

**Code Administrator Consultation Response Proforma****CMP395: Cap BSUoS costs and Defer payment to 2023/24 to protect GB customers**

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 **16 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.j.mullen@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:Paul.j.mullen@nationalgrideso.com) or [cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com)

Respondent details	Please enter your details
<b>Respondent name:</b>	Paul Youngman
<b>Company name:</b>	Drax
<b>Email address:</b>	paul.youngman@drax.com
<b>Phone number:</b>	07738802266

**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:**

- 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*

- 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.

Standard Code Administrator Consultation questions																																						
1	Do you believe that the Original Proposal and/or WACM1, WACM2, WACM3, WACM4 and WACM5 better facilitates the Applicable Objectives?	<p>Mark the Objectives which you believe each solution better facilitates:</p> <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> <tr> <td>WACM2</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>WACM3</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>A</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>B</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>C</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>D</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>E</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WACM4</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>WACM5</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>The Original proposal, WACM1, WACM2, WACM 4 and WACM5 are all positive against both applicable objective (a) and applicable objective (c). For (a) the proposals are likely to further competition in the supply and generation of electricity and lower costs to consumers overall by deferring charges above the cap level to the new charging year and reducing Generator BSUoS risk-premia. It was accepted by the workgroup that BSUoS charges are exceptionally volatile and difficult to forecast, even when compared to the previous instances when similar interventions have been granted by the Authority. For ACO (c) the proposals are positive adaptations of the charging methodology that reflect the impact of the challenging market conditions whilst ensuing ESO duties and obligations, including those with regard to competition, are maintained.</p> <p>WACM3 proposes a cap of £40/MWh which we believe would severely limit the benefit of the proposal. We therefore conclude that this option is broadly neutral against applicable objectives (a) and (c). We also note that this was the least favoured alternative, having to be 'saved' by the workgroup chair to become an official WACM.</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	WACM2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> E	WACM3	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> E	WACM4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> E	WACM5	<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																																	
WACM2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> E																																	
WACM3	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> E																																	
WACM4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> E																																	
WACM5	<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?	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>No</p> <p>We are supportive of the workgroup consensus that the implementation approach and recovery process should be consistent for all proposals.</p>																																				
3	Do you have any other comments?	No further comment.																																				