

Public

Code Administrator Consultation Response Proforma

CMP474: Fixed Balancing Services Use of System Price revision mechanism

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@neso.energy by **5pm** on **29 June 2026**. 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@neso.energy.

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
Respondent name:	Martin Cahill	
Company name:	NESO	
Email address:	Martin.cahill@neso.energy	
Phone number:	07840722302	
Which best describes your organisation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer body <input type="checkbox"/> Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator <input type="checkbox"/> Generator <input type="checkbox"/> Industry body <input type="checkbox"/> Interconnector	<input type="checkbox"/> Storage <input type="checkbox"/> Supplier <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> System Operator <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)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Confidential (<i>this will be shared with industry and the Panel for further consideration</i>)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Confidential (<i>this will be disclosed to the Authority in full but, unless specified, will not be shared with the Panel or the industry for further consideration</i>)

Public

For reference the Applicable CUSC (charging) Objectives are:

- d) *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;*
- e) *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 C11 requirements of a connect and manage connection);*
- f) *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 and the ISOP business*;*
- g) *Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency **; and*
- h) *Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the system charging methodology.*

** See Electricity System Operator Licence*

***The Electricity Regulation referred to in objective g) 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.*

Public

For reference, (for consultation question 4) the Electricity Balancing Regulation (EBR) Article 3 Objectives and regulatory aspects are:

- a) *fostering effective competition, non-discrimination and transparency in balancing markets;*
- b) *enhancing efficiency of balancing as well as efficiency of national balancing markets;*
- c) *integrating balancing markets and promoting the possibilities for exchanges of balancing services while contributing to operational security;*
- d) *contributing to the efficient long-term operation and development of the electricity transmission system and electricity sector while facilitating the efficient and consistent functioning of day-ahead, intraday and balancing markets;*
- e) *ensuring that the procurement of balancing services is fair, objective, transparent and market-based, avoids undue barriers to entry for new entrants, fosters the liquidity of balancing markets while preventing undue market distortions;*
- f) *facilitating the participation of demand response including aggregation facilities and energy storage while ensuring they compete with other balancing services at a level playing field and, where necessary, act independently when serving a single demand facility;*
- g) *facilitating the participation of renewable energy sources and supporting the achievement of any target specified in an enactment for the share of energy from renewable sources.*

What is the EBR?

The Electricity Balancing Regulation (EBR) is a European Network Code introduced by the Third Energy Package European legislation in late 2017.

The EBR regulation lays down the rules for the integration of balancing markets in Europe, with the objectives of enhancing Europe’s security of supply. The EBR aims to do this through harmonisation of electricity balancing rules and facilitating the exchange of balancing resources between European Transmission System Operators

Public

(TSOs). Article 18 of the EBR states that TSOs such as the NESO should have terms and conditions developed for balancing services, which are submitted and approved by Ofgem.

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 against the current baseline.	Mark the Objectives which you believe the proposed solution better facilitates than the current baseline:
		Original <input type="checkbox"/> d <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> e <input type="checkbox"/> f <input type="checkbox"/> g <input type="checkbox"/> h <input type="checkbox"/> None
		<p>NESO acknowledges the significant impact that a tariff reset could have on Suppliers and their customers, and the rationale for this proposal is completely understandable. CMP474 workgroups have been incredibly useful to understand potential impacts in more detail, such as interaction with price cap periods and different contract types. Regardless of the outcome of this modification these details will all be carefully considered in our BSUoS processes to mitigate risk.</p> <p>We believe that the proposals to be able to revise either fixed tariff and/or recover to the relevant utilisation floor could both be beneficial given the additional flexibility they would provide for managing the Working Capital Facility. The proposal reduces risk for Suppliers and their customers by ensuring a tariff reset can only</p>

Public

		<p>happen in advance of a tariff reset period, so there is a positive impact on applicable objective (d).</p> <p>However we believe that the minimum notice period is too long for us to be able to support this modification. The current 5 day notice period is intended as a worst case scenario/backstop, and it is possible that available Working Capital could be exhausted in a shorter timeframe than the new minimum notice period proposed. Given this risk, we also believe that the likelihood of resetting a BSUoS tariff (which has not happened to date) would be more likely. For these reasons we have judged there to be a negative impact on applicable objective (e).</p> <p>We also believe that 50% threshold could result in a high number of notifications being sent to Industry. This could be counterproductive if notifications are submitted when there is no intention to actually reset tariffs.</p>
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>We agree with the logic of a shorter notice period for the initial implementation period given the length of time between the decision date and the start of Fixed Tariff Period 8.</p>
3	Do you have any other comments?	No

Public

4	Do you agree with the Workgroup's assessment that the modification does not impact the Electricity Balancing Regulation (EBR) Article 18 terms and conditions held within the Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		Click or tap here to enter text.