

## CUSC Alternative and Workgroup Vote

### CMP335 - Transmission Demand Residual - Billing and consequential changes to CUSC Section 3 and 11 (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.

#### For reference the applicable CUSC objectives are:

##### CUSC (non-charging) objectives - for CMP335:

- 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).*

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 (against Baseline or the Original) 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

Workgroup Member	Company
Not applicable – no Alternatives raised	

## 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)
Eleanor Horn / Grahame Neale, National Grid ESO					
Original	Y	-	-	Y	Y
Voting Statement:  The option presented by CMP335 will support delivery of Ofgem's TCR Direction and the associated benefits of the direction. They will also update the existing CUSC arrangements to be compatible with the new methodology (delivered by CMP343) described in Ofgem's direction. As a result, all options are positive against Applicable CUSC Objectives A and D whilst they have no impact on Applicable CUSC Objective B and C.					

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)	Better facilitates ACO (c)	Better facilitates ACO (d)	Overall (Y/N)
Simon Vicary / Binoy Dharsi – EDF Energy					
Original	Y	Y	-	Y	Y
Voting Statement:  The CMP335 proposal is positive against Applicable CUSC Objectives a, b and d whilst being neutral against c.					

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)	Better facilitates ACO (c)	Better facilitates ACO (d)	Overall (Y/N)
Karl Maryon / Paul Bedford - Haven Power					
Original	Y	-	-	Y	Y
Voting Statement:  CMP335 is expected to have a positive impact against the non-charging CUSC applicable objectives a and d. For objective a, CMP335 ensures that the CUSC remains in line with the Transmission Licence obligations following the Authority's TCR decision. For objective d, CMP335 creates a process for the efficient integration of site data in timescales consistent with Ofgem's TCR decision together with a disputes process.					

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)	Better facilitates ACO (c)	Better facilitates ACO (d)	Overall (Y/N)
Garth Graham / Andy Colley - SSE Generation Ltd					
Original	Y	Y	-	-	Y
<p>Voting Statement:</p> <p>In the Authority's TCR SCR decision document (along with the associated information) the Authority set out the benefits that applying the Residual to Demand rather than Generation.</p> <p>Launched in the summer of 2017 and concluding in the winter of 2019 the Authority's review has considered the effects of their change in terms of, broadly, effective competition (Applicable Objective (b)) and went on, in terms of discharging a requirement in the Transmission Licence, to say the change should be made (Applicable Objective (a)) (as well as other wider aspects) and concluded that doing this change will be positive on both counts – I concur with the Authority's view. The Original is therefore better in terms of (a) and (b) than the Baseline.</p> <p>In terms of Applicable Objectives (c) and (d) the Original is neutral in respect of both these objectives.</p>					

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)	Better facilitates ACO (c)	Better facilitates ACO (d)	Overall (Y/N)
Alessandra De Zottis - Sembcorp					
Original	Y	Y	-	Y	Y
<p>Voting Statement:</p> <p>[No Voting Statement provided]</p>					

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)	Better facilitates ACO (c)	Better facilitates ACO (d)	Overall (Y/N)
Lee Stone - E.ON					
Original	Y	Y	-	Y	Y
<p>Voting Statement:</p> <p>I believe that CMP335 will have a positive impact against the non-charging CUSC applicable objectives a, b and d.</p>					

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

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

Workgroup Member	Company
<b>Not applicable – no Alternatives raised</b>	

**Stage 2c – Workgroup Vote**

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

Workgroup Member	Company	BEST Option?	Which objective(s) does the change better facilitate? (if baseline not applicable)
Eleanor Horn (Grahame Neale)	NGESO	Original	a, d
Simon Vicary	EDF Energy	Original	a, b, d
Karl Maryon (Paul Bedford)	Haven Power	Original	a, d
Garth Graham	SSE Generation Ltd	Original	a, b
Alessandra De Zottis	Sembcorp	Original	a, b, d
Lee Stone	E.ON	Original	a, b, d

Option	Of the 6 votes, how many said that this option was better than the Baseline
Original	<b>6</b>