

Code Administrator Consultation Response Proforma**CMP288: Explicit charging arrangements for customer delays and backfeeds**

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 18 July 2022**. 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 Jennifer Groome Jennifer.Groome@nationalgrideso.com or cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com

Respondent details	Please enter your details
Respondent name:	Ken Doyle
Company name:	NGESO
Email address:	Kenneth.doyle@nationalgrideso.com
Phone number:	07814062030

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:

- 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*

- 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	Do you believe that the Original Proposal better facilitates the Applicable Objectives?	<p>Mark the Objectives which you believe Original solution better facilitates:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Original</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>A</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>B</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>C</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>D</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>E</td> </tr> </table> <p>Objective A. The solution ensures the party causing the additional cost incurs the cost. This avoids other TNUoS parties incurring costs through no fault of their own which in turn facilitates effective competition.</p> <p>Objective B. The solution ensures that the charging methodology correctly reflects the additional costs incurred by the Onshore TOs.</p> <p>Objective C. The solution will ensure that charges will be applies to the party causing the addition costs as transmission business develop over time.</p> <p>Objective E. The solution will enhance efficiency in the implementation and administration of the charging methodology by making clear that delay charges are legitimate one-off work costs. Not including detailed TO costs information in the CUSC but rather locating it in the Charging Statements will avoid recurring modifications to the CUSC being required.</p>	Original	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E
Original	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E			
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>No</p> <p>The modification should be implemented at the earliest opportunity.</p>						
3	Do you have any other comments?	<p>We are aware that there has been a reduction in Modification Applications by developers who may be subject to Delay charges which suggests this Delay modification will be effective in delivering appropriate cost signals.</p>						