

**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>	Paul Youngman	
<b>Company name:</b>	Drax	
<b>Email address:</b>	Paul.Youngman@drax.com	
<b>Phone number:</b>	07738802266	
<b>Which best describes your organisation?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer body <input type="checkbox"/> Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Generator <input type="checkbox"/> Industry body <input type="checkbox"/> Interconnector	<input type="checkbox"/> Storage <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supplier <input type="checkbox"/> System Operator <input 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:**

- 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 Code Administrator Consultation questions		
1	Please provide your assessment for the proposed solution(s) against the Applicable Objectives?	Mark the Objectives which you believe the proposed solution(s) better facilitates:
		Original <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E
		WACM1 <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> E NEG (A)
		WACM2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E
<p>Improvements in transparency are very important to market participants, especially where deriving and applying charges. We agree with the unanimous findings of the workgroup that the Original proposal and WACM 2 are improvements on the baseline arrangements.</p> <p>The original and WACM 2 provide clear obligations and a higher degree of certainty to users compared to either the baseline or WACM1. Both the original and WACM 2 improve transparency and provide certainty as to the compliance obligations of the ESO. We expect positive benefits to applicable objectives A, B and E for both our preferred options. The improved transparency provided by the change should have a positive impact on competition AO (a) by providing greater certainty to all users as to the calculation and methodology used. Having a calculation that is transparent, compliant and repeatable should enhance AO (B) and provide assurance that costs are appropriately reflected in users charges. We also agree with the proposer that AO (e) should be positively impacted by providing clarity to all users of the charges that are or are not excluded. Over time this should reduce disputes and improve the efficiency of the system charging methodology.</p> <p>We did not view WACM 1 as having any particular benefit against the current arrangements, and viewed it as potentially negative against competition AO (a) as it could lead to more instances of information asymmetry between parties and consequential disputes. We note the workgroup also voted against WACM1 progressing.</p>		
2	Do you have a preferred proposed solution?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> WACM1 <input type="checkbox"/> WACM2 <input type="checkbox"/> Baseline <input type="checkbox"/> No preference
		The original solution is our preference - WACM2 would also be acceptable.

3	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		Click or tap here to enter text.
4	Do you have any other comments?	No other comments.