

## CUSC Alternative and Workgroup Vote

### CMP339: Consequential changes for CMP317/327 (TCR)

**Please note:** To participate in any votes, Workgroup members need to have attended at least 50% of meetings.

#### Stage 1 - Alternative Vote

If Workgroup Alternative Requests have been made, vote on whether they should become Workgroup Alternative Code Modifications.

#### Stage 2 - Workgroup Vote

2a) Assess the original and WACMs (if there are any) against the CUSC objectives compared to the baseline (the current CUSC).

2b) If WACMs exist, vote on whether each WACM better facilitates the Applicable CUSC Objectives better than the Original Modification Proposal.

2c) Vote on which of the options is best.

#### The Applicable CUSC Objectives (Non-Charging) 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 (d) refers specifically to European Regulation 2009/714/EC. Reference to the Agency is to the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER).

## Workgroup Vote

### Stage 1 – Alternative Vote

Vote on Workgroup Alternative Requests to become Workgroup Alternative Code Modifications.

*The Alternative vote is carried out to identify the level of Workgroup support there is for any potential alternative options that have been brought forward by either any member of the Workgroup OR an Industry Participant as part of the Workgroup Consultation.*

*Should the majority of the Workgroup OR the Chairman believe that the potential alternative solution would better facilitate the CUSC objectives then the potential alternative will be fully developed by the Workgroup with legal text to form a Workgroup Alternative Code modification (WACM) and submitted to the Panel and Authority alongside the Original solution for the Panel Recommendation vote and the Authority decision.*

“Y” = Yes

“N” = No

“-“ = Neutral

Alternative Number	WACM? Y/N/-
1	Y
2	Y
3	Y
4	Y
5	Y
6	Y
7	Y
8	Y
9	Y
10	Y
11	Y
12	Y
13	Y
14	Y
15	Y
16	Y
17	Y
18	Y
19	Y
20	Y
21	Y
22	Y
23	Y

## Stage 2a – Assessment against objectives

To assess the original and WACMs against the CUSC objectives compared to the baseline (the current CUSC).

You will also be asked to provide a statement to be added to the Workgroup Report alongside your vote to assist the reader in understanding the rationale for your vote.

ACO = Applicable CUSC Objective

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)	Better facilitates ACO (c)	Better facilitates ACO (d)	Overall (Y/N)
Original				Y	Y
WACM 1	Y			Y	Y
WACM 2				Y	Y
WACM 3	Y			Y	Y
WACM 4				Y	Y
WACM 5	Y			Y	Y
WACM 6				Y	Y
WACM 7	Y			Y	Y
WACM 8				Y	Y
WACM 9	Y			Y	Y
WACM 10				Y	Y
WACM 11	Y			Y	Y
WACM 12				Y	Y
WACM 13				Y	Y
WACM 14				Y	Y
WACM 15				Y	Y
WACM 16				Y	Y
WACM 17				Y	Y
WACM 18				Y	Y
WACM 19				Y	Y
WACM 20				Y	Y
WACM 21				Y	Y
WACM 22				Y	Y
WACM 23				Y	Y

### Voting Statement:

As the current CUSC cannot ensure compliance with 838/2010 both the original and all the workgroup alternatives for CMP317/327 offer potentially compliant solutions these changes are required to enact those changes, so my vote is consistent with my voting in those modifications in that they are all better than the baseline against objective D.

As the split of revenue between generation and demand is a significant area of uncertainty in TNUoS tariff forecasting any solution that reduces that uncertainty either by removing the need for an error margin or targeting the lower end to the range of the limiting regulation without taking congestion charges into account at the time of tariff setting would aid competition by reducing the uncertainty of the level of charges that parties would face, and so would be better

against objective A. As such all alternatives removing the need for an error margin, targeting the lower end to the range of the limiting regulation without taking congestion charges into account at the time of tariff setting or with a phased implementation would be better than the original proposal for competition.

### Stage 2b – WACM Vote (If required)

Where one or more WACMs exist, does each WACM better facilitates the Applicable CUSC Objectives than the Original Modification Proposal?

WACM Number	Better than original?
1	Yes
2	No
3	Yes
4	No
5	Yes
6	No
7	Yes
8	No
9	Yes
10	No
11	Yes
12	No
13	No
14	No
15	No
16	No
17	No
18	No
19	No
20	No
21	No
22	No
23	No

### Stage 2c – Workgroup Vote

Which option is the best? (Baseline, Proposer solution (Original Proposal), WACM1 or WACM2)

Workgroup Member	Company	BEST Option?	Which objective(s) does the change better facilitate? (if baseline not applicable)
Daniel Hickman	npower	WACM2	A and D