

Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma**CMP288/289: Explicit charging arrangements for customer delays and backfeeds (CMP288) and consequential change (CMP289)**

Industry parties are invited to respond to this consultation expressing their views and supplying the rationale for those views, particularly in respect of any specific questions detailed below.

Please send your responses to cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com by **5pm** on **27 April 2022**. Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration.

If you have any queries on the content of this consultation, please contact Jennie Groome Jennifer.Groome@nationalgrideso.com or cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com

Respondent details	Please enter your details
Respondent name:	Andy Vaudin
Company name:	EDF Energy
Email address:	andy.vaudin@edfenergy.com
Phone number:	07580526370

I wish my response to be:

(Please mark the relevant box)

☒ Non-Confidential☐ Confidential

Note: A confidential response will be disclosed to the Authority in full but, unless agreed otherwise, will not be shared with the Panel or the industry and may therefore not influence the debate to the same extent as a non-confidential response.

For reference the Applicable CUSC (non-charging) Objectives 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 (c) refers specifically to European Regulation 2009/714/EC. Reference to the Agency is to the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER).*

For reference the Applicable CUSC (charging) Objectives are:

- a. That compliance with the use of system charging methodology facilitates effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity and (so far as is consistent therewith) facilitates competition in the sale, distribution and purchase of electricity;
- b. That compliance with the use of system charging methodology results in charges which reflect, as far as is reasonably practicable, the costs (excluding any payments between transmission licensees which are made under and accordance with the STC) incurred by transmission licensees in their transmission businesses and which are compatible with standard licence condition C26 requirements of a connect and manage connection);
- c. That, so far as is consistent with sub-paragraphs (a) and (b), the use of system charging methodology, as far as is reasonably practicable, properly takes account of the developments in transmission licensees' transmission businesses;
- d. Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency *; and
- e. Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the system charging methodology.

*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).

Please express your views in the right-hand side of the table below, including your rationale.

Standard Workgroup Consultation questions - CMP288								
1	Do you believe that the Original Proposal better facilitates the Applicable Objectives?	<p>Mark the Objectives which you believe the Original solution better facilitates:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Original</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>A</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>B</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>C</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>D</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>E</td> </tr> </table> <p>The Original Proposal does not better facilitate the objectives as no detail on the delay charging methodology is set out in the CUSC with this proposal. This proposal just references the existing TO Charging Statements, which have very different levels of detail on delay charges for each TO.</p>	Original	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> E
Original	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> E			
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>No</p> <p>We do not support the current implementation approach, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detail on the delay charging methodology should be set out in the CUSC, which is subject to industry open-governance, rather than the CUSC just referencing each TO's Charging Statement as in this proposal. These TO charging statements are amended annually by the individual TO. They are not subject to industry review. The Scottish and England/Wales TOs currently 						

		<p>have very different levels of detail on delay charges in their Charging Statements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be a mechanism to address delay charges associated with shared and wider works. Ideally the charges should be “shallow” and only reflect a user’s contribution to the need for the works. In this proposal, the first party to delay would be hit with delay costs associated with all of the works. Detail should be provided in the CUSC on the degree to which charges might apply retrospectively following implementation of this modification. This is not clear in the proposal. The proposal does not include a requirement for the TO/ESO to regularly inform users of actual and forecast spend on connection works, allowing the users to assess potential delay charge liabilities. This should be included in the CUSC text.
3	Do you have any other comments?	None
4	Do you wish to raise a Workgroup Consultation Alternative Request for the Workgroup to consider?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.

Specific Workgroup Consultation questions – CMP288/289

1	Are there other supporting commercial processes (either codified or not) which could impact successfully applying delay charges/backfeed charges which the Workgroup have not considered? Please explain how CMP288 may impact them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No None known at present
2	Do you have any comments in respect of the options set out for Shared Works?	There should be a mechanism to address delay charges associated with shared and wider works. Ideally the charges should be “shallow” and only reflect a user’s contribution to the need for the works. In this proposal,

		the first party to delay would be hit with delay costs associated with all of the works.
3	Do you think the CMP289 modification is required? If so, please provide your justification. <i>If you think CMP289 is required, please continue to answer the CMP289 Workgroup consultation questions.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Not known at present

Standard Workgroup Consultation questions – CMP289

1	Do you believe that the Original Proposal and WACM1/WAGCM1 better facilitates the Applicable Objectives?	Mark the Objectives which you believe the Original solution better facilitates: <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Original</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> A</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> B</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> C</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> D</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> E</td> </tr> </table> Click or tap here to enter text.	Original	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> E
Original	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> E			
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.						
3	Do you have any other comments?	Click or tap here to enter text.						
4	Do you wish to raise a Workgroup Consultation Alternative Request for the Workgroup to consider?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.						