Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma

**CMP413: Rolling 10-year wider TNUoS generation tariffs**

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](mailto:cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com) by **5pm** on **02 October 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 [cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondent details** | **Please enter your details** | |
| **Respondent name:** | Click or tap here to enter text. | |
| **Company name:** | Click or tap here to enter text. | |
| **Email address:** | Click or tap here to enter text. | |
| **Phone number:** | Click or tap here to enter text. | |
| **Which best describes your organisation?** | Consumer body  Demand  Distribution Network Operator  Generator  Industry body  Interconnector | Storage  Supplier  System Operator  Transmission Owner  Virtual Lead Party  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:**

1. *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;*
2. *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);*
3. *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;*
4. *Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency \*; and*
5. *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 Workgroup Consultation questions** | | | |
| 1 | Do you believe that the Original Proposal better facilitate the Applicable Objectives? | Mark the Objectives which you believe the Original solution better facilitates: | |
| Original | A B C D E |
| Click or tap here to enter text. | |
| 2 | Do you support the proposed implementation approach? | Yes  No | |
| Click or tap here to enter text. | |
| 3 | Do you have any other comments? | Click or tap here to enter text. | |
| 4 | Do you wish to raise a Workgroup Consultation Alternative Request for the Workgroup to consider? | Yes  No | |
| Click or tap here to enter text. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Specific Workgroup Consultation questions** | | |
| 5 | The Original proposal is to limit the maximum variance by £2.50/kW per charging zone. Do you feel this is an appropriate level? | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 6 | The Original proposal deems a 10-year period to fix tariffs between the pre-defined Cap and Collar ranges appropriate. Is there an alternative length of time that would need to be considered? | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 7 | The Proposer has provided a mechanism by which components that feed into the wider tariff is allocated. The proposal apportions the Cap and Collar by the proportion of revenue collected for each component. Is there an alternative methodology that could be used? | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 8 | Should there be a provision to trigger a re-opener in tariffs to reflect the considerable amount of reform planned both through Open Governance and via the TNUoS Task Force? | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 9 | The Original proposal aims to protect Generators from un-predictable tariffs as the rational is that inefficient costs could ultimately cost consumers more. A breach to the Cap and Collar is socialised to Demand Users. Do you think this is appropriate? | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 10 | Please provide any evidence to support the merit of greater predictability over cost reflectivity (Clearly mark your response confidential if you wish this to be directed straight to Ofgem). | Click or tap here to enter text. |