

Code Administrator Consultation Response Proforma**CMP363 / CMP364: 'TNUoS Demand Residual charges for transmission connected sites with a mix of Final and non-Final Demand & Definition changes for CMP363'**

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 **13 September 2022**. 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 Paul Mullen Paul.Mullen@nationalgrideso.com or cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com

Respondent details	Please enter your details
Respondent name:	Lauren Jauss
Company name:	RWE Supply & Trading GmbH
Email address:	Lauren.jauss@rwe.com
Phone number:	07825 995497

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.

CMP363: For reference the Applicable CUSC (charging) Objectives are:

- a. 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;
- b. 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.

CMP363: Standard Code Administrator Consultation questions														
1	Do you believe that the CMP363 Original Proposal and/or WACM1 better facilitates the Applicable Objectives?	Mark the Objectives which you believe each solution better facilitates: <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 type="checkbox"/> E</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WACM1</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 type="checkbox"/> E</td> </tr> </table> <p>We support the Original Proposal and WACM1.</p> <p>We consider the Original to be the best solution. We believe the metering should be Settlement Metering in order to ensure accurate and robust data is used for charging and to properly take site losses into account.</p>	Original	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> E	WACM1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> E									
WACM1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> E									
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No No comment												
3	Do you have any other comments?	No comment												

CMP364: For reference the Applicable CUSC (non-charging) Objectives are:

- a) *The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence;*
- b) *Facilitating effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity, and (so far as consistent therewith) facilitating such competition in the sale, distribution and purchase of electricity;*
- c) *Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency *; and*
- d) *Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements.*

**The Electricity Regulation referred to in objective (c) 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.*

CMP364: Standard Code Administrator Consultation questions		
1	Do you believe that the CMP364 Original Proposal and/or WACM1 better facilitates the Applicable Objectives?	Mark the Objectives which you believe each solution better facilitates:
		Original <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> E
		WACM1 <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> E
		We support the Original Proposal. It is our understanding that there is no alternative for CMP364.
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		No comment
3	Do you have any other comments?	No comment