

CUSC Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma**CMP316: TNUoS Arrangements for Co-located Generation Sites**

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 28 February 2022**. Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration by the Workgroup.

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

Respondent details	Please enter your details
Respondent name:	Ryan Ward
Company name:	ScottishPower Renewables
Email address:	Ryan.ward@scottishpower.com
Phone number:	07818538595

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, the Workgroup 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;*
- 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 (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 regarding the Workgroup Consultation in the right-hand side of the table below, including your rationale.

Standard Workgroup Consultation questions		
1	Do you believe that the CMP316 Original Proposal better facilitates the Applicable Objectives?	<div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it better facilitates objectives: <div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> E </div> </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> No, it has a negative effect on objectives: <div> <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> E </div> </div> <div>C, D & E – Neutral</div>
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No </div> <div>The proposed implementation date of 01/04/2023 is deemed reasonable this aligns with the upcoming TNUoS charging year.</div>
3	Do you have any other comments?	This will only leave NGESO 6 months from decision to implementation, which could be challenging.
4	Do you wish to raise a Workgroup Consultation Alternative Request for the Workgroup to consider?	<div> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No </div> <div>N/A</div>

Specific Workgroup Consultation questions		
5	Do you think it is appropriate to publish on the TEC register the MFSSTEC for each technology type? Please give your justification.	<div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No </div> <div><i>SPR welcome additional transparency within the industry but recognise that confidentiality issues should be considered in relation to co-located assets that would have otherwise only be contained in a user's connection agreement.</i></div>

6	Which of the solutions to source the installed capacity is your preference and why? As set out in the Connection Agreement (Original) or the Declaration route (potential alternative).	<div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> As set out in the Connection Agreement (Original)</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Declaration route (potential alternative)</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)</div> <div>Using the information as stated within the connection agreement ensures consistency. This would also be more efficient to audit as a user may declare a value different from their contracted position.</div> <div><i>However, users should be given the opportunity to challenge what has been proposed.</i></div>
---	---	---