast inflation for the quarterly submissions and when the forecast should be updated, as it was noted that certain inflation sources aren't updated regularly. Additionally, it was questioned whether the source should be consistent across the DNOs, with the working group agreeing to seek party views on this matter.

- 4.19 It was also agreed to seek party views on who should be responsible for codifying the source for forecast inflation i.e. the DCUSA, Ofgem etc

5 Consultations

5.1 The Working Group undertook two consultations during the development of the change proposal.

Consultation One

- 5.2 The Working Group issued the first consultation on 11 August 2023. There were seven responses to the consultation. The collated responses to this consultation can be found in Attachment 4_DCP 421 Consolidated Consultation 1 Responses, with a summary of the responses given below.
- 5.3 All respondents understood the intent of the change proposal and supported the principles of the change proposal.
- 5.4 All respondents who offered a view agreed that the years in Table 1 should remain the same, with allowed revenue for any years in a future price control period assumed to be calculated on the same basis as the latest known price control period. The Working Group response is given in paragraph 5.14 below.
- 5.5 Five respondents agreed that the level of granularity included in 'Table 1 – CDCM Input' is sufficient for the CDCM requirements.
- 5.6 The only supplier respondent agreed that the level of granularity in 'Table 1 – Detailed' is preferable for Suppliers.
- 5.7 Five respondents agreed that no additional information was required in either version of Table 1. The other two respondents queried whether detail from the 'Detailed' version of Table 1 was also required in the 'CDCM' version of Table 1.
- 5.8 The Working Group response to these points relating to level of granularity in the template is given in paragraph 5.15 below.
- 5.9 All respondents agreed that the 'Delta from previous' table added additional value.
- 5.10 The only Supplier to respond confirmed that Table 2 is used by Suppliers. Four of the respondents agreed that the proposed format for Table 2 is an improvement on the existing table, with two respondents not offering a view and the final respondent expressing that the existing style is more preferable. Six of the respondents did not know of any additional data items that should be included in Table 2, with the final respondent suggesting a commentary column may be helpful. The Working Group response is given in paragraph 5.23 below.
- 5.11 The view relating to the source of forecast inflation was mixed, with suggestions including either the OBR forecast or DNOs setting their own forecast value as is the current process. Five of the

seven respondents agreed that the forecast inflation source should not be codified within the DCUSA. The Working Group response is given in paragraph 5.25 below.

- 5.12 All respondents agreed that the tables should be captured in a template workbook to ensure consistency between DNO submissions. The Working Group response is given in paragraph 5.27 below.
- 5.13 After reviewing the Consultation responses, the Working Group agreed that the below areas required further consideration:

Should the years in Table 1 remain the same as in the current Table 1 (consultation 1 Q3)

- 5.14 The Working Group agreed that the years in Table 1 should remain the same as in the current Table 1, with forecasts for any years in a future price control period calculated on the same basis as the latest known price control period, accompanied by a caveat stating that the allowed revenue in years beyond the current price control period were subject to change once the licence conditions are known. It was highlighted that forecasting years in future price control periods is necessary because of the requirement to give 15 months' notice for charges, whilst the licence conditions are not finalised until shortly before the price control period begins.

The level of granularity within the template (consultation 1 Q4-7)

- 5.15 After reviewing the feedback to the consultation, the Working Group agreed to make minor changes to the template as detailed below.
- Include two extra lines in the "Revenue raised outside of the CDCM" block in 'Table 1 – CDCM Input Version' to capture any such revenue arising in the future which is not currently known about now, such as the rebates in 2013/14 which the additional rows were last used for, but which was not known about in advance.
- 5.16 In regards to the respondent who stated 'The level of detail in the ED2 Detailed table is preferable to the CDCM input version, the extra level of granularity provided in the incentives section and the splits of allowed base revenues between the different funding pots may prove useful for suppliers in understanding the drivers of revenue movements', the Working Group concluded that both 'Table 1 - ED2 Detailed' and 'Table 1 - CDCM Input Version' would be required to be provided meaning that suppliers would be provided with both sets of data.
- 5.17 In regards to the response that stated that 'Table 1 – CDCM Input' worksheet: It might be beneficial to provide the breakdown of Output Delivery Incentive (ODI) and Other Revenue Allowance (ORA) as was done for Pass-Through (PT). Or leave the breakdown for all three in 'Table 1 – ED2 Detailed' worksheet.' It was highlighted by the working group that the breakdown of the passthrough is necessary for input into the CDCM, as e.g. licence fees and supplier of last resort charges are required separately, and that the ODI and ORA do not need to be broken down for input into the CDCM. It was agreed that the level of detail in 'Table 1 – ED2 Detailed' was sufficient and necessary.

- 5.18 It was also highlighted that everything required within Schedule 15 is included within the 'Table 1 – ED2 Detailed' sheet.
- 5.19 In regards to the responder who stated within their consultation response that a colour legend may be helpful, this responder commented within the Working Group that this was a 'nice to have requirement' and that they were happy with the proposed level of detail. The Working Group agreed it would make the template easier to navigate and populate if the formatting was clearer and amended the template to include a colour legend.
- 5.20 In response to the supplier who raised the comment on the data within the 'Delta from previous' table 'as the split of revenue between CDCM and EDCM isn't included in the 'ED2 Detailed' tab and the 'Delta from previous' tab shows movements based on that tab the movement in the split between CDCM and EDCM is omitted.' The Working Group concluded that the revenue split between the CDCM and EDCM is calculated as a function of the allowed revenue until such time that charges are formally set for each year, so including this within 'Table 1 – Delta From Previous' would not add value at this point.

The stakeholder teleconference (consultation 1 Q7)

- 5.21 In regards to the presentation material for the stakeholder teleconference, it was noted by the only supplier in the Working Group that whilst it may not be necessary for DNOs to prepare slides for the teleconference anymore, and instead just use the 'Table 1 – Delta From Previous', the stakeholder call would still add value as it gives suppliers an opportunity to ask questions.
- 5.22 It was agreed that as only the call was a mandatory requirement, and not the content of the call or how information is presented back to suppliers, i.e. slides or a spreadsheet, it would be best to allow the stakeholders on this call to informally agree on the approach for the call rather than mandating this, as mandating it would mean any future changes to the presentation material would have to be passed through the formal DCUSA change process.

Table 2 (consultation 1 Q8-10)

- 5.23 In regard to whether the proposed Table 2 is an improvement on the existing Table 2 and the response that stated 'the existing style is more preferable and the proposed table may be too prescriptive and not allow for any flexibility', it was explained that this area of the template wasn't prescriptive and that it was purely to allow suppliers and DNOs to forecast what potential changes could look like.
- 5.24 The Working Group member who'd raised this concern stated within the Working Group that now it had been explained that the proposed Table 2 data was purely for forecasting purposes, they were comfortable with the approach the Working Group were seeking to take.

Inflation (consultation 1 Q11-12)

- 5.25 In regards to the forecast of inflation to be used, it was concluded that as the OBR forecast is only published twice a year, and the licence only specifies that the value from the Autumn publication

should be used when setting charges, this may not be the most appropriate source to use throughout the year for the quarterly submissions as the forecast inflation could be very different several months after the Autumn OBR forecast is published.

- 5.26 A vote was taken within the Working Group and those in favour of using the OBR figure for forecasting was zero of seven Working Group members. Those in favour of allowing DNOs to set the figure was five of the seven Working Group members, with the remaining two members abstaining. It was also concluded that the current approach is to allow DNOs to make their own forecasts and that being too prescriptive could cause issues in the future if the value becomes not fit for purpose or if the frequency of publication of forecasts was updated or changed. It was also highlighted that the inflation source could be discussed and agreed on in the teleconference call if suppliers wanted a different source to be used, without the need for raising a new DCUSA change.

How the tables are reflected within the DCUSA legal text (consultation 1 Q13)

- 5.27 All respondents and Working Group members agreed that the tables should be provided in a template workbook with a reference to the template in the legal text as this would allow for flexibility to update the template and mean that all DNOs submit information in the same format, which makes it easier for Suppliers and other stakeholders to work with the data. The Working Group agreed that the template should be held on the DCUSA website.
- 5.28 The Working Group agreed that whilst it may seem desirable to be able to make changes to the template without the need for a formal DCUSA change proposal to be raised, any updates to the template would still require being put through the process of raising a modelling change request and then the new models being tested by industry parties.
- 5.29 Due to the above concerns, it was agreed that the legal text would reference the templates being housed on the DCUSA website but also that any updates to the template would need to be passed through the usual business as usual DCUSA change process.
- 5.30 Following additional feedback from Gowlings (the DCUSA legal advisors) the Working Group agreed that the contents of the tables should be included in the legal text as without this it is ambiguous what should be included in the template tables. The legal text has been drafted with this in mind.

Updates to the Template

- 5.31 Following the first consultation the template workbook was updated.
- 5.32 This template aligns to that described in Section 4 above with the following minor changes which have been made to aid navigation and population of the workbook and to correct formulas. These do not change the function or layout of the template as it was consulted on:
- New sheets added:
 - o 'Control' - contains the following:

- input cells for the DNO name and the submission date, and calculation of year t based on the submission date, which will all then feed through to the other sheets
 - Formatting Key to explain what the different cell formatting represents
 - Version control table to identify which version of the template is in use and what the changes are to any previous versions.
- 'Instructions' – contains basic instructions for DNOs on how to populate the template.
- Sheet names changed as follows:

Previous Sheet Name	Revised Sheet Name	Reason for Change
Table 1 – ED2 Detailed	Table 1 – Detailed	'ED2' removed in order to future-proof the sheet names
Table 1 - CDCM Input Version	Table 1 – CDCM Input	'Version' removed as it was unnecessary
Table 2	Table 2 - Sensitivities	'Sensitivities' added to make it clearer what is on the sheet

- Headers added to each sheet containing the DNO company name, the submission date and the title of the sheet. This was added to make it easier for Suppliers or other users of the populated workbooks to identify which information they are looking at, without having to check the file name.
- Formula for total passthrough corrected in all three Table 1 sheets to subtract SRC_t and HB_t , in line with the Special Licence Conditions
- Additional row added into 'Table 1 – Detailed' and 'Table 1 – Delta From Previous' so that the 'Sharing Factor' used in the calculation of the Post-TIM totex Allocation is an input rather than hardcoded, as this value varies by DNO.
- Formatting updates – various updates to cell formatting to make it clearer which cells are DNO inputs, which are calculations and which are linked. This is reflected in the Format key in the 'Control' sheet.

Objectives

- 5.33 Based on the responses to the consultation, the below details which of the objective's respondents believed were impacted by this CP.
- 5.34 For the General objectives five respondents believed objective 3 was better facilitated and four believed objective 2 was better facilitated. One responder offered no view.

General Objectives						
Responder	1	2	3	4	5	Overall response
Responder 1						Neutral
Responder 2						Neutral
Responder 3		Positive	Positive			Positive
Responder 4			Positive			Positive
Responder 5		Positive	Positive			Positive
Responder 6		Positive	Positive			Positive
Responder 7		Positive	Positive			Positive

5.35 For the charging objectives Six respondents believed the change better facilitates objective 4 and Five respondents believed objectives 1 and 2 were better facilitated.

Charging Objectives							
Responder	1	2	3	4	5	6	Overall response
Responder 1		Positive		Positive			Positive
Responder 2							No response
Responder 3	Positive	Positive		Positive			Positive
Responder 4	Positive			Positive			Positive
Responder 5	Positive	Positive		Positive			Positive
Responder 6	Positive	Positive		Positive			Positive
Responder 7	Positive	Positive		Positive			Positive

Consultation2

- 5.36 The Working Group undertook a second consultation on 15 July 2024 to gain feedback on the legal text and the cost information template.
- 5.37 There were seven responses received to the consultation. The Working Group's conclusions can be found in Attachment 5 DCP 421 Consolidated Consultation 2 Responses, with a summary of each shown below.

Question 1: Do you have any comments on Attachment 6_Proposed Cost Information Template and do you believe its contents are fit for purpose?

- 5.38 Six of the respondents stated that they believed the template was fit for purpose.
- 5.39 One responder provided some feedback on the Proposed cost information template. The first point raised was that they did not think the "Allowed Revenue Used In CDCM Model" for years (t+2) onwards should be greyed out in row 55 of the 'Table 1 - CDCM Input' sheet of the template and gave the reason that in February 2025, they would have set tariffs for 2026-27.
- 5.40 With this in mind they believed it might be helpful not to grey out any of the cells in this row and instead to set future years to equal Allowed Revenue in row 40.
- 5.41 The second point raised by this responder was in relation to 'Table 1 - Delta from Previous'. They noted that this would be the first time the new format would be in use and as such, they would like to clarify that the delta will not be required in the first publication (assuming it would be for November 2024). They also noted that if the Working Group was to agree that the legal text would require updating.
- 5.42 Their final point was in relation to the 'Table 2 – Sensitivities', where they had some queries on how the table will be populated, stating they understand it should cater for additional level of detail not included in the forecast. They went on to say that it would be useful for understanding movements (for instance, UMs, Re-openers, SOLR etc) and suggested rewording the instructions to be a more descriptive of what Table 2 should be used for.
- 5.43 The Working Group response can be found in paragraph 6.2-6.4 below.

Question 2. Do you have any comments on the proposed drafted legal text?

- 5.44 Five responders said they had no comments on the draft legal text.
- 5.45 One responder highlighted that it appeared that the titles of the columns in the tables (1&2) within the screenshots incorporated within the Legal Text had some errors displaying.

5.46 Another responder stated that they believed it was not clear how changes to the Template are governed and proposed some additional drafting for paragraph 1.3. This alternative text can be found in Attachment 5 DCP 421 Consolidated Consultation 2 Responses.

5.47 The Working Group response can be found in paragraph 6.5-6.7 below.

Question 3: Do you agree that 5 Working Days is an appropriate timescale for the secretariat to update the website with any approved changes to the template?

5.48 All seven respondents stated that they agreed that 5 working days was an appropriate timescale for the secretariat to update the website with any approved changes to the template.

Question 4: Do you have any other comments?

5.49 There were no additional comments provided by all the respondents.

6 Working Group Conclusions and Final Soltuion.

6.1 After reviewing the Consultation responses, the Working Group agreed that the below areas required further consideration:

Proposed Cost Information Template (Q1 above)

6.2 The Working Group agreed that none of the cells relating to “Allowed Revenue Used In CDCM Model” for years (t+2) onwards should be greyed out in row 55 of the ‘Table 1 - CDCM Input’ sheet of the template. The template was amended to reflect this.

6.3 The Working Group agreed that the information to populate the ‘Previous Submission’ section of ‘Table 1 - Delta from Previous’ would be available even though the Template has not previously been used, because it is necessary to calculate the allowed revenues in each submission in RIIO-ED2. Therefore, DNOs should be able to populate this the first time this template is used.

6.4 The Working Group agreed to amend the wording in the ‘Instructions’ sheet in relation to the sensitivities in Table 2 to make it clear what kind of sensitivities to include and also to clarify that the table may be left blank if there are no known sensitivities to include.

Legal Text Drafting

6.5 After reviewing the feedback to the consultation, the Working Group agreed to make minor changes to the screenshots in the legal text to resolve the errors in the titles of tables 1 and 2.

6.6 The Working Group reviewed the alternative text that was suggested for paragraph 1.3 and held a vote as to whether this text provided greater clarity on how changes to the Template are governed.

6.7 The Working Group were unanimous in that the suggested alternative legal text for paragraph 1.3 provided greater clarity on how changes to the Template are governed and agreed to amend the legal text.

Final Solution

- 6.8 Draft legal text for Schedule 15 is provided as Attachment 3.
- 6.9 The final template workbook proposed to be used following the approval and implementation of this CP is provided in Attachment 6.

7 Relevant Objectives

Assessment Against the DCUSA Objectives

- 7.1 For a DCUSA Change Proposal to be approved it must be demonstrated that it better facilitates the DCUSA Objectives. There are five General Objectives and six Charging Objectives. The full list of objectives is documented in the DCUSA.
- 7.2 The rationale provided by the Proposer as to which of the following DCUSA Objectives are better facilitated by DCP 421 is set out in the CP form, provided as Attachment 1 and is also detailed below.
- 7.3 As stated above, the previous electricity Distribution price control (known as RIIO-ED1) ended on 31 March 2023. The new price control (known as RIIO-ED2) will cover the five-year period from 1 April 2023 to 31 March 2028. By updating the tables within DCUSA Schedule 15 to correctly represent RIIO-ED2 allowed revenue it is believed that DCUSA General Objective 2 and 3 and DCUSA Charging Objectives 1, 2 and 4 will be better facilitated.

DCUSA General Objectives	Identified impact
1. The development, maintenance and operation by the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of efficient, co-ordinated, and economical Distribution Network	None
2. . The facilitation of effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity and (so far as is consistent therewith) the promotion of such competition in the sale, distribution and purchase of electricity).	Positive
3. The efficient discharge by the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of obligations imposed upon them in their Distribution Licences.	Positive
4. The promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the DCUSA.	None
5. Compliance with the EU Internal Market Regulation and any relevant legally binding decisions of the European Commission and/or the Agency for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators	None

DCUSA Charging Objectives	Identified impact
1. that compliance by each DNO Party with the Charging Methodologies facilitates the discharge by the DNO Party of the obligations imposed on it under the Act and by its Distribution Licence	Positive
2. that compliance by each DNO Party with the Charging Methodologies facilitates competition in the generation and supply of electricity and will not restrict, distort, or prevent competition in the transmission or distribution of electricity or in participation in the operation of an Interconnector (as defined in the Distribution Licences)	Positive
3. that compliance by each DNO Party with the Charging Methodologies results in charges which, so far as is reasonably practicable after taking account of implementation costs, reflect the costs incurred, or reasonably expected to be incurred, by the DNO Party in its Distribution Business	None
4. that, so far as is consistent with Clauses 3.2.1 to 3.2.3, the Charging Methodologies, so far as is reasonably practicable, properly take account of developments in each DNO Party's Distribution Business	Positive
5. that compliance by each DNO Party with the Charging Methodologies facilitates compliance with the Regulation on Cross-Border Exchange in Electricity and any relevant legally binding decisions of the European Commission and/or the Agency for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators.	None
6. that compliance with the Charging Methodologies promotes efficiency in its own implementation and administration.	None

8 Impacts & Other Considerations

Impacts on other Industry Codes

8.1 The Working Group acknowledge that there will be interactions with DCP 325 however, the Working Group also concluded that the two change proposals were written specifically in a way to separate which parts of schedule 15 needed changing so there shouldn't be any interactions.

BSC..... ☐ MRA..... ☐ Grid Code..... ☐ REC..... ☐
 CUSC..... ☐ SEC..... ☐ Distribution Code.. ☐ None..... ☒

Significant Code Review Impacts?

8.2 It is noted that the DESNZ and Ofgem Energy Code Review is also considering code governance in general.

Consideration of Wider Industry Impacts

8.3 The issue which this CP seeks to remedy has been discussed in the DCP 421 Working Group and there were no further wider industry impacts.

Consumer Impacts

8.4 The Working Group does not consider that there are any impacts to consumers as a result of the implementation of this CP that should be highlighted within this Change Report.

Modelling Impact Assessment

8.5 DCP 421 revises the format of the inputs in the 'General Inputs' sheet of the CDCM and ARP but does not impact on the calculations or the tariffs output from the model.

8.6 Additionally, the 'SoLR and Bad Debt Adders' sheet was amended to remove the rows referring to the COVID-19 bad debt, which are no longer required. In RIIO-ED2 the formulas around bad debt in the Special Conditions of the Electricity Distribution Licence no longer include any reference to COVID-19 Bad Debt, therefore all references to this should be removed from the CDCM. No change is required to paragraph 103 of Schedule 16 for this, as it just refers to "Eligible Bad Debt" and does not specifically mention COVID-19 Bad Debt.

8.7 A Working Group member populated the revised models with their data and verified that the output tariffs were unchanged from those published, as expected.

8.8 Details of the amendments to the models and the modelling analysis can be found in **Attachment 7_DCP 421 Modelling documents**.

Environmental Impacts

8.9 In accordance with DCUSA Clause 11.20.6(D), the Working Group assessed whether there would be a material impact on greenhouse gas emissions if this CP were implemented. The Working Group did not identify any material impact on greenhouse gas emissions from the implementation of this CP.

9 Implementation

9.1 The intended implementation date for this change is 5 Working Days after industry approval.

10 Legal Text

Legal Text

10.1 The proposed legal text is provided in Attachment 3.

10.2 Amendments have been made to the current Tables 1 and 2 within Schedule 15 of DCUSA to correctly represent the calculation of allowed revenue in RIIO-ED2. Please see attached proposed template (Attachment 6).

10.3 The Working Group agreed that the tables should continue to be explicitly described in Schedule 15 but should also be captured in a separate template workbook, as in Attachment 6, which shall

be used by the DNOs for their quarterly Cost Information submission. It was agreed that this template should be hosted on the DCUSA website, with reference to this template within the legal text along with governance on how this table gets updated.

Text Commentary

- 10.4 The following changes have been made to the legal text:
- 10.5 Add introduction to the Schedule and move existing glossary of terms to end of schedule, in line with the way other Schedules are structured.
- 10.6 Insert new clauses relating to the template, what information should be in the template and governance of the template.
- 10.7 Include pictures of what the tables in the template should include.

11 Code Specific Matters

Reference Documents

- 11.1 N/A

12 Voting

- 12.1 The DCP 421 Change Report was issued to DCUSA Parties for Voting on 27 August 2024 for a period of 3 weeks.

DCP 421 Solution – Recommendation

Part 2 Matter: Authority Decision is not Required

DCP 421 Solution – Accept

- 12.2 For the majority of the Party Categories that were eligible to vote:
- the number of groups in each Party Category which voted to accept the proposed variation was more than 65% of the total number of Groups in that Party Category which voted; and
 - the sum of the Weighted Votes of the Groups in each Party Category which voted to accept the proposed variation was more than 65%
- 12.3 DCUSA Parties have voted to accept the proposed variation (solution) of DCP 421.
- 12.4 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 421 Implementation Date – Accept

12.5 For the majority of the Party Categories that were eligible to vote:

- the number of groups in each Party Category which voted to accept the implementation date was more than 65% of the total number of groups in that Party Category which voted; and
- the sum of the Weighted Votes of the Groups in each Party Category which voted to accept the implementation date was more than 65%.

12.6 DCUSA Parties have voted to accept the implementation date of DCP 421

The table below sets out the outcome of the votes that were received in respect of the DCP 421 Change Report that was issued on 27 August 2024 for a period of 15 working days.

DCP 421	WEIGHTED VOTING				
	DNO	IDNO	SUPPLIER	CVA REGISTRANT	GAS SUPPLIER
CHANGE SOLUTION	Accept	n/a	Accept	n/a	n/a
IMPLEMENTATION DATE	Accept	n/a	Accept	n/a	n/a

12.7 DCUSA Parties have voted on DCP 421 and in accordance with Clause 13.5, the Parties have been deemed that the Change Proposal be accepted.

12.8 Of the thirteen DNO Parties that voted all thirteen were in favour of the solution and implementation date.

12.9 The one Supplier party who voted was in favour of the DCP 421 Solution and implementation date.

12.10 Therefore, taking the above into consideration, across all Party categories that voted, 100% of all Parties who voted, voted to accept the solution and the implementation date.

13 Recommendations

Panel's Recommendation

13.1 DCUSA Parties have voted on DCP 421, with the outcome being a decision to accept the Change Proposal and thus the proposed variation to the DCUSA **will** be made accordingly.

14 Attachments

- Attachment 1_DCP 421 Change Proposal Form
- Attachment 2_DCP 421 Consolidated Party Votes
- Attachment 3_DCP 421 Draft Legal Text

- Attachment 4_DCP 421 Consolidated Consultation 1 Responses
- Attachment 5_DCP 421 Consolidated Consultation 2 Responses
- Attachment 6_Proposed Cost Information Template
- Attachment 7_DCP 421 Modelling documents