# CUSC Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma

**CMP285 ‘CUSC Governance Reform – Levelling the Playing Field’**

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 **10 September 2018** to 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 Shazia Akhtar at Shazia.akhtar2@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 Standard CUSC objectives are:  (a) The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence;(b) 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; (c) Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency \*; and (d) Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements. \*Objective (c) refers specifically to European Regulation 2009/714/EC. Reference to the Agency is to the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER). |

**Standard Workgroup consultation questions**

| **Q** | **Question** | **Response** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **Do you believe that CMP285 Original proposal, 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* |

**Specific questions for CMP285**

| **Q** | **Question** | **Response** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | **Do you think the draft legal text delivers the intent of the revised Proposal?** |  |
| 6 | **As per the revised Proposal, do you believe that CUSC signatories owned under a controlling parent company structure should be grouped into voting groups to limit their votes to a maximum of four votes for the CUSC panel elections?** |  |
| 7 | **Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to ensure that some parent companies of CUSC parties are not able to potentially exercise overwhelming control over cumulative CUSC panel votes?** |  |
| 8 | **As per the revised Proposal, do you support an independent model i.e. two independent (and salaried) panel members to join the remaining five user elected panel members?** |  |
| 9 | **As per the revised Proposal, do you believe that the independent panel members should be remunerated for their services and do you believe the proposed remuneration arrangements are appropriate?** |  |
| 10 | **As per the revised Proposal, do you agree that the consecutive terms of office of panel members should be time limited? If so, is the proposed two consecutive term limit (i.e. four years before a panel member would have to take a one term break before standing for election again) appropriate?** |  |
| 11 | **Do you believe there is a need to build greater knowledge and experience of CUSC matters across the industry? If so, does the revised Proposal help to share the knowledge and experience by ensuring a wider range of individuals sit on the panel over time?** |  |
| 12 | **As per the revised Proposal, do you agree with the suggested use of panel alternates whereby panel members would no longer be able to select an alternate in their absence and alternates would instead be allocated on the basis of being selected by the chair, or being next of a rota?** |  |
| 13 | **As per the revised Proposal, do you agree with the proposed changes to the nomination and voting process under Section 8A i.e. nominated candidates must provide additional information and parties wishing to vote must confirm their Voting Group to the Code Administrator in advance?** |  |

1. <https://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/electricity/codes/connection-and-use-system-code-cusc/cusc-modifications> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)