

CUSC Alternative and Workgroup Vote

CMP339: Consequential changes for CMP317/327 (TCR)

Please note: To participate in any votes, Workgroup members need to have attended at least 50% of meetings.

Stage 1 - Alternative Vote

If Workgroup Alternative Requests have been made, vote on whether they should become Workgroup Alternative Code Modifications.

Stage 2 - Workgroup Vote

2a) Assess the original and WACMs (if there are any) against the CUSC objectives compared to the baseline (the current CUSC).

2b) If WACMs exist, vote on whether each WACM better facilitates the Applicable CUSC Objectives better than the Original Modification Proposal.

2c) Vote on which of the options is best.

The Applicable CUSC Objectives (Non-Charging) are:

(a) The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence;

(b) Facilitating effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity, and (so far as consistent therewith) facilitating such competition in the sale, distribution and purchase of electricity;

(c) Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency *; and

(d) Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements.*Objective (d) refers specifically to European Regulation 2009/714/EC. Reference to the Agency is to the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER).

Workgroup Vote

Stage 1 – Alternative Vote

Vote on Workgroup Alternative Requests to become Workgroup Alternative Code Modifications.

The Alternative vote is carried out to identify the level of Workgroup support there is for any potential alternative options that have been brought forward by either any member of the Workgroup OR an Industry Participant as part of the Workgroup Consultation.

Should the majority of the Workgroup OR the Chairman believe that the potential alternative solution would better facilitate the CUSC objectives then the potential alternative will be fully developed by the Workgroup with legal text to form a Workgroup Alternative Code modification (WACM) and submitted to the Panel and Authority alongside the Original solution for the Panel Recommendation vote and the Authority decision.

“Y” = Yes

“N” = No

“-“ = Neutral

Alternative Number	WACM? Y/N/-
1	Y
2	Y
3	Y
4	Y
5	Y
6	Y
7	Y
8	Y
9	Y
10	Y
11	Y
12	Y
13	Y
14	Y
15	Y
16	Y
17	Y
18	Y
19	Y
20	Y
21	Y
22	Y

23	Y
----	---

Stage 2a – Assessment against objectives

To assess the original and WACMs against the CUSC objectives compared to the baseline (the current CUSC).

You will also be asked to provide a statement to be added to the Workgroup Report alongside your vote to assist the reader in understanding the rationale for your vote.

ACO = Applicable CUSC Objective

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)	Better facilitates ACO (c)	Better facilitates ACO (d)	Overall (Y/N)
Grace March - Sembcorp					
Original	Y	N	-	Y	Y
WACM 1	Y	-	-	Y	Y
WACM 2	Y	N	-	Y	Y
WACM 3	Y	-	-	Y	Y
WACM 4	Y	N	-	Y	Y
WACM 5	Y	-	-	Y	Y
WACM 6	Y	N	-	Y	Y
WACM 7	Y	-	-	Y	Y
WACM 8	Y	N	-	Y	Y
WACM 9	Y	-	-	Y	Y
WACM 10	Y	N	-	Y	Y
WACM 11	Y	-	-	Y	Y
WACM 12	Y	N	-	Y	Y
WACM 13	Y	-	-	Y	Y
WACM 14	Y	N	-	Y	Y
WACM 15	Y	-	-	Y	Y
WACM 16	Y	N	-	Y	Y
WACM 17	Y	-	-	Y	Y
WACM 18	Y	N	-	Y	Y
WACM 19	Y	-	-	Y	Y
WACM 20	Y	N	-	Y	Y
WACM 21	Y	-	-	Y	Y
WACM 22	Y	N	-	Y	Y
WACM 23	Y	-	-	Y	Y

Voting Statement:

All proposed solutions have the appropriate definitions for the solutions to CMP317/327 and therefore will facilitate the final solution, so are positive against ACO (d). All solutions are potentially necessary, depending on which solution to CMP317/327 is implemented.

The most correct interpretation of the connection exclusion is “All local circuits & local substations except for pre-existing assets and shared assets” as the other options are too broad or too narrow. WACMs with these definitions are less positive against ACO(a) (as they allow the ESO to reduce the risk of breaching the Limiting Regulation) but are still an

improvement on the baseline. The CMP339 proposed solutions reflect the intention of the relative proposed solution to CMP317/327 and they are therefore correct.

Not having a set target will leave average charges on generators close to the upper limit of €2.50 and will have a negative impact on competition. WACMs which don't have a definition of a Target Rate are therefore negative against ACO(b).

WACMs that do not define Relevant BSC charges and Ancillary Services exclusion are less effective at facilitating ACO(a) as I believe those elements need to be considered in order to avoid a breach of the Limiting Regulation.

Stage 2b – WACM Vote (If required)

Where one or more WACMs exist, does each WACM better facilitates the Applicable CUSC Objectives than the Original Modification Proposal?

WACM Number	Better than original?
1	Y
2	N
3	Y
4	N
5	Y
6	Y
7	Y
8	Y
9	Y
10	Y
11	Y
12	Y
13	Y
14	Y
15	Y
16	Y
17	Y
18	Y
19	Y
20	Y
21	Y
22	Y
23	Y

Stage 2c – Workgroup Vote

Which option is the best? (Baseline, Proposer solution (Original Proposal), WACM1 or WACM2)

Workgroup Member	Company	BEST Option?	Which objective(s) does the change better facilitate? (if baseline not applicable)
Grace March	Sembcorp Energy UK	WACM 23	(a) and (d)