

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](mailto: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](mailto:sarah.williams@neso.energy) or [cusc.team@neso.energy](mailto:cusc.team@neso.energy)

| Respondent details                             | Please enter your details   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Respondent name:</b>                        | Tim Ellingham   |   |
| <b>Company name:</b>                           | RWE   |   |
| <b>Email address:</b>                          | Tim.ellingham@rwe.com   |   |
| <b>Phone number:</b>                           | 0798932176  |   |
| <b>Which best describes your organisation?</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Consumer body<br><input type="checkbox"/> Demand<br><input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Generator<br><input type="checkbox"/> Industry body<br><input type="checkbox"/> Interconnector | <input type="checkbox"/> Storage<br><input type="checkbox"/> Supplier<br><input type="checkbox"/> System Operator<br><input type="checkbox"/> Transmission Owner<br><input type="checkbox"/> Virtual Lead Party<br><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*)

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?                        | Original   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> i <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ii <input type="checkbox"/> iii <input type="checkbox"/> iv <input type="checkbox"/> None |
|   |  | This mod will avoid over securitisation of works, thus lowering the financial barrier to undertaking generation projects directly connecting. This will encourage investment into the country, reduce the risk to existing projects, and enable more competition.  |   |
| 2 | Do you support the proposed implementation approach?   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes<br><input type="checkbox"/> No   |   |
|   |  | If it is possible to get the process completed before reform offers are made then this would be logical and avoid re-issuance of security statements.  |   |
| 3 | Do you have any other comments?  | The mod seeks to address works assigned to generation connections, however some of these works may also form the make-up of Final Sums on Demand connections. CMP417 has been referenced in the workgroup report, but if that mod does not succeed or is delayed, then the term Attributable Works will not apply to demand and that class of User will not see the same benefit that Generators do from this mod. In addition, will connections via DNO networks also benefit from this mod or are they in the same camp as directly connected Used/Demand? |   |
| 4 | Do you wish to raise a Workgroup Consultation Alternative Request for the Workgroup to consider? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (the request form can be found in the <a href="#">Workgroup Consultation Section</a> )<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  |   |
|   |  | Click or tap here to enter text.   |   |

## Public

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| 5 | Does the draft legal text satisfy the intent of the modification?   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes<br><input type="checkbox"/> No<br><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? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes<br><input type="checkbox"/> No<br><div></div>                                 |

## 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<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No<br><div>We are keen that definitions do not limit what can be designated under this process. We support the publication of a list of Excepted Works by Ofgem so that their impact on relevant projects are possible to be assessed by Users.</div> |
| 8 | Can you suggest an alternative approach to adjustment of the   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  |

## Public

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
|    | 'fix' of the Attributable Works to that in the Original Proposal?  | We support the proposed adjustment for previously fixed projects  |
| 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 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? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes<br><input type="checkbox"/> No<br><p>Yes, as otherwise this presents a backdoor route where removed Attributable costs re-appear, albeit somewhat diluted, back into the Wider Works Cancellation Charge.</p>   |
| 10 | Following on from Question 9, does this require a different modification if so?  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No<br><p>We believe such a change should form part of this mod to avoid a period where designated works could be moved through to Wider charges prior to the 'Wider' being adjusted. A party cancelling (or even just securing against cancellation) in that period would</p> |

## Public

|    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
|    |  | then be liable for works which, from the intention of this mod, they should not be.  |
| 11 | Is it important is it for this solution to be implemented in time for Gate 2 offers being issued? Please explain your rationale. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes<br><input type="checkbox"/> No   |
|    |  | It would be logical for this solution to be implemented ahead of G2 offers to avoid additional security statements being produced at a later stage and to allow parties to assess their financial exposures more accurately. |