

# Review of TAR CUSC process

CUSC Amendments Panel

25 September 2009



**nationalgrid**

The power of action.™

# Agenda

---

- ◆ Objectives
- ◆ Review of TAR CUSC process – discussion
  - ◆ Timescales
  - ◆ Working Groups
  - ◆ CAP160 Process
  - ◆ CUSC / charging interaction
  - ◆ Other issues
- ◆ Conclusions

# Session objectives

---

- ◆ Discuss:
  - ◆ TAR CUSC Process Issues
    - ◆ What went well?
    - ◆ What did not go well?
- ◆ Agree:
  - ◆ Conclusions
    - ◆ What changes are required?
    - ◆ How should these changes be taken forward?

# Timescales

---

- ◆ Pressure from Government to reach timely conclusion....
- ◆ But, complex areas required significant level of analysis
  
- ◆ Standing group to consider main issues followed by the detailed consideration of fewer mods?
  - ◆ How would this provide signal that progress was being made?
  
- ◆ More formal working group project programmes would facilitate more informed debate with Ofgem on the need for time extensions

# Working Groups

---

- ◆ Transmission Access modifications were organised into three separate Working Groups
  - ◆ Short-term access
  - ◆ Long-term access
  - ◆ Supporting changes
- ◆ Continuity provided by common chair and working group members and occasional workshops for all....
- ◆ But groups struggled when their work areas depended on the work of other groups (e.g. sharing zones)

# CAP160 Process 1

---

- ◆ Timing of process change
  - ◆ Immediately prior to major programme of amendments
- ◆ Working group consultation
  - ◆ At what stage should this be done?
    - ◆ Too early – not enough detail to allow respondents to contribute to debate
    - ◆ Too late – limited opportunity for respondents to influence outcome of working group discussions

# CAP160 Process 2

---

- ◆ Working Group Alternative Amendments
  - ◆ Who can raise them and when?
    - ◆ CUSC needs to be clearer
  - ◆ Better than baseline and/or original
    - ◆ A very bad original is a low threshold!
    - ◆ Again, CUSC needs to be clearer
- ◆ Role of the Chair
  - ◆ The balance between ensuring all sensible alternatives progress, and preventing too many alternatives is difficult to strike

# CUSC / Charging Interaction

---

- ◆ Better than usual, but still considerable room for improvement
- ◆ Time pressure meant it was difficult for charging developments to keep pace with defined CUSC process timescales
  - ◆ Focus on CUSC was necessary to ensure delivery
- ◆ Indicative charges were useful in improving industry understanding of access options....
- ◆ But linking particular charging options with particular models was unhelpful!

# Other issues

---

- ◆ Size of reports
  - ◆ Repetition within reports
- ◆ Too many consultations?
  - ◆ CUSC
    - ◆ Working Group
    - ◆ Company
  - ◆ Charging
    - ◆ Pre-consultation
    - ◆ Consultation
  - ◆ Impact Assessment

# Conclusions

---

- ◆ What changes are required?
- ◆ How should changes be taken forward?