

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:	Simon Shaw	
Company name:	Good Energy	
Email address:	simon.shaw@goodenergy.co.uk	
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 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"/> 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.	<p>Mark the Objectives which you believe the proposed solution better facilitates than the current baseline:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 40%; padding: 2px;">Original</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>d <input type="checkbox"/>e <input type="checkbox"/>f <input type="checkbox"/>g <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>h <input type="checkbox"/>None</td> </tr> </table> <p>Good Energy supports the progression of CMP474. We consider it preferable to CMP475 as it provides a more appropriate mechanism for managing exceptional movements in fixed BSUoS charges.</p> <p>Longer notice periods and a formalised reset process would provide greater certainty to the market, reduce short-term cash flow risk for suppliers, and help mitigate the risk of sharp price increases being passed through to consumers where fixed BSUoS prices rise significantly over a short period.</p>	Original	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d <input type="checkbox"/> e <input type="checkbox"/> f <input type="checkbox"/> g <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> h <input type="checkbox"/> None
Original	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d <input type="checkbox"/> e <input type="checkbox"/> f <input type="checkbox"/> g <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> h <input type="checkbox"/> None			
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>No</p> <hr/> <p style="color: #ccc; font-size: small;">Click or tap here to enter text.</p>		

Public

3	Do you have any other comments?	<p>One further consideration is whether the proposed 50% trigger is set at the appropriate level. In this example, there would still be 50% headroom remaining, meaning a reset may not be necessary in all circumstances.</p> <p>This is particularly relevant where the issue relates to a single cap period and the next fixed period may be only weeks or days away.</p> <p>While we recognise the Proposer’s view that over-recovery has previously been managed through adjustments in subsequent fixed tariff periods, greater clarity is needed on how the proposed solution would avoid opening the reset process unnecessarily where sufficient headroom remains to carry through to the next fixed period.</p> <p>A higher threshold may therefore be appropriate, particularly for a single-period option, to reduce the risk of unnecessary in period resets.</p>
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?	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>