

**Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma****CMP395: Cap BSUoS costs and Defer payment to 2023/24 to protect GB customers**

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](mailto:cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com) by **5pm on 01 September 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 Paul Mullen [Paul.j.mullen@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:Paul.j.mullen@nationalgrideso.com) or [cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com)

Respondent details	Please enter your details
<b>Respondent name:</b>	Sean Gauton
<b>Company name:</b>	Uniper
<b>Email address:</b>	sean.gauton@uniper.energy
<b>Phone number:</b>	+44 7971 038886

**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 (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.*

*\*The Electricity Regulation referred to in objective (d) is Regulation (EU) 2019/943 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 June 2019 on the internal market for electricity (recast) as it has effect immediately before IP completion day as read with the modifications set out in the SI 2020/1006.*

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

Standard Workgroup Consultation questions		
1	Do you believe that the Original Proposal or any of the potential alternative solutions better facilitates the Applicable Objectives?	<p>Mark the Objectives which you believe each solution better facilitates:</p> <p>Original      <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>A    <input type="checkbox"/>B    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>C    <input type="checkbox"/>D    <input type="checkbox"/>E</p> <p>If implemented the proposal would help companies to better manage BSUoS charges in the interests of a broad group of stakeholders.</p>
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>No</p> <p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>
3	Do you have any other comments?	None.
4	Do you wish to raise a Workgroup Consultation Alternative Request for the Workgroup to consider?	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>No</p> <p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>

Specific Workgroup Consultation questions		
1	The CMP395 Original proposes to set a £15/MWh cap on BSUoS. Do you think it is appropriate to set a BSUoS cap and if so to what value? Please provide the rationale for your response including any supporting analysis.	The proposal sets out the benefits of imposing a BSUoS cap. Given that the ESO can support £250M of costs, the £15/MWh cap would appear to be an appropriate level.
2	Do you think it is appropriate to	No. The intention is to remove uncertainty from BSUoS charges so that a lower risk premium can be included in

	introduce a rules based re-assessment of the BSUoS cap on utilisation against the limit of the additional BSUoS costs that would be deferred. If so, on what basis? Please provide the rationale for your response.	pricing. A re-assessment adds back some of the uncertainty removed by introducing the cap.
3	The CMP395 Original seeks to defer the additional BSUoS costs above the cap to the 2023/2024 charging year. Recovery of the deferred costs is proposed to commence from 1 April 2023. Do you agree with this approach? Please provide rationale for your response.	Yes. This approach is proven in previous CUSC modifications.
4	CMP308 comes into effect on 1 April 2023 and removes the payment of BSUoS from Generators. Against this backdrop, the Workgroup have considered options to recover deferred costs from Generators from 1 April 2023. Do you support any of the options proposed?. Please provide justification for your response.	In the context of the change in BSUoS charging it is noted that the ESO will not have a system in place to automatically bill BSUoS to generators after 1 April 2023. Option 3b is the most appropriate option. A manual process is acceptable but the ESO must put forward a transparent method of calculation that allows all parties to verify the accuracy of invoices.
5	Do you think it is appropriate to introduce a Supplier BSUoS cap only or a BSUoS cap for Suppliers and	It is appropriate that the cap should be applied to suppliers and generators. The intention of the proposal is not to reallocate costs between parties.

	Generators?. Please provide the rationale for your response.	
6	The CMP395 Original seeks to limit the additional BSUoS costs that would be deferred to £250m. Do you think it is appropriate to introduce a limit and if so to what value? Please provide the rationale for your response.	It is appropriate to introduce a limit to the support provided. Given ESO funding constraints £250m gives a manageable level of BSUoS cost deferral.
7	Do you agree that reporting of the percentage utilisation of the deferred amount should be in line with that introduced for CMP381. Please provide justification for your response.	Yes. This will allow parties to manage activities appropriately.
8	Does the CMP395 Original proposal or any of the potential alternative solutions impact your business and/or end consumers. If so, how? <b>Confidential Information can be shared with Ofgem directly particularly where it relates to Ofgem's Urgency Criteria.</b>	As described in the proposal, a cap on BSUoS, along with other factors, will be considered in pricing decisions.
9	Do you support the view that CMP395 would mean reduced overall BSUoS costs (as a result of reduced risk premia) and therefore benefit consumers. Please provide the rationale	Capping the BSUoS charge may have a downward pressure on overall BSUoS costs but is only one of multiple factors which influence BSUoS costs.

<p>for your response. <b><i>Confidential Information can be shared with Ofgem directly particularly where it relates to Ofgem's Urgency Criteria.</i></b></p>	
---	--