










DCUSA Change Declaration		At what stage is this document in the process?
<h1>DCP 460:</h1> <h2>Updating incorrect company names referenced throughout the DCUSA</h2> <p>Date Raised: 12 August 2025</p> <p>Proposer Name: Andy Green</p> <p>Company Name: ElectraLink</p> <p>Party Category: Secretariat</p>	01 – Change Proposal	
	02 – Consultation	
	03 – Change Report	
	04 – Change Declaration	
<p>Purpose of Change Proposal:</p> <p>The intent of this CP is to ensure that any references to the company names of specific Parties within the DCUSA are correct and to explore the possibility of future proofing these against any future changes.</p>		
	<p>Governance:</p> <p>DCUSA Parties have voted on DCUSA Change Proposal (DCP) 460 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. The DCUSA Parties consolidated votes are provided as Attachment 2.</p>	
	<p>For DCP 460, 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: DNOs / IDNOs</p>	
	<p>Impacted Clauses: Sections 2 and 3 of Schedule 2B and Paragraph 1.2 in both Schedules 17 and 18</p>	

Contents		 Any questions?
1	Summary	3
2	Governance	3
3	Why Change?	3
4	Solution and Legal Text	4
5	Code Specific Matters	6
6	Relevant Objectives	7
7	Impacts & Other Considerations	8
8	Voting	9
9	Implementation	9
10	Recommendations	9
11	Attachments	10
Timeline		 Contact: Code Administrator  DCUSA@electralink.co.uk  020 7432 3011 Proposer: Andy Green  Andy.green@electralink.co.uk
The Panel agreed to the following timetable:		
Initial Assessment Report	20 August 2025	
Consultation Issued to Industry Participants	N/A	
Change Report Approved by Panel	17 September 2025	
Change Report issued for Voting	18 September 2025	
Party Voting Closes	09 October 2025	
Change Declaration Issued to Parties	13 October 2025	
Change Declaration Issued to Authority	N/A	
Authority Decision	N/A	

1 Summary

What?

- 1.1 There are some company names referenced across several DCUSA schedules that are currently incorrect and should be amended.

Why?

- 1.2 If the change is not made, then the issue of the DCUSA containing incorrect company names is being perpetuated and it is our view that the DCUSA should not contain incorrect information.

How?

- 1.3 At a minimum, it is proposed that the incorrect company names be updated to reflect the correct company names and if, through exploration with DCUSA Ltd.'s legal advisors, a legally sound, and practicable to achieve option exists for future proofing the text, then that will be explored.

2 Governance

Justification for Part 1 or Part 2 Matter

- 2.1 This is a Part 2 Matter as the changes are cosmetic and will not have any material impact to any market participants or customers.

Next Steps

- 2.2 DCUSA Parties voted to accept DCP 460 and as such, it will be implemented.

3 Why Change?

- 3.1 As mentioned above, there are some company names referenced across several DCUSA schedules that are currently incorrect and should be amended.
- 3.2 As detailed in Section 5 below, this Change Proposal is being raised by the Secretariat following on from a discussion that was held during the July SIG meeting ([SIG 170](#)) as part of [DIF 85](#) where a vote was held to determine if the Secretariat should raise a CP to update the company names. The outcome of that vote was that 2 DNOs, 3 suppliers and 2 IDNOs had voted for the secretariat to raise a CP with no votes against and no votes abstaining. Further detail of the vote can be found within the DCUSA SIG 170 minutes by clicking on the SIG 170 link in above.
- 3.3 At that meeting it was discussed that the CP could go to a Working Group for further development but having considered the best approach we have opted for a different approach which is explained below.

- 3.4 We believe the best way forward would to avoid using industry time and resource on something that is technically a housekeeping Change Proposal and that to address the points raised during the SIG meeting as to whether or not there is a viable way to future proof the text, then this would be something that could be put to the legal advisors when issuing the legal text for their review. We believe that there are likely to be few credible routes by which future proofing can be achieved and therefore it would be best to use the most appropriate resource available.
- 3.5 If the legal advice were to come back with an array of different options to select, then we would be happy to take this back to the Panel and seek their steer as to whether or not a Working Group was now required in order to put options forward to Parties as to which they prefer.

4 Solution and Legal Text

Background

- 4.1 As noted in Section 3 above, having considered the discussion held during the SIG meeting, where it was agreed that the Secretariat should raise this Change Proposal; we suggested an approach by which we seek clarity from DCUSA Ltd.'s legal advisors as to the question of future proofing the text so further updates, if a company name changes, can be avoided.
- 4.2 We also decided that we could utilise the DCMDG meeting as means of testing if there was both an appetite for future proofing the text and if so, whether there was a preference between the options that had been identified (Company Registration numbers, GSP groups or MPIDs). It seemed clear from the reaction that there was appetite to future proof and as to the options mentioned:
- the use of Company Registration numbers was ruled as it would require anyone who didn't already know which schedule applies to which DNO to conduct a search for the company numbers.
 - out of the remaining options, there was support for both, as set out below:
 - there was a stronger preference for using MPIDs as they were seen as something that most market participants are able to understand and decode. We also thought this would be the better option as it still retains a link back through to the DCUSA as Market Domain IDs are available via the website and is a defined term in the DCUSA.
 - using GSP Groups was a second preference but still supported as means for future proofing but came with the draw back of not being as well known to market participants and might require more of them to look up which is applicable to who. We also thought this would be a less useful option GSP Groups doesn't link back through to the DCUSA as they do not form part of the Party details and whilst the term is used about 19 times throughout the DCUSA, it isn't officially defined (although in some cases it is used with the addition of (as defined in the BSC) after it.

4.3 It should be noted that with respect to all option to future-proof, there would be some degree of specificity lost, and could mean more work for people outside the industry, or even those that are new to the industry to understand which companies use which schedule. That being said, it should also be noted that it appears that the intent of the wording in Schedules 17 and 18 is really a direction to the respective DNOs and not necessarily a way to communicate to the outside world who uses what, even though it does currently include that as a benefit.

4.4 In seeking guidance from DCUSA Ltd.'s legal advisors, we set out a number of options, which included:

Schedule 2B 'National Terms of Connection'

- That the bare minimum change would be to just update the company names and noted that was of course the most simple option but doesn't future proof the text as had been identified during a SIG meeting as something that might be beneficial. We noted it did have a benefit of not introducing a change to the way the text currently operates, which the future proofed option would.
- That a way to future proof the text against further company name changes would essentially to remove the carve out for the two companies currently listed and included wording that would have the effect of apply the laws of England and Wales between customers located in England and Wales and distributors who whose companies are registered in England and Wales. It would also state that Scots law would apply between customers located in Scotland and distributors whose companies are registered in Scotland. We noted that doing so would alter the current operation of the text in that it was potentially changing which legal system is applicable for customers connected to IDNO networks as well as for the IDNOs themselves.

Schedules 17 and 18 'EHV Distribution Charging Methodologies'

- We explained the options available, and the detail set out under paragraph 4.2 above, including the preferences of the DCMDG.

The views from the legal advisors

4.5 The below sets out the response from the legal advisors:

1. **Regarding Schedule 2B (NTC)** – *in addition to the need for certainty, the wording here also needs to be fair to consumers and needs to be capable of being readily understood by domestic and non-domestic consumers. In terms of fairness, one would ordinarily expect consumers in Scotland to be able to bring or defend claims in Scotland.*

The current approach starts from this expected position, but allows a qualification for those consumers on the Scottish-English border who are connected to the NE and NW DNO networks. This was presumably at the request of the NE and NW DNOs, so that they don't have to engage in Scottish law, and on the basis that it is not too unusual or inconvenient for a relatively small number of consumers on the border to have to operate under English law in the English courts.

The first alternative of the legal drafting maintains this approach. Use of the legal names seems the best way to identify these two DNOs, and the names will hopefully be familiar to consumers. Inclusion of the company numbers means that the position is still certain from a legal perspective even if the names change and there is a delay in updating the DCUSA.

The second alternative presents an entirely different approach. By focusing on the DNO/IDNO's jurisdiction of incorporation, the focus moves from what is fair to consumers, and instead focusses on what is convenient to DNO/IDNO. As you identify in your comments - an IDNO which operating in the Scottish Highlands/Islands but happens to be incorporated in E&W will dictate that their

consumers are bound by English law and English courts, meaning that consumers in those areas would need to engage English lawyers and bring/defend claims in courts which are a long way away.

It may be that the proposer/working group have or can come up with good reasons why this should not matter – for example, it's possible that very few claims have or are likely to be brought. This will, however, need to be given proper consideration – particularly as this will retrospectively be changing the governing law of existing NTC contracts.

A third alternative would be to remove the exceptions for the NE and NW DNOs, and just say that the governing law and jurisdiction are Scottish if the consumer is in Scotland. Has SP ENW or Northern Powergrid expressed a view on whether they want/need to maintain the exceptions which apply to them?

2. **Regarding Schedules 17 and 18 (EDCM)** – this is a very different proposition. I agree with the DCMDG – my preference is also to use Market Domain IDs.

Our final position

4.6 Have considered the comments from the legal advisors, we concluded the following:

- That for the company names in Schedule 2B ‘National Terms of Connection’, that the simple approach of just updating the company names was most appropriate. We noted the question from the legal advisors with respect to a third alternative solution but expect the statement made regarding the original future-proofing option would likely apply to this option too, albeit to a lesser extent. For clarity, that option would have been to check with both Electricity North West and Northern Powergrid if they were happy for the exception that applies to them currently to be removed, but we chose not to ask them. The applicable statement from the legal advisors with respect to the original future-proofing option was that it would “*need to be given proper consideration – particularly as this will retrospectively be changing the governing law of existing NTC contracts.*”. As we expect that statement applies equally to the alternative suggested by the legal advisors (just to a lesser extent), we don’t believe that the intent of this change is broad enough to possibly encompass “*retrospectively changing the governing law of existing NTC contracts*” even if it did future proof the text moving forward.
- That for the company names in Schedules 17 and 18, due to the support for future proofing provided by members of the DCMDG, as well as the agreement of the legal advisors in terms of the preference of options, swapping the company names for applicable MPIDs was the best approach to use.

Legal Text and additional commentary

4.7 The legal text can be found in Attachment 1 to this Change Declaration, and we are comfortable that it meets the intent of the change.

4.8 As noted in the Change Proposal form itself, we intend on taking the proposed solution to the Panel as per any other change, but will seek additional confirmation as to whether they consider that a Working Group should still review and further refine what we’ve put forward and our rationale for putting it forward. We are doing so on the basis that the SIG had originally suggested this change be developed by a Working Group but where we considered that might be a waste of industry time and thought legal advice might settle the matter without the need for industry to attend

5 Code Specific Matters

Reference Documents

- 5.1 This Change Proposal is being raised as a result of the continued vigilance of the DCUSA Panel, DCUSA Parties, and the DCUSA Code Administrator. The incorrect company names were found and then the Panel was notified and where the Panel agreed to add this as an item to the Panel's 'Housekeeping Log' with a view to resolving the issue alongside other Housekeeping Items in the log.
- 5.2 Following a discussion at a recent Panel meeting, and the raising of DCP 457 'Housekeeping Items', it was agreed for the DCUSA Code Administrator to take this as a separate issue to the Standing Issues Group for further consideration. The item was then discussed at the July SIG meeting ([SIG 170](#)) as part of [DIF 85](#) and where a vote was held to determine if the DCUSA Code Administrator (also known as the Secretariat) should raise a CP to update the company names.

6 Relevant Objectives

Assessment Against the DCUSA Objectives

- 6.1 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.
- 6.2 The Proposer considers that the following DCUSA General Objectives are better facilitated by this CP

	DCUSA General Objectives	Identified impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. The development, maintenance and operation by the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of efficient, co-ordinated, and economical Distribution Networks	None
<input type="checkbox"/>	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	None
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. The efficient discharge by the DNO Parties and IDNO Parties of obligations imposed upon them in their Distribution Licences	None
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4. The promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the DCUSA	Positive
<input type="checkbox"/>	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

- 6.3 DCUSA General Objective 4 will be better facilitated by this change as it is clearly more efficient to correct incorrect company names than to leave them in place and in the case of future proofing the text moving forward, then that can only be seen as even more efficient than just correcting them.

7 Impacts & Other Considerations

Impacts on any Significant Code Review (SCR) or other significant industry change projects

- 7.1 We do not believe that this CP impacts upon any current SCR or other significant industry change projects or that any significant industry change projects will impact upon the progression of the Change Proposal.

Impacts on other Codes

- 7.2 We have considered whether any other industry codes might be impacted as a result of this Change Proposal and have concluded that there is no impact on any other industry codes if this Change Proposal is to be progressed.

Grid Code.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	SEC.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	CUSC.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distribution Code...	<input type="checkbox"/>	REC.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	BSC.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
None.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

Consumer Impacts

- 7.3 We have assessed whether there may be direct or indirect impacts on consumers and in doing so, we have concluded that there may be some very small positive and negative impacts for consumers as a result of this Change Proposal progressing. The small positive impact could be realised if or when a consumer were to read through the National Terms of Connection and not come across incorrect company names which could otherwise cause confusion. The small negative impact could be realised if or when a consumer were to read through Schedules 17 or 18 and can't identify which DNO uses which methodology, however, we note that customers are likely to view the DNOs charging statements on their websites, rather than the methodologies themselves and the DNOs identify which of the methodologies they use in those statements.

Environmental Impacts

- 7.4 In accordance with DCUSA Clause 10.4.5A, we have assessed whether there would be a material impact on greenhouse gas emissions if this CP were implemented and following that assessment, we concluded that there would be no impacts on greenhouse gas emissions if this CP were implemented.

Wider Industry Impacts

- 7.5 We note that the National Terms of Connection will need to be republished via the ENA website and there may be a requirement to place a notice in the London Gazette to advise of the changes made, although we will confirm this with the Panel as the change are of a housekeeping nature and do not impact the contractual arrangements. We do not believe there are any other wider industry impacts as a result of this Change Proposal being progressed.

8 Voting

8.1 The 460 Change Report was issued to DCUSA Parties for Voting on 18 September 2025.

Part 2 Matter: Authority Decision **is not** Required

DCP 460 Proposed Variation (Solution) Decision

8.2 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%

8.3 DCUSA Parties have voted to **accept** the proposed variation (solution) of DCP 460.

DCP 460 Implementation Date Decision

8.4 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%.

8.5 DCUSA Parties have voted to **accept** the implementation date of DCP 460.

The table below sets out the outcome of the votes that were received in respect of the DCP 460 Change Report that was issued on 18 September 2025 for a period of 15 working days.

DCP 460	WEIGHTED VOTING					
	DNO	IDNO	SUPPLIER	SAFE ISOLATION PROVIDER	CVA REGISTRANTS	GAS SUPPLIER
CHANGE SOLUTION	Accept	Accept	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
IMPLEMENTATION DATE	Accept	Accept	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

9 Implementation

Implementation Date

9.1 DCUSA Parties have voted on DCP 460, with the outcome being a decision to accept the implementation date of 06 November 2025.

10 Recommendations

DCUSA Parties

10.1 DCUSA Parties have voted on DCP 460, with the outcome being a decision to accept the Change Proposal and thus the proposed variation to the DCUSA **will be** made.

11 Attachments

- Attachment 1 – DCP 460 Legal Text
- Attachment 2 – DCP 460 Consolidated Party Votes