

Public

Code Administrator Consultation Response Proforma

CMP446: Increasing the lower threshold in England and Wales for Evaluation of Transmission Impact Assessment

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@nationalenergygyso.com by **5pm on 17 March 2025**. 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 milly.lewis@uk.nationalenergygyso.com or cusc.team@nationalenergygyso.com

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
Respondent name:	Martin Cahill	
Company name:	NESO	
Email address:	martin.cahill1@nationalenergygyso.com	
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)

☒ **Non-Confidential** (*this will be shared with industry and the Panel for further consideration*)

☐ **Confidential** (*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*)

Public

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 by this 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.*

* See Electricity System Operator Licence

**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.

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(s) against the Applicable Objectives?	Mark the Objectives which you believe the proposed solution(s) better facilitates:	
		Original	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D
		WACM1	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D
		WACM2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D
		WACM3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
		WACM4	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
		WACM5	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D

Public

		<p>We believe that the Original solution and WACM2 better facilitate the Applicable Objectives. These will both remove the need for a TIA for smaller projects, allowing these projects to connect quicker and help deliver Net Zero (Objective B) and improving the overall process by focussing assessment on projects which have a more significant impact on the Transmission System (Objective A). We believe there is also a positive impact of both on Objective D by increasing the efficiency of the connections process.</p> <p>While we welcome the intention of the other WACMs, we cannot support any variant for a modification relating to Transmission impact which is not agreeable by the Transmission Operator. NGET are best placed to agree what threshold is acceptable for these projects and have informed the workgroup that the threshold should in their view be based on Registered Capacity. Therefore we believe that WACM 1 and 4 are negative against Objective A and do not better facilitate the objectives overall.</p> <p>We believe that WACM3 and WACM4 have a negative impact on Objective B as the cap would be breached by projects which are already in the Connections Queue, and any potential risk of increasing the threshold is more to do with newer projects/changes which are not yet in the queue. These WACMs add a significant amount of complexity in administering (Objective D) while any future increase in impact from connections in the 1 to 5MW range could be addressed by a future change. There is also an interaction with CP2030 buckets where a Power Station could miss out on the ability to go through without a TIA, but then also not be able to connect because CP2030 buckets are full.</p>
--	--	---

Public

2	Do you have a preferred proposed solution?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> WACM1 <input type="checkbox"/> WACM2 <input type="checkbox"/> WACM3 <input type="checkbox"/> WACM4 <input type="checkbox"/> WACM5 <input type="checkbox"/> Baseline <input type="checkbox"/> No preference Our view is that the Original strikes the best balance between implementing efficiently and creating a positive change for stakeholders.
3	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.
4	Do you have any other comments?	Click or tap here to enter text.
5	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.