

## CUSC Alternative and Workgroup Vote

### CMP364: Definition changes for CMP363

**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 CUSC Modifications (WACMs).

#### 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.

#### Terms used in this document

Term	Meaning
Baseline	The current CUSC (if voting for the Baseline, you believe no modification should be made)
Original	The solution which was firstly proposed by the Proposer of the modification
WACM	Workgroup Alternative CUSC Modification (an Alternative Solution which has been developed by the Workgroup)

#### The applicable CUSC (Non-Charging) objectives are:

- The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence;
- 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;
- Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency \*; and
- Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements.

\*Objective (c) refers specifically to European Regulation 2009/714/EC. Reference to the Agency is to the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER).

\*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 CUSC 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 Chair believe that the potential alternative solution may better facilitate the CUSC objectives than the Original proposal then the potential alternative will be fully developed by the Workgroup with legal text to form a Workgroup Alternative CUSC 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

**No Alternative Vote for CMP364**

## 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)
	Grahame Neale - ESO				
Original	Y	Y	-	Y	Y
Voting Statement:					
This modification will affect the Applicable CUSC Objectives (ACOs) as follows;					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Positive as it was a requirement of Ofgem's decision on CMP334 to update the CUSC to provide this clarity.</li> <li>b. Positive as it provides clarity in the treatment of TNUoS demand residual charges in respect of complicated sites (that have a mix of Final and non-Final Demand) to ensure a level playing field across these types of site and so enhance competition.</li> <li>c. Neutral as this modification does not impact this ACO.</li> <li>d. Positive as the removal of uncertainty will increase how efficiently the charging arrangements.</li> </ul>					

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)	Better facilitates ACO (c)	Better facilitates ACO (d)	Overall (Y/N)
	Lee Stone – E.ON				
Original	Y	-	Y	-	Y
Voting Statement:					
I believe this modification is necessary in order to adequately enable sites with mix of Final and non-Final Demand in line with TCR direction, therefore CMP364 is positive against Applicable Code Objectives a and c.					

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	-	Y	-	Y
Voting Statement:					

This modification is necessary for CMP364 and therefore provides the same benefits. It is consistent with the Authority's decision on recovering the residual and therefore positive against ACOs a) and c).

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)	Better facilitates ACO (c)	Better facilitates ACO (d)	Overall (Y/N)
Simon Vicary – EDF Energy					
Original	Y	-	Y	-	Y
Voting Statement:					
This modification is necessary for CMP363. It is positive against ACO's a and c					

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)	Better facilitates ACO (c)	Better facilitates ACO (d)	Better facilitates ACO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
Edda Dirks – SSE Generation Limited						
Original	Y	Y	-	Y		Y
Voting Statement:						
<p><i>AO a. – transmission licence obligations</i>            Positive - we consider that this proposal enables the ESO to comply with its obligations in terms of Ofgem's direction to address the defect described in this proposal</p> <p><i>AO b. – effective competition</i>            Positive - we consider that this proposal would create a more level playing field between non-final demand at stand-alone sites and at mixed demand sites in respect of their residual liability, and hence improve competition.</p> <p><i>AO c. – compliance with EU regulations</i>            Neutral.</p> <p><i>AO d. – efficiency – charging methodology</i>            Positive - we consider that the proposal promotes this objective by creating a clear and TCR-compliant process for the correct allocation of residual charges.</p>						

## Stage 2b – Workgroup Vote

Which option is the best? (Baseline or Proposer solution (Original))

Workgroup Member	Company	BEST Option?	Which objective(s) does the change better facilitate? (if baseline not applicable)
Grahame Neale	ESO	Original	a, b, d
Lee Stone	E.ON	Original	a, c
Grace March	Sembcorp	Original	a, c
Simon Vicary	EDF Energy	Original	a, c
Edda Dirks	SSE Generation Limited	Original	a, b, d

Of the 5 votes, how many voters said this option was better than the Baseline.

Option	Number of voters that voted this option as better than the Baseline
Original	5