

Public

Code Administrator Consultation Response Proforma

CMP471: Interim Contract Variation Process Ahead of CMP434 Gated Application Window

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 **25 September 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:	Rob Smith	
Company name:	Enso Green Holdings Ltd	
Email address:	Rob.smith@ensoenergy.co.uk	
Phone number:	Click or tap here to enter text.	
Which best describes your organisation?	☐ Consumer body ☐ Demand ☐ Distribution Network Operator ☒ Generator ☐ Industry body ☐ Interconnector	☒ Storage ☐ Supplier ☐ System Operator ☐ Transmission Owner ☐ Virtual Lead Party ☐ Other

Public

I wish my response to be:

(Please mark the relevant box)	☒ Non-Confidential (<i>this <u>will be shared</u> with industry and the Panel for further consideration</i>)
	☐ Confidential (<i>this will be disclosed to the Authority in full but, unless specified, <u>will not be shared</u> with the Panel or the industry for further consideration</i>)

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, (for consultation questions 5) the Electricity Balancing Regulation (EBR) Article 3 Objectives and regulatory aspects are:

- a) *fostering effective competition, non-discrimination and transparency in balancing markets;*

Public

- 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 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.

Public

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 solution(s) against the Applicable Objectives against the current baseline.	Mark the Objectives which you believe the proposed solution(s) better facilitates than the current baseline: <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Original</td> <td>☐i ☒ii ☐iii ☒iv ☐None</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WACM1</td> <td>☐i ☒ii ☐iii ☒iv ☐None</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WACM2</td> <td>☐i ☐ii ☐iii ☐iv ☒None</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WACM3</td> <td>☐i ☒ii ☐iii ☒iv ☐None</td> </tr> </table> Click or tap here to enter text.	Original	☐ i ☒ ii ☐ iii ☒ iv ☐ None	WACM1	☐ i ☒ ii ☐ iii ☒ iv ☐ None	WACM2	☐ i ☐ ii ☐ iii ☐ iv ☒ None	WACM3	☐ i ☒ ii ☐ iii ☒ iv ☐ None
Original	☐ i ☒ ii ☐ iii ☒ iv ☐ None									
WACM1	☐ i ☒ ii ☐ iii ☒ iv ☐ None									
WACM2	☐ i ☐ ii ☐ iii ☐ iv ☒ None									
WACM3	☐ i ☒ ii ☐ iii ☒ iv ☐ None									
2	Do you have a preferred proposed solution?	☒Yes ☐No If yes, please indicate below which one. <table border="1"> <tr> <td>WACM3</td> </tr> </table>	WACM3							
WACM3										
3	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	☒Yes ☐No Click or tap here to enter text.								
4	Do you have any other comments?	The approximate 2-year freeze in the connection application process, coupled with the evolving uncertainty of what a User's revised offer would contain, has led to a significant drop in investment confidence in the generation sector with many funders suspending								

Public

		the placement of capital until they receive Gate 2 offers and the associated clarity on revised connection dates, connection costs and connection points. The implications being that developers are no longer able to make the necessary procurement commitments early enough to hit the connection dates they might get when the Gate 2 offer is issued. This proposal simply provides the possibility of reinstating the timeframes that makes development of a project focused on completion, credible and achievable. The adjustment of the timing of the QM milestones is an important factor in this proposal as projects that have been delayed, due to this externally created uncertainty, will have to amend the development stages within a project as well as the completion date.
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?	☒ Yes ☐ No Click or tap here to enter text.