

Public

# Final TNUoS Tariffs for 2026/27 Webinar

## Q&A Summary – 12/02/2026

**Contributors** Nick Everitt, Sarah Chleboun, Alan Fradley, Priya Chigullapalli, Tobi Odusanya, Dan Hickman, Nicky White, Katie Clark & Edward Adofo

**Purpose** To summarise the questions asked as part of the Final TNUoS Tariffs for 2026/27 Webinar and the answers provided by the presenters.

**Date** 12/02/2026

### Introduction

A webinar was held on 12 February 2026 to outline the Final TNUoS Tariffs for 2026/27.

You can download the slide deck from this webinar [HERE](#)

You can view a recording of this webinar [HERE](#)

The following questions were asked, and answers provided during the webinar Q&A session. It is worth noting that the written answers provided below may differ, be more detailed or include additional information that we were not able to provide during the live webinar.

Topic: REVENUE		
#	Questions	Answers
1.	When is the next 5 year revenue view expected and how will this be communicated?	<p>The team has received feedback that more frequent five-year revenue views would be helpful and will consider what can be included in the initial forecast report. However, under the STC rules, updated revenue information from Transmission Owners is not expected until October, so any interim update may show only limited changes.</p> <p>In recent years, interim five-year revenue views have been provided where possible due to strong industry interest, and the intention is to continue doing this. Ongoing STC change proposals aim to give NESO access to more information, potentially enabling more regular and more detailed longer-term revenue forecasts.</p>

## Public

Topic: REVENUE		
#	Questions	Answers
		<p>An update on this work is expected to be shared at the next Transmission Charging Methodology Forum (TCMF) meeting in early March.</p> <p>Further details on the TCMF can be found on the NESO website: <a href="https://neso.energy/industry-information/codes/connection-and-use-system-code-cusc/cusc-forum">neso.energy/industry-information/codes/connection-and-use-system-code-cusc/cusc-forum</a>.</p>
2.	Why does offshore TNUoS dip in 2027/28?	The offshore revenue line on slide 13 also includes the interconnector contribution/allowances based on their January revenue submissions. Therefore, the lower value for 2027/28 is due to the net impact of the offshore TO revenues and interconnector submissions.

Topic: SENSITIVITIES		
#	Questions	Answers
3.	Will the additional year forecasts be robust with models provided or will they be similar to the previous 10-year projection, less robust?	There are no firm plans yet for how the additional year forecasts will be produced. However, feedback from the previous 10year projection has been taken on board, and the intention is to improve the robustness and quality of any future longer-year projection. The exact approach is still to be determined, but the aim is to make the next version better than the last.

## Public

Topic: GENERATION		
#	Questions	Answers
4.	Generation used in the locational model is not updated but the NESO best view of generation has been updated in the tariff model. Won't this affect locational?	No, the locational tariffs (the Peak Security, Year-Round Shared and Year-round not shared) are set using the Contracted TEC as of 31st October. We then assess how much revenue we expect to collect from generators using these tariffs and the expected charging base, at which point the adjustment tariff is calculated to ensure that we are collecting a value allowed under the limiting regulation.
5.	You say final locational tariffs must be based on TEC register, but the model circulated says the model uses best view of TEC not contracted TEC. Please clarify.	<p>The model uses two different generation datasets for different purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contracted TEC (as set at 31 October) is used to calculate the locational tariffs.</li> <li>Best-view generation (charging base) is used to calculate the non-locational tariffs.</li> </ul> <p>It's worth noting that in the version of the model that we share externally, the charging-base data is not included because it is confidential, so both columns will appear the same in the version that you see (except for interconnector data, since they do not feed into our charging base). Internally, however, the two datasets are distinct and used in different parts of the model.</p>
6.	Are locational tariffs based on contracted TEC or NESO best view in final tariffs?	Locational Tariffs are based on the contracted TEC as per the TEC register on the 31 October.
7.	Could you explain why the locational tariffs in the model don't match published tariffs if contracted TEC is based on public TEC register? Shouldn't they match?	<p>Thank you for highlighting this issue. This issue has been investigated and some missing nodes on the Gen Input Tab caused the Wider Generation Tariff to be mis-matched.</p> <p>The Public Model will be re-issued where the Wider Generation Tariffs between the Public and Tariff model versions do match. The Contracted TEC was used in both models and that input data is unchanged.</p>

## Public

Topic: GENERATION		
#	Questions	Answers
8.	Will the delay in protected contracts - 2/3 of protected projects running late - introduce instability in 2027 tariffs?	"2/3 of protected projects running late" doesn't match NESO's data and likely comes from a recent press article rather than internal information, even if some protected projects face delays, this is not expected to cause instability in the 2027 tariffs. NESO uses both best-view and actual TEC data, and any updated energisation dates are incorporated into the tariff calculations as they become known. Therefore, delays would be reflected in the data, not create instability

Topic: GENERAL / OTHER		
#	Questions	Answers
9.	Did you guys say that Scottish TNUoS is lower this year than last because of CMP463? Could you briefly explain how CMP463 did this?	The reduction is relative to the draft forecast, not compared with last year's charges. CMP463: Stabilising the Specific Onshore Expansion Factors from 1st April 2026, lowered the modelled cost of power flows on certain Scottish circuits by adjusting the link specific expansion factors. Since these affected circuits are all in Scotland, the change reduced Scottish tariffs compared with the earlier draft forecast—not compared with the previous tariff years.
10.	Is it right that CMP460 could alter TNUoS for next year?	CMP460: Improving Transmission Connection Asset Charging is not expected to affect next year's TNUoS tariffs. Its implementation date is targeted for 1 April 2027, so it will not impact the tariffs that have just been published.
11.	Could there be a republication of the 5 year forecasts following CMP463 approval due to the significant impact?	<p>Re-publishing the five-year forecasts after CMP463 is unlikely. While the team can look into what effort would be involved, we generally do not revise or reissue previous publications once a decision has been made. Although CMP463 was approved late and there is a long gap until the next planned five-year view in September, re-publishing would be significant work. The team will discuss it, but there are no promises at this stage. It's worth noting that with the models that we make available, interested parties can make their own changes to parameters such as revenues, LSEFs, Security Factors etc.</p> <p>We have reviewed this request since the webinar and can confirm that we do not currently have capacity to rework the last 5-year view. However, we will be providing a view of the individual and</p>

## Public

Topic: GENERAL / OTHER		
#	Questions	Answers
		<p>updated Specific Expansion Factors from the implementation of CMP463 at the next TCMF meeting in March.</p> <p>Further details on the TCMF can be found on the NESO website: <a href="https://neso.energy/industry-information/codes/connection-and-use-system-code-cusc/cusc-forum">neso.energy/industry-information/codes/connection-and-use-system-code-cusc/cusc-forum</a>.</p>
12.	<p>You normally say you can't accept changes after end September. Yet CMP463 was issued in January. How did accommodate that?</p>	<p>There is normally a cutoff point for when modification decisions can be included in tariffs, but CMP463 was treated as an agreed exception. It was clear that this modification needed to be incorporated before tariff publication, and this was discussed closely with Ofgem. Although Ofgem sets the cutoff rules, they also allow for exceptions where necessary.</p> <p>In this case, the modification was manageable to implement quickly because it only required updating a small number of values rather than making major system or model changes. Whether a late modification can be accommodated depends on its scale and complexity.</p>