# CUSC Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma

**CMP259 ‘Clarification of decrease in TEC as a Modification’**

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 by **17:00 3rd May 2016** to [cusc.team@nationalgrid.com](mailto:cusc.team@nationalgrid.com) Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration by the Workgroup.

Any queries on the content of the consultation should be addressed to Christine Brown at [Christine.brown1@nationalgrid.com](mailto:Christine.brown1@nationalgrid.com)

These responses will be considered by the Workgroup at their next meeting at which members will also consider any Workgroup Consultation Alternative Requests. Where appropriate, the Workgroup will record your response and its consideration of it within the final Workgroup Report which is submitted to the CUSC Modifications Panel.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Respondent:** | *Please insert your name and contact details (phone number or email address)* |
| **Company Name:** | *Please insert Company Name* |
| **Please express your views regarding the Workgroup Consultation, including rationale.**  **(Please include any issues, suggestions or queries)** | For reference, the Applicable CUSC objectives are: **Standard CUSC Objectives**   1. the efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence; 2. 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; 3. Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency. |

**Standard Workgroup consultation questions**

| **Q** | **Question** | **Response** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **Do you believe that CMP259 Original proposal, or any potential alternatives for change that you wish to suggest, better facilitates the Applicable CUSC Objectives?** |  |
| 2 | **Do you support the proposed implementation approach?** |  |
| 3 | **Do you have any other comments?** |  |
| 4 | **Do you wish to raise a WG Consultation Alternative Request for the Workgroup to consider?** | *If yes, please complete a WG Consultation Alternative Request form, available on National Grid's website[[1]](#footnote-1), and return to the CUSC inbox at* [*cusc.team@nationalgrid.com*](mailto:cusc.team@nationalgrid.com) |

**Specific questions for CMP254**

| **Q** | **Question** | **Response** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | **Do you believe that should CM259 be implemented there would be a subsequent greater reduction in TEC (MW) across the Transmission system than would have been the case without CMP259?** |  |
| 6 | **If at least one year and five days’ notice of the (MW) TEC reduction has been given by the generator, then the TNUoS charges that would otherwise have been paid by the generator would be entirely funded via the remaining generators across the system paying an additional amount through an increase in the Generation Residual Tariff element, unless another generator utilises this capacity. Under CMP259, generators may pay this additional residual charge for capacity which may not actually be available for permanent reallocation because its return has been guaranteed to the generator making the modification application. What are your views about this?** |  |
| 7 | **Do you believe CMP259 would alter the signal provided to Generators through TNUoS charges?** |  |
| 8 | **Do you believe that the process for issuing Interactive offers would be affected by CMP259 and that this would require a change in the manner in which capacity can be allocated by TOs?** |  |
| 9 | **There are a number of scenarios outlined in Annex 4. What are your views about the impact of the proposals on these? Are there any additional scenarios that that the Workgroup should consider?** |  |
| 10 | **Do you agree that should a generator reduce its TEC (MW) level to 0 in any charging year that the generic figure should be used to calculate their ALF level?** |  |
| 11 | **In your opinion, what are the potential benefits of CMP259? Could you provide evidence of these benefits?** |  |
| 12 | **Do you believe that CMP259 will facilitate a more efficient utilisation of the transmission system?** |  |

1. <http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Electricity/Codes/systemcode/amendments/forms_guidance/> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)