

## DCP 421 'Update the Table in Schedule 15 of the DCUSA

### COLLATED CONSULTATION 2 RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	1. Do you have any comments on Attachment 5_Proposed Cost Information Template and do you believe its contents are fit for purpose?	Working Group Comments
The Electricity Network Company Ltd.	Non-confidential	We support the proposed changes to the Cost Information Tables 1 and 2, part of Schedule 15, for the Allowed Revenue calculations to be updated and align with the RIIO-ED2 licence conditions.	Noted
UK Power Networks	Non-confidential	We have no comments and believe it is fit for purpose.	Noted
Northern Powergrid	Non-confidential	We believe the proposed template is fit for purpose.	Noted
ENWL	Non-confidential	No comments.  ENWL believe Attachment 5_Proposed Cost Information Template contents are fit for purpose	Noted
NGED	Non-confidential	Yes.	Noted
Centrica	Non-confidential	I believe the contents are fit for purpose. The current Cost Information Template does not reflect the RIIO2 PCFM outputs unlike the proposed template which has a lot more detail on the various costs that the DNOs face.	Noted
Southern Electric Power Distribution	Non-confidential	Comments:	Noted

## DCP 421 'Update the Table in Schedule 15 of the DCUSA

### COLLATED CONSULTATION 2 RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc		<p>TABLE 1 CDCM Input (Allowed Revenue used in CDCM model; specifically, cells G55 to I55): We do not think (t+2) should be greyed out. Reason being that in February 2025, we would have set tariffs for 2026-27. It might be helpful not to grey out any of the cells and just set future years to equal AR in row 40 (with commentary).</p> <p>Table 1 - Delta from Previous: As these tables have not yet been implemented, we would like to clarify that the delta will not be required in the first publication (assuming Nov-24) as this is the first time the new format would be in use. If this is the case, can the legal text also be updated to indicate this so it's clear?</p> <p>TABLE 2 - Sensitivities: We have some queries on how Table 2 will be populated. We understand it should cater for additional level of detail not included in the forecast which is useful for understanding movements (for instance, UMs, Re-openers, SOLR etc). So, we are all on the same page on what is required, we are recommending rewording the instructions to be a bit more descriptive.</p>	
<p>Working Group Conclusions: Six of the respondents stated that they believed the template was fit for purpose.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			

## DCP 421 'Update the Table in Schedule 15 of the DCUSA

### COLLATED CONSULTATION 2 RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

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.

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.

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	2. Do you have any comments on the proposed drafted legal text?	Working Group Comments																		
The Electricity Network Company Ltd.	Non- confidential	<p>A minor observation – it appears that the titles of the tables (1&amp;2) within the screenshots incorporated within the Legal Text to have some errors displaying. Some attention may be required to correct it</p> <p>Company Name: Enter Company Name Date: Enter Date Title: DCUSA Schedule 15 - Table 2 - Sensitivities</p> <table><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1898/-1 t-1</td><td>1899/-100 t</td><td>1900/1 t+1</td><td>#VALUE! t+2</td><td>#VALUE! t+3</td><td>#VALUE! t+4</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>£m 20/21 prices</td><td></td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr></table>				1898/-1 t-1	1899/-100 t	1900/1 t+1	#VALUE! t+2	#VALUE! t+3	#VALUE! t+4		£m 20/21 prices		-	-	-	-	-	-	Highlighted a potetnial error on the screenshot of the tables
			1898/-1 t-1	1899/-100 t	1900/1 t+1	#VALUE! t+2	#VALUE! t+3	#VALUE! t+4													
	£m 20/21 prices		-	-	-	-	-	-													
UK Power Networks	Non- confidential	<p>It is not clear how changes to the Template are governed, we propose</p> <p>1.3 Where a Change Proposal amends the Cost Information Template, the new version shall be uploaded to the Website by the Secretariat, within 5WD of the change being approved.</p>	Offered alternativtive text for paragrah 1.3 to clarify how changes to																		

## DCP 421 'Update the Table in Schedule 15 of the DCUSA

### COLLATED CONSULTATION 2 RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

			the template are govended
Northern Powergrid	Non-confidential	We are comfortable with the proposed drafted legal text.	Noted
ENWL	Non-confidential	No.	Noted
NGED	Non-confidential	Yes	Noted
Centrica	Non-confidential	I prefer the Cost Information Template to be included as an attached spreadsheet rather than the tables being within the legal text as they are currently. Having the template spreadsheet as an annex improves consistency across the DNOs, potentially making it easier for other industry parties who use templates from multiple DNOs.	Noted
Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc	Non-confidential	No further comments save the suggestion in response to Q1 above (Table 1 – Delta from Previous).	Noted
<p>Working Group Conclusions: Five responders said they had no comments on the draft legal text.</p> <p>One responder highlighted that it appeared that the titles of the columns in the tables (1&amp;2) within the screenshots incorporated within the Legal Text had some errors displaying.</p> <p>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</p>			

## DCP 421 'Update the Table in Schedule 15 of the DCUSA

### COLLATED CONSULTATION 2 RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	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?.	Working Group Comments
The Electricity Network Company Ltd.	Non-confidential	Yes, we agree that this is a reasonable time period for the changes to be updated by the Secretariat.	Agrees with 5 working days
UK Power Networks	Non-confidential	Yes we believe this is appropriate.	Agrees with 5 working days
Northern Powergrid	Non-confidential	Yes.	Agrees with 5 working days
ENWL	Non-confidential	Yes	Agrees with 5 working days
NGED	Non-confidential	No.	Agrees with 5 working days
Centrica	Non-confidential	I believe this to be an appropriate timescale. This falls in line with the timescales for publishing other elements such as DUoS Annual Review Packs by the secretariat.	Agrees with 5 working days
Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish	Non-confidential	Assume the 5 working days are forward looking and the changes are to do with the format, then yes. For example, in the unlikely event that the template was amended and updated on the DCUSA website close to the DNO submission date, we would need to agree a minimum number of days' notice for DNOs to use the new template (to allow for assurance processes),	Agrees with 5 working days

## DCP 421 'Update the Table in Schedule 15 of the DCUSA

### COLLATED CONSULTATION 2 RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc		or alternatively, the revised template would take effect from the next quarter.	
Working Group Conclusions: 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			

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	4. Do you have any other comments?	Working Group Comments
The Electricity Network Company Ltd.	Non-confidential	N/A	Noted
UK Power Networks	Non-confidential	No.	Noted

## DCP 421 'Update the Table in Schedule 15 of the DCUSA

### COLLATED CONSULTATION 2 RESPONSES WITH WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

Northern Powergrid	Non-confidential	No.	Noted
ENWL	Non-confidential	No.	Noted
NGED	Non-confidential	No.	Noted
Centrica	Non-confidential	No	Noted
Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc	Non-confidential	No further comments.	Noted
Working Group Conclusions: There were no additional comments provided by all the respondents.			