

Public

Code Administrator Consultation Response Proforma

CMP444: Introducing a cap and floor to wider generation TNUoS charges

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 cust.team@nationalenergyso.com by **5pm** on **14 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 cust.team@nationalenergyso.com

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
Respondent name:	Tom Palmer	
Company name:	Zenobe Energy	
Email address:	Tom.palmer@zenobe.com	
Phone number:	07760 128 046	
Which best describes your organisation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer body <input type="checkbox"/> Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Generator <input type="checkbox"/> Industry body <input type="checkbox"/> Interconnector	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Storage <input type="checkbox"/> Supplier <input type="checkbox"/> System Operator <input type="checkbox"/> Transmission Owner <input type="checkbox"/> Virtual Lead Party <input checked="" 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 (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 C11 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 and the ISOP business*;*
- Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency **; and*
- Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the system charging methodology.*

* See Electricity System Operator Licence

**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	Please provide your assessment for the proposed solutions against the Applicable Objectives?	Mark the Objectives which you believe the proposed solutions better facilitates:
		Original <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input 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
		WACM2 <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input 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 type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> E
		WACM5 <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> E

Public

		WACM6	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> E
		WACM7	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> E
		<p>We support the need for reform to network charging, as the current regime has got out of control and is not fit for purpose.</p> <p>However, we cannot conclude that any of the proposed modifications better facilitate the applicable objectives. This is because the proposed change and objective of the cap and floor recommended by Ofgem doesn't align with the CUSC objectives.</p> <p>We do not believe that the proposal to introduce the Cap is covered under the CUSC Objectives directly, but that doesn't mean it is not better.</p> <p>However, even though the objective of the change doesn't align with the CUSC objectives, we would support the change because the network charges need substantial reform anyway and this is a short-term solution.</p> <p>In summary, our ability to support any of the proposed solution due to the interaction with many ongoing TNUoS code modifications, REMA and the wider uncertainty created by Ofgem's letter on their approach to prioritising decisions on TNUoS - <u>Open letter: Our approach to prioritisation of electricity transmission network charging modifications / Ofgem.</u></p>	
2	Do you have a preferred proposed solution?	<input 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"/> WACM6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WACM7	

Public

		<input type="checkbox"/> Baseline <input type="checkbox"/> No preference
		We think it strikes the fairest balance
3	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		But a lot of uncertainty remains.
4	Do you have any other comments?	We welcome the analysis and spreadsheet by NESO to test modifications and would like to see the same approach on all mods.
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.
		Click or tap here to enter text.