

CUSC Alternative and Workgroup Vote

CMP379: Determining TNUoS demand zones for transmission connected demand at sites with multiple Distribution Network Operators (DNOs)

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 CUSC Modifications (WACMs).

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) Vote on which of the options is best.

Terms used in this document

Term	Meaning
Baseline	The current CUSC (if voting for the Baseline, you believe no modification should be made)
Original	The solution which was firstly proposed by the Proposer of the modification
WACM	Workgroup Alternative CUSC Modification (an Alternative Solution which has been developed by the Workgroup)

The Applicable CUSC Objectives (Charging) are:

- a) 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.
- b) 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);

- c) 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.
- d) 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.

Workgroup Vote

Stage 1 – Alternative Vote

Vote on Workgroup Alternative Requests to become Workgroup Alternative CUSC 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 Chair believe that the potential alternative solution may better facilitate the CUSC objectives than the Original proposal then the potential alternative will be fully developed by the Workgroup with legal text to form a Workgroup Alternative CUSC 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 (Stage 2 only)

“Abstain”

Workgroup Member	Alternative 1 (Company, characteristic)	Alternative 2 (Company, characteristic)	Alternative 3 (Company, characteristic)	Alternative 4 (Company, characteristic)
Name				
WACM?				

Not required – No Alternatives raised.

Stage 2a – Assessment against objectives

To assess the original 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)	Better facilitates ACO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
Andy Colley - SSE Generation						
Original	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Yes	Yes
Voting Statement:						
This modification clarifies how TNUoS will be charged in this situation and so encourages consistent understanding between Users and the ESO.						

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)	Better facilitates ACO (c)	Better facilitates ACO (d)	Better facilitates ACO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
George Douthwaite - ITP Energised						
Original	Yes	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Yes	Yes
Voting Statement:						
a) Clarification of an otherwise ambiguous charge for a specific set of demand users can only help in providing greater certainty and clarity to market participants which in turn helps promote competition. e) Where the CUSC is currently ambiguous, this modification will provide clarity on how TNUoS demand tariffs should be determined for those transmission-connected demand users who connect at the boundaries of multiple DNO areas.						

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)	Better facilitates ACO (c)	Better facilitates ACO (d)	Better facilitates ACO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
Grace March- Sembcorp Energy UK						
Original	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Yes	Yes
Voting Statement:						
This modification clarifies how TNUoS will be charged in this situation and so encourages consistent understanding between Users and the ESO.						

ESO

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)	Better facilitates ACO (c)	Better facilitates ACO (d)	Better facilitates ACO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
Harvey Takhar – NGESO						
Original	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Yes	Yes
Voting Statement:						
In favour of the proposed changes that this modification is seeking to implement, therefore my overall vote is Yes.						

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates ACO (a)	Better facilitates ACO (b)	Better facilitates ACO (c)	Better facilitates ACO (d)	Better facilitates ACO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
Simon Lord - Engie						
Original	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Yes	Yes
Voting Statement:						
This modification clarifies how TNUoS will be charged in this situation and so encourages consistent understanding between Users and the ESO.						

Stage 2b – 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)
Andy Colley	SSE Generation Ltd	Original	e
George Douthwaite	ITP Energised	Original	a, e
Grace March	Sembcorp Energy UK	Original	e
Harvey Takhar	NGESO	Original	e
Simon Lord	Engie	Original	e

Of the 5 votes, how many voters said this option was better than the Baseline.

Option	Number of voters that voted this option as better than the Baseline
Original	5