

Stage 4: Final CUSC Modification Report	At what stage is this document in the process?
<h1>CMP319:</h1> <p>Consequential changes to section 11 of the CUSC as a result of CMP280 and/or 281</p>	<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; align-items: flex-end;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 5px; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px; display: flex; align-items: center;"> 01 <div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 5px; padding: 2px 5px; flex-grow: 1;">Proposal Form</div> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 5px; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px; display: flex; align-items: center;"> 02 <div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 5px; padding: 2px 5px; flex-grow: 1;">Code Administrator Consultation</div> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 5px; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px; display: flex; align-items: center;"> 03 <div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 5px; padding: 2px 5px; flex-grow: 1;">Draft CUSC Modification Report</div> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 5px; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px; display: flex; align-items: center;"> 04 <div style="background-color: #00a651; color: white; border-radius: 5px; padding: 2px 5px; flex-grow: 1;">Final CUSC Modification Report</div> </div> </div>
<p>Purpose of Modification: As part of the Workgroup analysis, the Workgroup identified that CMP 280 and 281 are charging modification and as such can only change section 14 of the CUSC. If either modification is approved changes to other non-charging sections of the CUSC will be required. These changes cannot be achieved with CMP280 and CMP281. The principle addition related to the definitions of storage as a class. The definitions are common to CMP 280, 281 and their alternates.</p>	
	<p>This Final CUSC Modification Report has been prepared in accordance with the terms of the CUSC. An electronic version of this document and all other CMP319 related documentation can be found on the National Grid ESO website via the following link:</p> <p>https://www.nationalgrideso.com/codes/connection-and-use-system-code-cusc/modifications/consequential-changes-section-11-cusc</p> <p>At the Special CUSC Panel meeting on 12 September 2019, the Panel members agreed by majority that the Original was better than the baseline and recommended that it should be implemented.</p> <p>The purpose of this document is to assist the Authority in making its determination on whether to implement CMP319.</p>
	<p>Low Impact National Grid ESO: Changes will be required to the BSUoS and TNUoS billing systems to tag out the appropriate metered import volumes for the purpose of the BSUoS and TNUoS charging base.</p> <p>Suppliers: The reduced recovery of BSUoS and TNUoS charges from storage operators will need to be recovered from the balance of parties liable to BSUoS and TNUoS.</p>

Contents

1	About this document	4
2	Summary	4
3	Governance	5
4	Why Change?	5
5	Code Specific Matters	6
6	Solution	6
7	Impacts & Other Considerations	8
8	Relevant Objectives	8
9	Implementation	9
10	Code Administrator Consultation: Responses	9
11	CUSC Panel Views	16
12	Legal Text	18
13	Impacts	20
14	Annex 1: Code Administrator Responses	21

Timetable

The Code Administrator recommends the following timetable:

Presented to Panel	26 July 2019
Code Administration Consultation Report issued to the Industry	31 July 2019
Draft Final Modification Report presented to Panel	12 September 2019
Modification Panel decision	12 September 2019
Final Modification Report issued to Authority	15 October 2019
Indicative Decision Date	19 November 2019
Decision implemented in CUSC	1 April 2021

 Any questions?

Contact:
Ren Walker

 cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com

 07976 940 855

Proposer:
Simon Lord, Engie

Simon.lord@engie.com



 07980 793 692

National Grid ESO Representative:

Harriet Harmon



Harriet.Harmon@nationalgrideso.com



telephone

Proposer Details

Details of Proposer: (Organisation Name)	First Hydro Company
Capacity in which the CUSC Modification Proposal is being proposed: (i.e. CUSC Party, BSC Party or "National Consumer Council")	CUSC Party
Details of Proposer's Representative: Name: Organisation: Telephone Number: Email Address:	Simon Lord Engie 07980 793692 Simon.lord@engie.com
Details of Representative's Alternate: Name: Organisation: Telephone Number: Email Address:	Libby Glazebrook Engie 07970-767221 libby.glazebrook@engie.com
Attachments (No): If Yes, Title and No. of pages of each Attachment:	

Impact on Core Industry Documentation.

Please mark the relevant boxes with an "x" and provide any supporting information

BSC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Grid Code	<input type="checkbox"/>
STC	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

(Please specify)

P383 currently progressing through the BSC process interacts with the definition of SVA storage

1 About this document

This document is the Final CUSC Modification Report document that contains the responses received from the Code Administrator Consultation which closed on 29 August 2019.

CMP319 was proposed by Engie and was submitted to the CUSC Modifications Panel for its consideration on 26 July 2019. The Panel unanimously decided to send CMP319 straight to a Code Administrator Consultation.

CMP319 - As part of the Workgroup analysis, the Workgroup identified that CMP 280 and 281 are charging modification and as such can only change section 14 of the CUSC. If either modification is approved changes to other non-charging sections of the CUSC will be required. These changes cannot be achieved with CMP280 and CMP281. The principle addition related to the definitions of storage as a class. The definitions are common to CMP 280, 281 and their alternates.

Four responses were received to the Code Administrator Consultation. A summary of the response can be found in Section 10 of this document. Overall the respondent agreed that the proposal better facilitates the applicable CUSC objectives.

At the Special CUSC Panel meeting on 12 September 2019, the Panel voted on CMP319 against the applicable CUSC objectives. The Panel members agreed by majority that the Original was better than the baseline and recommended that the Original should be implemented.

This CUSC Final Modification Report has been prepared in accordance with the terms of the CUSC. An electronic copy can be found on the National Grid ESO website:

<https://www.nationalgrideso.com/codes/connection-and-use-system-code-cusc/modifications/consequential-changes-section-11-cusc> .

2 Summary

Defect

In June 2017, *CMP281 Removal of BSUoS Charges from Energy Taken From the National Grid System by Storage Facilities* was raised by Scottish Power and subsequently adopted by Engie (First Hydro Company).

Also, in June 2017, *CMP280 Creation of a New Generator TNUoS Demand Tariff which Removes Liability for TNUoS Demand Residual Charges from Generation and Storage User* was raised by Scottish Power and was subsequently adopted by Drax.

As part of the Workgroup analysis, the Workgroup identified that CMP280 and CMP281 will require changes to not only the charging sections of the CUSC but the definitions sections as well. These changes cannot be achieved with CMP280 And CMP281.

Consequently, this modification has been raised to detail the required changes to various none charging section of the CUSC. It is suggested, to improve efficiencies, that this Modification proceeds to code administrator consultation at the same time as CMP280 and CMP281.

What

Inserting in section 11 of the CUSC definitions related to CMP 280 and 281 principally around the definition of storage as a class.

Why

This change is needed to facilitate CMP280 and or CMP 281 or their alternates.

How

Modification to the none charging sections of the CUSC to support CMP280, the CMP 280 alternate and/or CMP281.

3 Governance

This Modification has been raised to detail the required changes to section 11 (none charging sections of the CUSC) as a result of issues identified by the CMP280 and CMP281 working group. It is suggested that this Modification proceeds to code administrator consultation at the same time as CMP281 and CMP280.

4 Why Change?

In June 2017, CMP281 (Removal of BSUoS Charges from Energy Taken From the National Grid System by Storage Facilities) was raised by Scottish Power and subsequently adopted by Engie.

Storage operators are liable for the BSUoS on both their import and export volumes to and from the transmission network (in addition to the BSUoS costs implicit in their 'fuel cost'). This means that storage operators make a significantly greater contribution towards the recovery of BSUoS charges than their competitors.

Failure to address this issue will perpetuate a distortion to competition between storage operators and other generators and could hinder the development of new storage that could meet the increasing demand for flexibility. Moreover, given the nature of storage facilities and the system support role that they play, they are very unlikely to impose such balancing costs on the system when compared to other users.

In June 2017 CMP 280 Creation of a New Generator TNUoS Demand Tariff which Removes Liability for TNUoS Demand Residual Charges from Generation and Storage User was raised by Scottish Power and was subsequently adopted by Drax.

The locational element of the Demand TNUoS tariff provides a cost reflective signal of the impact on the transmission system of increasing demand at a particular location of the transmission system. The TNUoS Demand Residual tariff element is not intended to be cost-reflective and serves to ensure that the Total Allowed Revenue is recovered from

parties. As outlined in Ofgem's Targeted Charging Review consultation, Residual charges should be recovered on a basis which: reduces distortions, is fair and is proportional and practical in its application. Requiring storage parties to contribute to both the Generation and Demand TNUoS Residual tariff elements gives an unfair advantage to generators (whose imports are typically a small proportion of exports) compared to storage (whose imports typically exceed exports). The solution is to remove the liability to the TNUoS Demand Residual tariff element from these parties. Failure to do so will perpetuate the above distortion.

As part of the Workgroup analysis, the Workgroup identified that whilst this was a charging modification (which if approved would require change to aspects of section 14 - Charging Methodologies of the CUSC) there are in fact some definitions outside section 14 of the CUSC that would require change should CMP280 and or CMP 281 be approved.

Both CMP280, CMP280 alternate and/or CMP281 require new definitions relating to storage to be added to section 11 of the CUSC.

5 Code Specific Matters

Technical Skillsets

The Working Group (if this modification does not precede directly to consultation) should consist of members with a well-developed understanding of the BSUoS and TNUoS.

Reference Documents

Targeted Charging Review: a consultation, Ofgem, 13 March 2017

6 Solution

The proposed definitions for SVA Storage Facility and CVA Storage Facility have been developed as part of the CMP280 /CMP281 working group discussions and are contained in both reports. For clarity, the discussion and details behind the key requirements is set out below. Also included below are details of the declaration that is proposed to be used to bring these requirements together for each storage facility.

Generation license

The Electricity Act envisages certain core activities, including the generation of electricity, which only a licensee (or a person subject to an exemption) may perform. Therefore, in order for the imports to a storage facility to be distinct from an ordinary supply, it is considered helpful for a storage facility to hold a generation license for the following reasons:

- i. Ensuring operators have a generation licence is related to validation and verification. That is, to obtain a generation licence parties will need to apply to the Authority for a licence. This process will provide comfort that the generation licence holder meets the criteria for a generation licence and holding a licence is a public act which can be verified. It will provide assurance to CUSC Parties about the identity and activities of the licence holder. In particular, given the modification

would also apply to SVA storage, requiring operators to hold a licence is a necessary precaution.

- ii. Relief from Final Consumption Levies (FCLs) is predicated on the generator holding a generation licence – which means that the facility is excluded from the ordinary meaning of supply that is used to determine volumes that are subject to FCLs. Requiring storage facility operators to hold a generation licence to be relieved from BSUoS or demand charges would ensure consistency with the approach to FCLs and provide regulatory certainty to storage operators as to what they must do in order to be relieved of certain charges.

Whilst the requirements to hold a generation licence may place an extra burden on storage facilities, it is likely that storage operators seeking relief from networks charges and BSUoS are likely to also seek relief from FCLs.

On balance, it is considered that arguments for requiring operators to hold a licence outweighed those against.

Performs Electricity Storage as its sole function

Ofgem has consulted on changes to the standard conditions of the generation licence¹ that would clarify how the licensing regime applies to the operators of certain types of storage facility. These changes are intended to make clear that: electricity storage is considered a form of generation; that storage operators seeking relief from FCLs must hold a generation licence; and that to hold a generation licence the licensee operating an Electricity Storage Facility must not have self-consumption as its primary function.

The CUSC obligation uses the key definitions proposed for electricity storage and electricity storage facility, with a further obligation that the storage facility must “only” perform electrical storage. The intent here is to ensure that any co-located demand or generation must be separately metered and cannot be part of a storage facility. It is recognised that there will inevitably be some small additional loads contained in the storage facility demand that are required to support the electricity storage function (e.g. lights, fans, cooling, instrumentation etc) and without these the storage facility would not be able to operate as designed.

This CUSC proposal seeks to achieve consistency with the expected licence arrangements.

Has import and export metering that measures the electrical inputs and outputs to the storage facility

Whilst the requirement for import metering is self-evident, the need for export metering provides two benefits: firstly, it ensures that the storage facility is capable of exporting to the system; and secondly, it will allow the comparison of imports and export to the facility to take place and so ensure that any metering anomalies can be picked up as part of the BSC and/or CUSC validation and compliance processes.

¹ Definition from draft generation licence condition for storage at https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/system/files/docs/2017/10/elegcn_slcs_consolidated_29sept2017.pdf

CVA storage facilities are BM Units that only perform activities for electricity storage

This requirement is specific to CVA storage facilities and is driven by the way that CVA generation is set out in the relevant bilateral agreements between the Company and storage facility, and subsequently referenced in the CUSC for charging purposes.

Declaration Submission

The declaration submission brings together the key requirement in one submission. The requirements are confirmed in a declaration, the validity of which is determined by The Company for CVA Storage Facilities, or in accordance with the BSC for SVA storage facilities. The BSC processes are currently being developed by the BSC through code modification P383.

The “Storage Tariff”

One further definition The “Storage Tariff” is also set out this will be detailed in the Transmission Network Use of System charge of that name as published by the Company in the Statement of Use of System Charges should CMP 280 or its alternate be approved.

7 Impacts & Other Considerations

Changes will be required for sections 11 of the CUSC and there may be other changes required for consistency as detailed in the legal text.

Does this modification impact a Significant Code Review (SCR) or other significant industry change projects, if so, how?

No

Consumer Impacts

Removal of this distortion should result in fairer allocation of the costs of balancing the system and hence in stronger competition, which should in turn allow discovery of new lower cost outcomes and new forms of flexibility

8 Relevant Objectives

Impact of the modification on the Applicable CUSC Objectives (Standard):

Relevant Objective	Identified impact
(a) The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence;	Positive. Removing a distortion in competition will better facilitate competition.
(b) Facilitating effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity, and (so far as consistent therewith) facilitating such	Positive/ As BSUoS and residual TNUoS charges are not intended

competition in the sale, distribution and purchase of electricity;	to be cost reflective, this proposal will have little impact on cost reflectivity other than removing a distortion whereby some users pay a disproportionate amount of the costs.
(c) Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency *; and	None
(d) Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements.	None
*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).	

9 Implementation

The Proposal should be implemented to coincide with the start of a Charging Year at the same time as CMP280 and / or CMP281.

1 April 2021 is the suggested implementation date.

10 Code Administrator Consultation: Responses

The Code Administrator Consultation was issued on 31 July 2019 for 20 Working Days, with a close date of 29 August 2019. Four responses were received to the Code Administrator Consultation and are detailed in the table below.

Respondent	Do you believe that the proposed original or any of the alternatives better facilitate the Applicable CUSC Objectives? Please include your reasoning.	Do you support the proposed implementation approach? If not, please state why and provide an alternative suggestion where possible.	Do you have any other comments?
ESB (Generation and Trading)	<p>We are supportive of this modification. We believe that the proposed solution will help implement CMP280/alternate and CMP281 in a consistent and efficient way. The proposed modification will better facilitate the following Applicable CUSC Objective:</p> <p>Standard (Non- Charging) Object</p> <p>(a) The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the Obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence</p> <p>The proposed modification better facilitates this objective by allowing implementation of CMP281 and CMP280/alternate. It provides means to ensure there is consistency in implementation of both modifications. CMP281 and CMP280/alternate, in turn, better facilitate competition in the market and</p>	Yes, we agree with the proposed approach	No further comments

	<p>remove current distortions between participating generators and assets.</p> <p>(b) Facilitating effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity, and (so far a consistent therewith) facilitating such competition in the sale, distribution and purchase of electricity.</p> <p>By supporting the implementation of CMP280/alternate and CMP281, this modification will remove distortion in competition and would ensure a level playing field between storage and non-storage assets</p>		
<p>EDF Energy</p>	<p>For reference, the Applicable CUSC objectives are:</p> <p>Standard (Non- Charging) Objectives</p> <p>(a) The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence</p> <p>Yes, Positive. Removing a distortion in competition will better facilitate competition</p> <p>(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</p> <p>Yes, positive, although it should be noted that as BSUoS and residual TNUoS charges are not intended to be cost</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>

	<p>reflective, the main impact of this proposal on cost-reflectivity will be the removal, if it is passed, of a distortion whereby some users pay a disproportionate amount of the costs.</p> <p>(c) Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency</p> <p>neutral</p> <p>(d) Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements</p> <p>*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).</p> <p>positive – this is a consequential mod to CMP280 and CMP281, and if they are passed, they won't work unless this mod is also passed</p>		
--	--	--	--

	Overall the mod is positive against the COAs in their entirety			
Uniper	<p>For reference, the Applicable CUSC objectives are:</p> <p><i>As a facilitating modification for CMP280 and CMP281, it should better promote applicable objective d) "Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements".</i></p>	Yes	No	
First Hydro Company (Engie)	<p>For reference, the Applicable CUSC objectives are:</p> <p>Standard (Non- Charging) Objectives</p> <p>(a)The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence</p> <p>(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</p> <p>Yes:- We believe that the original proposal better facilitates CUSC objective a and b. Further details are contained in the table below.</p>	Yes	In the table below, we provide a summary of our views on the key issue that are covered in the work group report or are relevant to this modification	
			Key Work Group issue	<i>Engie view</i>
			The economic rationale for the solution.	We support the views that the proposer(s) put forward in the consultation and believe that this provides a strong economic case for storage and other non-end use consumption not being subject to residual network charges and BSUoS charges. We believe

				that this will lead to a lower cost for consumers. These issues are brought out in the consultations.
			How should storage be defined to limit the use to only include demand used for storage.	We support the definition of storage facility being principally based on the licence definition of storage augmented by the need to have metering systems that only measure imports and exports. These definitions have been set out in the CUSC principally to ensure that they are available prior to the draft licence conditions being approved. We support this approach.
			Should the storage provider need to hold a generation licence	We believe that the need to hold a generation licence is an appropriate condition and the

				consultation has brought out the benefits of this.
			How is storage demand measured and should auxiliary demand be included	The solution requires that the imports and exports to the storage facilities are measured by appropriate metering systems. This requirement ensures data is available so that validation can confirm that the facility is operating as a storage facility and not an own use demand facility. We support this approach.

11 CUSC Panel Views

At the CUSC Special Panel meeting on 12 September 2019, the Panel voted on CMP319 against the Applicable CUSC Standard Objectives.

The Panel members by majority agreed that the Original was better than the baseline and recommended that it should be implemented.

For reference the Applicable CUSC Standard 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).

Vote 1: Does the original facilitate the objectives better than the Baseline?

Panel Member: Andy Pace

	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)?	Better facilitates ACO (c)?	Better facilitates ACO (d)?	Overall (Y/N)
Original	Yes	Yes	Neutral	Neutral	Yes
Voting Statement					
CMP319 will remove a market distortion that creates a barrier for entry for new storage sites and prevents existing storage competing on a level playing field. This change therefore better meets relevant objectives (a) and (b).					

Panel Member: Garth Graham

	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)?	Better facilitates ACO (c)?	Better facilitates ACO (d)?	Overall (Y/N)
Original	Yes	Yes	Neutral	Neutral	Yes
Voting Statement					

In respect of Applicable Objective (a), this proposal by addressing the treatment of storage by the Licensee is better in discharging the obligations within the Act and Licence. In terms of Applicable Objective (b), this proposal better facilitates competition in terms of charges as it ensures that storage facilities are able to compete on an equitable footing with other providers, which leads to better competition within the electricity market. In regards to Applicable Objectives (d) and (e), this proposal is neutral. Overall this proposal is better when compared with the baseline.

Panel Member: Simon Sheridan (Alternate to Jon Wisdom)

	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)?	Better facilitates ACO (c)?	Better facilitates ACO (d)?	Overall (Y/N)
Original	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	No
Voting Statement					
On its own, this CMP has no effect on the CUSC as the new provisions it adds are only used in Section 14 of CUSC to exempt storage from certain charges under CMPs 280 and 281. If those CMPs are approved then this CMP319 is appropriate in its delivery of new or revised definitions for the purposes of enacting changes to the charging methodologies. However, not being supportive of CMP280/281 leads to a neutral vote overall.					

Panel Member: Cem Suleyman

	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)?	Better facilitates ACO (c)?	Better facilitates ACO (d)?	Overall (Y/N)
Original	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Yes	Yes
Voting Statement					
As a facilitating modification for CMP280 and CMP281, it should better promote efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements.					

Panel Member: Robert Longden

	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)?	Better facilitates ACO (c)?	Better facilitates ACO (d)?	Overall (Y/N)
Original	Yes	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Yes
Voting Statement					
CMP319 is necessary to fully implement CMPs 280/281. These are supported and therefore so is CMP319					

Panel Member: Paul Mott

	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)?	Better facilitates ACO (c)?	Better facilitates ACO (d)?	Overall (Y/N)
Original	Neutral	Yes	Neutral	Yes	Yes
Voting Statement					
This mod is related to CMP280 and CMP281 has the same benefits as they do. The reason it's positive against (d) is because it is a consequential mod to CMP280 and CMP281, and if they are passed, they won't work unless this mod is also passed.					

Vote 2 – Which option is the best?

Panel Member	BEST Option?
Andy Pace	Original
Garth Graham	Original
Simon Sheridan (Alternate to Jon Wisdom)	Baseline
Cem Suleyman	Original
Robert Longden	Original
Paul Mott	Original

The CUSC Panel therefore recommended by majority that the Original could be implemented.

12 Legal Text

To be added to section 11

An “SVA Storage Facility” is an Electricity Storage Facility that:

- i. performs Electricity Storage as its sole function;
- ii. is operated by a Storage Facility Operator who also holds a generation licence;
- iii. has its imports and exports, measured only by Half Hourly Metering Systems which are registered in the Supplier Meter Registration Service (SMRS) as part of a Supplier BM Unit, and where those Half Hourly Metering Systems only measure activities necessary for performing Electricity Storage; and
- iv. is the subject of a valid Declaration.

A “CVA Storage Facility” is an Electricity Storage Facility that:

- i. performs Electricity Storage as its sole function;
- ii. is operated by a Storage Facility Operator who also holds a generation licence;
- iii. has its imports and exports measured only by Half Hourly Metering Systems which are registered in the Central Meter Registration Service (CMRS), and as a BM Unit within the Central Registration Service (CRS) and where those Half Hourly Metering Systems only measure activities necessary for performing Electricity Storage;
- iv. comprises plant and apparatus registered as part of a BM Unit or BM Units which only perform activities necessary for Electricity Storage, and the BM Units are listed within a bi-lateral agreement; and
- v. is the subject of a valid Declaration.

A ‘Declaration’ is a statement to be submitted by the Registrant of the relevant BM Unit or BM Units, which:

- i. is signed by one of the Storage Facility Operator’s registered Directors that confirms that a Storage Facility fulfils the criteria set out in the definitions of SVA Storage Facility and CVA Storage Facility as applicable ; and either
- ii. for SVA Storage Facility only, is submitted in accordance with the BSC and contains other details that are required in accordance with BSC Section S; or
- iii. for CVA Storage Facility only, identifies the specific BM Units which only perform activities necessary for Electricity Storage and is submitted to The Company.

The validity of an SVA Declaration is determined in accordance with BSC Section S, and of a CVA Declaration is determined by The Company. A CVA Declaration received by The Company will either be accepted or rejected within three Business Days and shall take effect on the effective date and time as notified to the CUSC Party.

“Electricity Storage” is the conversion of electrical energy into a form of energy which can be stored, the storing of that energy, and the subsequent reconversion of that energy back into electrical energy.

An “Electricity Storage Facility” is a facility where Electricity Storage occurs.

A “Storage Facility Operator” is a Generation Licensee who is responsible for the operation of a Storage Facility

The “Storage Tariff” is the Transmission Network Use of System charge of that name as published by the Company in the Statement of Use of System Charges

Text Commentary

Section 5 contains details of the derivations of the definitions. Should only CMP 280 original be approved the SVA Storage Facility definitions would be redundant and could be removed by a further housekeeping change. Should only neither CMP 280 or its alternate be approved the definition of Storage Tariff would be redundant and could be removed with a housekeeping modification.

13 Impacts

Costs

Industry costs (Standard CMP)	
Resource costs	£3,630 – 1 Consultation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 0 Workgroup meetings• 0 Workgroup members• 1.5 man days effort per consultation response• 4 consultation respondents
Total Industry Costs	£3,630

14 Annex 1: Code Administrator Responses

CUSC Code Administrator Consultation Response Proforma

CMP319 – ‘Consequential changes to Section 11 of the CUSC as a result of CMP280 and/or CMP281’

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 by **29 August 2019** to cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com. Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration by the CUSC Modifications Panel when it makes its final determination.

These responses will be included in the Final CUSC Modification Report which is submitted to the CUSC Modifications Panel.

Respondent:	<i>Kirsty Ingham</i> kirsty.ingham@esb.ie <i>Kamila Nugumanova</i> kamila.nugumanova@esb.ie
Company Name:	<i>ESB (Generation and Trading)</i>
Do you believe that the proposed original or any of the alternatives better facilitate the Applicable CUSC Objectives? Please include your reasoning.	<p>We are supportive of this modification. We believe that the proposed solution will help implement CMP280/alternate and CMP281 in a consistent and efficient way. The proposed modification will better facilitate the following Applicable CUSC Objective:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Standard (Non- Charging) Objectives</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(a) The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence</p> <p>The proposed modification better facilitates this objective by allowing implementation of CMP281 and CMP280/alternate. It provides means to ensure there is consistency in implementation of both modifications. CMP281 and CMP280/alternate, in turn, better facilitate competition in the market and remove current distortions between participating generators and assets.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(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</p> <p>By supporting the implementation of CMP280/alternate and CMP281, this modification will remove distortion in competition and would ensure a level playing field between storage and non-storage assets.</p>
Do you support the proposed implementation approach? If not, please state why and provide an alternative	Yes, we agree with the proposed approach.

suggestion where possible.	
Do you have any other comments?	No further comments

CUSC Code Administrator Consultation Response Proforma

CMP319 – ‘Consequential changes to Section 11 of the CUSC as a result of CMP280 and/or CMP281’

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 by **29 August 2019** to cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com. Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration by the CUSC Modifications Panel when it makes its final determination.

These responses will be included in the Final CUSC Modification Report which is submitted to the CUSC Modifications Panel.

Respondent:	Simon Vicary simon.vicary@edfenergy.com
Company Name:	EDF Energy
<p>Do you believe that the proposed original or any of the alternatives better facilitate the Applicable CUSC Objectives? Please include your reasoning.</p>	<p>For reference, the Applicable CUSC objectives are:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Standard (Non- Charging) Objectives</p> <p>(a) The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence</p> <p>Yes, Positive. Removing a distortion in competition will better facilitate competition</p> <p>(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</p> <p>Yes, positive, although it should be noted that as BSUoS and residual TNUoS charges are not intended to be cost reflective, the main impact of this proposal on cost-reflectivity will be the removal, if it is passed, of a distortion whereby some users pay a disproportionate amount of the costs.</p>

	<p>(c) Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency</p> <p>neutral</p> <p>(d) Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements</p> <p>*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).</p> <p>positive – this is a consequential mod to CMP280 and CMP281, and if they are passed, they won't work unless this mod is also passed</p> <p>Overall the mod is positive against the COAs in their entirety</p>
<p>Do you support the proposed implementation approach? If not, please state why and provide an alternative suggestion where possible.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Do you have any other comments?</p>	<p>No</p>

CUSC Code Administrator Consultation Response Proforma

CMP319 – ‘Consequential changes to Section 11 of the CUSC as a result of CMP280 and/or CMP281’

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 by **29 August 2019** to cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com. Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration by the CUSC Modifications Panel when it makes its final determination.

These responses will be included in the Final CUSC Modification Report which is submitted to the CUSC Modifications Panel.

Respondent:	Paul Jones paul.jones@uniper.energy
Company Name:	Uniper
Do you believe that the proposed original or any of the alternatives better facilitate the Applicable CUSC Objectives? Please include your reasoning.	For reference, the Applicable CUSC objectives are: <i>As a facilitating modification for CMP280 and CMP281, it should better promote applicable objective d) “Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements”.</i>
Do you support the proposed implementation approach? If not, please state why and provide an alternative suggestion where possible.	Yes.
Do you have any other comments?	No.

CUSC Code Administrator Consultation Response Proforma

CMP319 – ‘Consequential changes to Section 11 of the CUSC as a result of CMP280 and/or CMP281’

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 by **29 August 2019** to cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com. Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration by the CUSC Modifications Panel when it makes its final determination.

These responses will be included in the Final CUSC Modification Report which is submitted to the CUSC Modifications Panel.

Respondent:	<i>Simon Lord</i> simon.lord@engie.com <i>07980793692</i>
Company Name:	<i>First Hydro Company (Engie)</i>
Do you believe that the proposed original or any of the alternatives better facilitate the Applicable CUSC Objectives? Please include your reasoning.	<p>For reference, the Applicable CUSC objectives are:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Standard (Non- Charging) Objectives</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(a) The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(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</p> <p>Yes:- We believe that the original proposal better facilitates CUSC objective a and b. Further details are contained in the table below.</p>
Do you support the proposed implementation approach? If not, please state why and provide an alternative suggestion where possible.	Yes

Do you have any other comments?	<i>See table below</i>
---------------------------------	------------------------

In the table below, we provide a summary of our views on the key issue that are covered in the work group report or are relevant to this modification	
Key Work Group issue	<i>Engie view</i>
The economic rationale for the solution.	We support the views that the proposer(s) put forward in the consultation and believe that this provides a strong economic case for storage and other non-end use consumption not being subject to residual network charges and BSUoS charges. We believe that this will lead to a lower cost for consumers. These issues are brought out in the consultations.
How should storage be defined to limit the use to only include demand used for storage.	We support the definition of storage facility being principally based on the licence definition of storage augmented by the need to have metering systems that only measure imports and exports. These definitions have been set out in the CUSC principally to ensure that they are available prior to the draft licence conditions being approved. We support this approach.
Should the storage provider need to hold a generation licence	We believe that the need to hold a generation licence is an appropriate condition and the consultation has brought out the benefits of this.
How is storage demand measured and should auxiliary demand be included	The solution requires that the imports and exports to the storage facilities are measured by appropriate metering systems. This requirement ensures data is available so that validation can confirm that the facility is operating as a storage facility and not an own use demand facility. We support this approach.