

**Code Administrator Consultation Response Proforma****CMP392: Transparency and legal certainty as to the calculation of TNUoS in conformance with the Limiting Regulation**

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 **04 September 2023**. 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 Teri Puddefoot [terri.puddefoot@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:terri.puddefoot@nationalgrideso.com) or [cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com).

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
<b>Respondent name:</b>	Jacqueline Wilkie	
<b>Company name:</b>	SSEN-Transmission	
<b>Email address:</b>	Jacqueline.wilkie@sse.com	
<b>Phone number:</b>	Click or tap here to enter text.	
<b>Which best describes your organisation?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer body <input type="checkbox"/> Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator <input type="checkbox"/> Generator <input type="checkbox"/> Industry body <input type="checkbox"/> Interconnector	<input type="checkbox"/> Storage <input type="checkbox"/> Supplier <input type="checkbox"/> System Operator <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transmission Owner <input type="checkbox"/> Virtual Lead Party <input type="checkbox"/> Other

**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:**

- 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;*
- 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);*
- 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 Code Administrator Consultation questions								
1	Please provide your assessment for the proposed solution(s) against the Applicable Objectives?	<p>Mark the Objectives which you believe the proposed solution(s) better facilitates:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Original</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>D <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>E</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WACM1</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>D <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>E</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WACM2</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>D <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>E</td> </tr> </table> <p>The proposals provide transparency of the charging methodology and define the assets under 'Connection Exclusion'. This allows for better understanding of the charges applied which should improve related administration processes.</p>	Original	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E	WACM1	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E	WACM2	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E
Original	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E							
WACM1	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E							
WACM2	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E							
2	Do you have a preferred proposed solution?	<p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Original  <input type="checkbox"/>WACM1  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>WACM2  <input type="checkbox"/>Baseline  <input type="checkbox"/>No preference         </p> <p>Transparency of the methodology is good to have under the Original Proposal, in addition to the clarity on definition in terminology. Reporting of charges on a project-by-project basis would go further in demonstrating the open ness of the charging process.</p>						
3	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes  <input type="checkbox"/>No         </p> <p>We support the code modification as it introduces visibility, transparency and consistency into TNUoS calculations.</p>						
4	Do you have any other comments?	Click or tap here to enter text.						