

Public

Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma

CMP460: Improving Transmission Connection Asset Charging

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 **18 February 2026**. 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 cusc.team@neso.energy

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
Respondent name:	<i>Jonathan Oguntona</i>	
Company name:	<i>BayWa r.e UK Limited</i>	
Email address:	<i>Jonathan.Oguntona@baywa-re.co.uk</i>	
Phone number:	<i>M: +447508890930 T: +44141 4680592 </i>	
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 type="checkbox"/> Storage <input type="checkbox"/> Supplier <input 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:

☒ **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 Panel or the industry for further consideration)**

For reference the Applicable CUSC (charging) Objectives are:

- d) *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;*
- e) *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);*
- f) *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*;*
- g) *Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency **; and*
- h) *Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the system charging methodology.*

* See Electricity System Operator Licence

**The Electricity Regulation referred to in objective g) 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, (for consultation question 5) the Electricity Balancing Regulation (EBR) Article 3 Objectives and regulatory aspects are:

Public

- 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;*
- 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

Public

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 better facilitates the Applicable Objectives versus the current baseline?	<p>Mark the Objectives which you believe the Original Solution better facilitates than the current baseline:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Original</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>d <input type="checkbox"/>e <input type="checkbox"/>f <input type="checkbox"/>g <input type="checkbox"/>h <input type="checkbox"/>None</td> </tr> </table> <p><i>Creating a consistent charging approach for Users connecting at a Grid Supply Point SuperGrid Transformer, which could be either an Infrastructure Asset or a Transmission Connection Assets, as currently defined, removes a significant step-change cost distortion. This promotes competition in generation by enabling a more level playing field for all Users.</i></p> <p><i>N.B., We do not support Option 2 (see answer to Question 6). We would support development of Option 3 (see answer to question 7).</i></p>	Original	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d <input type="checkbox"/> e <input type="checkbox"/> f <input type="checkbox"/> g <input type="checkbox"/> h <input type="checkbox"/> None
Original	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d <input type="checkbox"/> e <input type="checkbox"/> f <input type="checkbox"/> g <input type="checkbox"/> h <input type="checkbox"/> None			
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>No</p> <p><i>Yes, we agree with the timing and with the suggestion that bilateral contracts between Users and NESO as well as</i></p>		

Public

		<i>between embedded generators and DNOs will have to change to reflect changes to the charging methodology. This is required to maintain progress to CP30 targets.</i>
3	Do you have any other comments?	<i>No.</i>
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 Workgroup Consultation Section) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <div>Click or tap here to enter text.</div>
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 <div>Click or tap here to enter text.</div>

Public

Specific Workgroup Consultation questions		
6	Do you agree with the Proposer's view on when the new definition of Infrastructure Assets and Connection Assets should be applied to new and existing connection agreements, and therefore amend the connection charges in a User's agreement?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		<p><i>Yes, we agree with the timing and with the suggestion that bilateral contracts between Users and NESO as well as between embedded generators and DNOs will have to change to reflect changes to the charging methodology. This is essential to safeguard the post CP30 targets.</i></p> <p><i>We do not support Option 2, which broadly maintains the status quo and offers no useful solution to the impasse of 'cliff-edge' reinforcement cost risk.</i></p>
7	Is moving the cost to Transmission Demand Residual (TDR) reasonable?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		<p><i>We agree that on balance a significant proportion of the associated capital cost should be recovered via the TDR component of TNUoS, as there are net system benefits.</i></p> <p><i>However, it is important that the User demonstrates commitment to the proposed connection, and that undue costs do not fall on general bill-payers without there being an overall net benefit. We believe a degree of cost (for example, an apportioned cost, or regulated standard contribution per-MW) should be levied against each connecting User, linked to maximum contracted import or export. Our preferred solution is therefore closer to Option 3 than Option 1.</i></p>