

CUSC Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma**CMP316: TNUoS Arrangements for Co-located Generation Sites**

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 28 February 2022**. Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration by the Workgroup.

If you have any queries on the content of this consultation, please contact Jennifer.groome@nationalgrideso.com or cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com.

Respondent details	Please enter your details
Respondent name:	Binoy Dharsi
Company name:	EDF
Email address:	Binoy.dharsi@edfenergy.com
Phone number:	07790 893 373

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, the Workgroup 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*
- Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements.*

**Objective (d) refers specifically to European Regulation 2009/714/EC. Reference to the Agency is to the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER).*

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

Standard Workgroup Consultation questions		
1	Do you believe that the CMP316 Original Proposal better facilitates the Applicable Objectives?	<div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it better facilitates objectives: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> E </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> No, it has a negative effect on objectives: <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> E </div>
		We agree that this modification will allow for co-located generators to pay a fairer contribution towards TNUoS charges based on the underlying principles of charging based on technology type – enabling effective competition (a); compliance with costs incurred by transmission (b).
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.

Specific Workgroup Consultation questions	
5	Do you think it is appropriate to publish on the TEC register the MFSSTEC for each technology type? Please give your justification.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No It is important that this information is transparent to align with the TEC register publication.

6	Which of the solutions to source the installed capacity is your preference and why? As set out in the Connection Agreement (Original) or the Declaration route (potential alternative).	<div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> As set out in the Connection Agreement (Original) <input type="checkbox"/> Declaration route (potential alternative) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)</div> <div>There needs to be confidence in the data used to determine the correct contribution by generators. The declaration route, if not clearly defined, could lead to inaccurate / poorer quality data being used to determine charges. Our preference is therefore to use the more stable Connection Agreement data unless the declaration route can provide detailed guidance on how it would be able to provide accurate information.</div>
---	---	--