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1. Executive Summary

#### What?

* 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. 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. 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 5\_Proposed ED2 Template.
  2. These amendments are also reflected in the CDCM model and Annual Review Pack (ARP) ‘General Inputs’.
  3. It has been highlighted that DCP 325[[1]](#footnote-2) ‘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.

1. Governance

#### Justification for Part 2 Matter

* 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.

**Requested Next Steps**

* 1. The Panel recommends that this CP should be issued to Parties for Voting.

1. Why Change?

#### Background of DCP 421

* 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.
  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. This CP proposes changes to these tables to represent the breakdown of allowed revenue in RIIO-ED2.

1. DCP 421 Working Group Assessment

#### DCP 421 Working Group Assessment

* 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](http://www.dcusa.co.uk).
  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

* 1. The RIIO-ED2 licence conditions were published by Ofgem in February 2023[[2]](#footnote-3), 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. The proposer provided a proposed template for the revised tables. This was assessed and updated by the working group and is provided in **Attachment 5\_Proposed ED2 Template**.
  3. 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.
  1. 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**

* 1. The current table 1 includes calculations of allowed revenue for the years t-1 to t+4, where t is the current regulatory year.
  2. 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.
  3. 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. 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.
  5. 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.
  6. 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’.
  7. 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 are seeking views on the level of granularity preferred by Suppliers and other users of the Cost Information Tables.
  8. It was suggested that the level of detail and complexity contained in ‘Table 1 - ED2 detailed’ within attachment 3 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**

* 1. 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.
  2. 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**

* 1. 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.
  2. 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.
  3. 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.

1. DCP421 Consultation
   1. The Working Group undertook one consultation during the development of the change proposal.

**Consultation**

* 1. The consultation was issued to parties on 11 August 2023. There were seven responses received to the consultation. The Working Group’s conclusions can be found in **Attachment 3 DCP 421 Consolidated Consultation 4 Responses**, with a summary of each shown below.

Question 1: Do you understand the intent of the Change Proposal?

Question 2: Are you supportive of the principles of this Change Proposal?

* 1. All respondents understood the intent of the change proposal and all respondents supported the principles of the change proposal.

Question 3 – Should the years in Table 1 remain the same as in the current Table 1, 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? Please provide rationale.

* 1. All six of the respondents who offered a view on this question believed 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, with the final responder not offering a view.
  2. One of the six responders who replied to this question suggested including a caveat to say the allowed revenue in years outside of the current price control period are subject to change once the licence conditions are finalised.

Question 4 – Is the level of granularity in ‘Table 1 – CDCM Input Version’ sufficient for the CDCM ‘General Inputs’ or is anything further required for input into the CDCM? Please provide rationale.

* 1. Five respondents believed the level of granularity in 'Table 1 - CDCM Input Version’ was sufficient for the CDCM requirements.
  2. One responder stated that they did not use the “Excluded Services”, or the “Revenue raised outside of the CDCM” blocks but believed that it may make sense to keep a few rows in to allow for anything that comes up that isn’t currently known, such as the rebates in 2013/14 which the voluntary under-recovery row was last used for.

Question 5 – For Suppliers Only- Is the level of granularity in ‘Table 1 – ED2 Detailed’ required for the quarterly Cost Information submissions, or is the level within ‘Table 1 – CDCM Input Version’ sufficient, or should both be produced? Please provide rationale.

* 1. Six of the seven respondents were not suppliers so offered no view for this question.
  2. The only supplier who responded to the consultation stated that the level of detail in the ‘ED2 Detailed’ table was preferable.

Question 6 - Are there any data items that have not been included within ‘Table 1 - ED2 Detailed’ or ‘Table 1 - CDCM input version’ that you believe should be included, or any other changes to the format that you believe would improve this table? If so please provide rationale.

* 1. Five respondents stated that no additional data items were required.
  2. One responder commented that for ‘Table 1 – CDCM Input Version’ 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.
  3. The same responder to the above point also stated that a colour legend would be helpful.
  4. The only supplier to respond to the consultation stated that the split of revenue between CDCM and EDCM isn’t included in the ‘ED2 Detailed’ tab, so if the intention is to only provide only the ‘ED2 Detailed’ or the ‘CDCM Input Version’ then rows 48, 49 and 53 of the ‘CDCM Input Version’ should be included in the ‘ED2 Detailed output’.

Question 7 – Does the ‘Delta from previous’ table provide additional value to the submission? Are there any data items that have not been included within the ‘Delta from previous’ table that you believe should be included, or any other changes to the format that you believe would improve this table? If so please provide rationale.

* 1. All respondents believed that the ‘Delta from previous’ table provided additional value. The reasons ranged from it potentially explaining significant price changes to allowing for an easy comparison to the previous submission.
  2. One of the respondents commented that the stakeholder teleconference, which is mandated by the DCUSA, might need to take a slightly different format as these deltas are discussed during the presentation (for example, the slides may not be needed as the same information is contained in the worksheet).

Question 8 - For suppliers only - Do you use the information provided in Table 2? If so what do you use the information for and does it add significant value?

* 1. Six of the seven respondents didn’t offer a view as they were not suppliers.
  2. The only supplier to respond to this question stated that the the current format of Table 2 does not provide much insight and that the updated Table 2 could be much more useful in providing foresight of potential revenue movements.

Question 9 – Is the proposed Table 2 an improvement on the existing Table and do you believe this could provide more meaningful information to Suppliers? Please provide your rationale.

* 1. Four of the six respondents stated they believed the proposed Table 2 is an improvement on the existing table.
  2. One of these four respondents stated that whilst they believed Table 2 was an improvement, this question was more pertinent to suppliers as it is more relevant to them as the recipients of this information.
  3. Two respondents didn’t offer a view stating that this question was more appropriate for Suppliers to comment on.
  4. The final respondent stated they believed the existing style is more preferable and the proposed table may be too prescriptive and not allow for any flexibility to reflect issues of importance in the future without a DCP.

Question 10 - Are there any data items that have not been included within Table 2 tab that you believe should be included, or any other changes to the format that you believe would improve this table? If so please provide rationale.

* 1. Six of the seven respondents stated that they did not believe there were any additional data items or changes required to Table 2 or didn’t offer a view.
  2. The final respondent stated that a commentary column may be helpful as well as the previously mentioned colour coded legend.
  3. They also commented that unless the intention for the inflation table in Table 2 is to only show potential large swings and impacts of different inflation values, it is not needed.

Question 11 - What source of forecast inflation should be used and should that source be consistently applied by all DNOs?

* 1. The responses to this question ranged from either the OBR forecast being the source of inflation or the DNOs setting the value as is the current process.

Question 12 - Who should be responsible for codifying where the inflation source comes from i.e. the DCUSA, Ofgem etc? Please provide rationale.

* 1. Five of the respondents believed that codifying the forecast inflation source was not needed as per the current process.
  2. One respondent stated it should be Codified within the DCUSA and another offered no view.

Question 13: Do you have a preference of how the tables are reflected within the DCUSA legal text? Should they be captured within the body of the text or provided in a separate workbook, referenced within the legal text.

* 1. All respondents agreed that the tables should be within a separate workbook with a reference in the legal text as this would allow for flexibility to update the template without having to go through the formal change process.

Question 14: Do you consider the solution better facilitates the DCUSA objectives? Please give supporting reasons.

* 1. 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 |

* 1. 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 |

Question 15: Are you aware of any wider industry developments that may impact upon or be impacted by this CP?

* 1. Three responders highlighted that DCP 325 was also reviewing some elements of schedule 15 (cost information tables) but that CP had no direct impact DCP 421 and vice versa.

Question 16: What date do you believe this change proposal should be implemented? Please provide rationale.

* 1. Five responders stated that the implementation date should not be before 01 January 2024. One responder stated that implementation should be for the next quarterly return and one responder offered no view.

Question 17: Do you have any other comments?

* 1. There were no comments raised to this question that hadn’t been previously brought up within the earlier consultation responses.

1. Working Group Conclusions & Final Solution
   1. 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**

* 1. 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**

* 1. 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.
  1. 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 the ED2 detailed table and the CDCD input version tables would be required to be provided meaning that suppliers would be provided with both sets of data.
  2. 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.
  3. It was also highlighted that that everything within Schedule 15 included within the sheet.
  4. In regards to the responder who stated within their consultation response that a colour legend may be helpful, this responder commented within the Working Gorup that this was a ‘nice to have requirement’ and that they were happy with the proposed level of detail.
  5. 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**

* 1. 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 added value as it gives suppliers an opportunity to ask questions.
  2. 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 it would mean any future changes to the presentation material would have to be passed through the formal DCUSA change proposal.

**Table 2**

* 1. In regards 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.
  2. 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**

* 1. 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.
  2. 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 as 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 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**

* 1. 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. The Working Group agreed that the template should be held on the DCUSA website.
  2. 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.
  3. Due to the above concerns, it was agreed that the legal text would reference the templates being housed on the DUCSA website but also that any updates to the template would need to be passed through the usual BAU DCUSA change process.

**Final Solution**

* 1. Draft legal text for Schedule 15 is provided as Attachment 2.
  2. The final template workbook proposed to be used following the approval and implementation of this CP is provided in Attachment 1.
  3. This template aligns to that described in Section 4 above.

1. Relevant Objectives

#### Assessment Against the DCUSA Objectives

* 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.
  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 2 and also detailed below.
  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 |
| 1. 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** |
| 1. The efficient discharge by the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of obligations imposed upon them in their Distribution Licences. | **Positive** |
| 1. The promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the DCUSA. | None |
| 1. 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** |
| 1. 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** |
| 1. 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 |
| 1. 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** |
| 1. 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 |
| 1. That compliance with the Charging Methodologies promotes efficiency in its own implementation and administration. | None |

1. Impacts & Other Considerations

#### Impacts on other Industry Codes

* 1. The Working Group acknowledge that there will be interactions with DCP 325however, 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………… |  | Distrbution Code.. |  | None………. |  |

#### Significant Code Review Impacts?

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

**Consideration of Wider Industry Impacts**

* 1. The issue which this CP seeks to remedy has been discussed in the DCP 421 Working Group and at the ENA Connections Commercial Operations Group (“Connections COG”).

#### Consumer Impacts

* 1. 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

* 1. 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.
  2. 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.
  3. A Working Group member populated the revised models with their data and verified that the output tariffs were unchanged from those published, as expected.
  4. Details of the amendments to the models and the modelling analysis can be found in Attachment 6.

#### Environmental Impacts

* 1. 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.

1. Implementation
   1. The intended implementation date for this change is 5 Working Days after industry approval.
2. Legal Text

**Legal Text**

* 1. Amendments to be 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 5).**
  2. The Working Group agreed that the tables are referenced within the Clause 45A and Schedule 15 are captured in a separate workbook, such as the template in **Attachment 5,** and that this attachment is hosted on the DCUSA website, with reference to this within the legal text along with governance on how this table gets updated.
  3. New Paragraphs 1.6 to 1.11 inserted to clarify the governance procedure for updating the template within Attachment 5 and how updates are to be shared with the wider industry.

#### Text Commentary

* 1. It is proposed that Paragraphs 1.16 t o1.11 are created to reflect how the tables are updated on the DCUSA website.
  2. Tables 1 ,2 and 3 delated and leading text for all tables updated to reference that the templates are now hosted on the DCUSA website.

1. Code Specific Matters

#### Reference Documents

* 1. N/A

1. Recommendations

#### Panel’s Recommendation

* 1. The Panel approved this Change Report on 15 May 2024. The Panel considered that the Working Group has carried out the level of analysis required to enable Parties to understand the impact of the proposed amendment and to vote on DCP 421.
  2. The Panel have recommended that this report is issued for Voting for a period of 3 weeks and DCUSA Parties should consider whether they wish to submit views regarding this Change Proposal.

1. Attachments

* Attachment 1\_DCP 421 Change Proposal Form
* Attachment 2\_DCP 421 Draft Legal Text
* Attachment 3\_DCP 421 Voting Form
* Attachment 4\_DCP 421 Consolidated Consultation 1 Responses
* Attachment 5\_Proposed ED2 Template.
* Attachment 6\_DCP 421 Modelling documents

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')**](https://www.dcusa.co.uk/change/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-a/) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. [Decision on the proposed modifications to the RIIO-2 Electricity Distribution licences | Ofgem](https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications/decision-proposed-modifications-riio-2-electricity-distribution-licences) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)