

Code Administrator Consultation Response Proforma

CMP330: Allowing new Transmission Connected parties to build Connection Assets greater than 2km in length & CMP374: Extending contestability for Transmission Connections

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 29 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:	Precious Nwokoma	
Company name:	Fred.Olsen Seawind	
Email address:	Precious.nwokoma@fredolsen.com	
Phone number:	Click or tap here to enter text.	
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 type="checkbox"/> Supplier <input type="checkbox"/> Transmission Owner <input type="checkbox"/> Virtual Lead Party <input checked="" 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);*

- 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.*

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(s) against the Applicable Objectives?	<p>Mark the Objectives which you believe the proposed solution(s) better facilitates:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Original</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>A</td> <td><input 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> <tr> <td>WACM1</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>A</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>B</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>C</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>D</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>E</td> </tr> </table> <p>Original: We are supportive of the original proposal which in general will introduce competition into the delivery of sole use transmission assets in the GB electricity transmission network. Considering the scale of works required to deliver net zero targets, allowing competition in building transmission assets will help market forces dictate costs of delivering these assets-leading efficiency and cheaper price/kW for the consumer.</p>	Original	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E	WACM1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> E
Original	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E									
WACM1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> E									
2	Do you have a preferred proposed solution?	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Original <input type="checkbox"/>WACM1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>No preference</p> <p>The original proposal and WACM1 are both improvements to the baseline.</p>												
3	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>No</p> <p>We support the implementation approach as it ensures that no assets are stranded and provides for competition even in cases where there is a second comer/ potential User.</p>												

4	Do you have any other comments?	<p>We are mindful of the challenges in procurement and delivery of works at transmission level, especially 275kV and 400KV. This proposal under proper guidance should solve the disparity in transmission level between Scotland and England/Wales where 132KV is a transmission voltage in the former and not in the latter. This will 'harmonise' the GB transmission network. As 132KV is already a contestable voltage level in England/Wales, we believe this will also open Scotland to much needed competition at this voltage level.</p> <p>The proposal should be a trial in making additional aspects of the transmission network contestable.</p>
---	---------------------------------	---