

Public

Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma

CMP447: Removal of designated Strategic Works from cancellation charges/securitisation

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 04 August 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 sarah.williams@neso.energy or cusc.team@neso.energy

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
Respondent name:	Eibhlin Norquoy	
Company name:	Community Energy Scotland	
Email address:	Eibhlin.norquoy@communityenergy.scot	
Phone number:	07919305843	
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 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)

Public

☐ **Confidential** (this will be disclosed to the Authority in full but, unless specified, will not be shared with the Workgroup, Panel or the industry for further consideration)

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

- i. The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and by this licence*;
- ii. 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;
- iii. Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency **; and
- iv. Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements.

* See Electricity System Operator Licence

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

For reference, 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;

Public

- 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 (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 Workgroup Consultation questions

1	Do you believe that the Original Proposal	Mark the Objectives which you believe the Original solution better facilitates than the current baseline:
---	---	---

Public

	better facilitates the Applicable Objectives versus the current baseline?	<div>Original</div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/>i <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>ii <input type="checkbox"/>iii <input type="checkbox"/>iv <input type="checkbox"/>None </div> <div>Click or tap here to enter text.</div>
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>No </div> <div>We believe this should be implemented ahead of Gate 2 offers being issued.</div>
3	Do you have any other comments?	This would reduce a significant hurdle for community owned renewable generation and storage projects which are reliant on the "Excepted" works.
4	Do you wish to raise a Workgroup Consultation Alternative Request for the Workgroup to consider?	<div> <input type="checkbox"/>Yes (the request form can be found in the Workgroup Consultation Section) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>No </div> <div>Click or tap here to enter text.</div>
5	Does the draft legal text satisfy the intent of the modification?	<div> <input type="checkbox"/>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>No </div> <div>Click or tap here to enter text.</div>
6	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?	<div> <input type="checkbox"/>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>No </div> <div></div>

Public


--	--	--

Specific Workgroup Consultation questions

7	Can you suggest a better definition, than those put forward in the Workgroup Consultation of how Ofgem might exercise its discretion in relation to designation of transmission works?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
		Click or tap here to enter text.
8	Can you suggest an alternative approach to adjustment of the 'fix' of the Attributable Works to that in the Original Proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
		Click or tap here to enter text.
9	Do you consider that if works are to be removed from the Attributable works cancellation charge (and therefore not securitised via the Attributable Works component of a Generator's potential	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		The purpose of removing works from the Attributable works cancellation charge is to remove unnecessary securities against those works. The works should not appear in the wider works cancellation charge as it has already been determined that it is unnecessary to post securities against those specific works which are

Public

	cancellation charge), because they are designated as “Excepted”, the definition of wider works cancellation charge should be altered so as to remove them from the wider works cancellation charge?	<p>designated as “Excepted”. The present calculation of wider works cancellation charge would reduce the value of the security against the works designated as “Excepted” but does not remove the entire security.</p> <p>Based on the intention of CMP447, the definition of the wider works cancellation charge would need to be altered to exclude the “Excepted” works as well as the Attributable Works.</p>
10	Following on from Question 9, does this require a different modification if so?	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Not amending the definition would result in an unintended consequence which is directly counter to the purpose of this CMP therefore we believe it should be included within this modification.</p>
11	Is it important is it for this solution to be implemented in time for Gate 2 offers being issued? Please explain your rationale.	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The Gate 2 to Whole Queue process aims to reorder the connections queue with Users projects that are ‘ready’ and ‘needed’ to connect. Requiring Users to provide unnecessary securities creates a barrier for projects that are ready and needed. This includes community owned projects which have repeatedly shown a much larger social benefit than privately owned projects. It is therefore important to promote effective competition through the reduction of the overall financial burden for Users, facilitate the achievement of Net Zero targets, facilitate access to the system, and accelerate User connections.</p>



Public