

Code Administrator Consultation Response Proforma**CMP412: CMP398 Consequential Charging Modification**

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 **09 June 2023**. 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 Milly Lewis Milly.Lewis@nationalgrideso.com or cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
Respondent name:	George Moran	
Company name:	Centrica	
Email address:	George.moran@centrica.com	
Phone number:	07557 611983	
Which best describes your organisation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer body <input type="checkbox"/> Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network <input type="checkbox"/> Operator <input type="checkbox"/> Generator <input type="checkbox"/> Industry body	<input type="checkbox"/> Interconnector <input type="checkbox"/> Storage <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supplier <input type="checkbox"/> Transmission Owner <input type="checkbox"/> Virtual Lead Party <input type="checkbox"/> Other

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;*

- 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.*

Please express your views in the right-hand side of the table below, including your rationale.

Standard Code Administrator Consultation questions		
1	Please provide your assessment for the proposed solution against the Applicable Objectives?	<div>Mark the Objectives which you believe the proposed solution better facilitates:</div> <div> <div>Original</div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/>A <input type="checkbox"/>B <input type="checkbox"/>C <input type="checkbox"/>D <input type="checkbox"/>E </div> </div> <p>We are unable to properly assess this modification. It proposes to expand the definition of black start costs to include costs associated with CMP398 – but it doesn't provide any assessment on how much this change in definition will add to BSUoS costs. Neither is there any impact assessment contained in the related CMP398. We don't believe it is capable of approval without impact assessment.</p> <p>Absent such an impact assessment, we conclude that the change will have a negative impact on applicable objective (a) as it provides for additional costs to be added to BSUoS without providing suppliers with any indication of how much these additional costs will be.</p>
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<div> <input type="checkbox"/>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>No </div> <div>Click or tap here to enter text.</div>
3	Do you have any other comments?	Click or tap here to enter text.