
Energy code reform programme– statutory consultation on modifications to industry codes to implement the harmonised code modification prioritisation process – response template

This document provides a template for responses to our statutory consultation on modifications to industry codes to implement the harmonised code modification prioritisation process, published on 20 November 2025.

If you are interested in responding to this consultation, please complete this word document and send it to industrycodes@ofgem.gov.uk by the end of the day on 12 January 2026.

Guidance

We typically publish consultation responses when we publish our decision. To ensure that we can correctly attribute your response, please ensure that you enter all relevant details in the “your company’s details” section (template part 1).

If you would like us to treat your response as being confidential, either in full or in part, please indicate this to us below. Further information on how we will treat your response, data and confidentiality can be found at the end of this document.

Please use template part 2 to provide your responses. For all questions, the template below provides space for you to enter free text comments. Some questions also ask whether you agree with our proposals. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with relevant proposals by deleting all but one of the bullets provided.

There is also a section for “general feedback” (template part 3). Please use this section to provide any views on the overall consultation process.

Template part 1: your organisation's details

Contact name	Andrew Enzor
Role title	Regulation and Policy Manager
Company name	Field
Telephone number	07701218732
Email address	Andrew.enzor@field.energy
Date of submission	9 January 2026
Do you want your response treated as confidential? (If yes, please indicate whether you would like the whole of your response to be confidential, or just particular parts).	No

Template part 2: consultation responses

Summary

Field develops, constructs, operates and optimises the renewable energy infrastructure needed to get to net zero. We are an international company, with our main focus to date on batteries in GB. We have a 500MW/900MWh portfolio of nine assets of varying sizes connecting to both transmission and distribution networks, which are operational, in construction, or preparing for construction, and a 3.5GW development pipeline of large, transmission connected assets in GB alone, alongside a similar pipeline in Spain, Italy and Germany.

We have first-hand experience of the code modification process and challenges it presents. Our Regulation and Policy Manager is a CUSC Modifications Panel member and we are the Proposer of a live DCUSA modification (DCP452).

There are clearly fundamental issues to be addressed with the code modification process and its ability to consistently and efficiently deliver outcomes which benefit consumers. Hence we are supportive of Ofgem’s ongoing work to reform the codes and associated modification processes.

However, we are concerned that Ofgem’s proposals on prioritisation in particular may not deliver the desired outcomes.

Firstly, we suggest Ofgem should (briefly) examine the underlying causes of modification proposals being slow to progress. We think there are three key issues:

- Ofgem is often slow to make modification decisions, and in many instances has now effectively said that it cannot make a decision at all on many modifications. Better prioritisation of modifications to the point of submitting a report to Ofgem for decision is academic if no decision is then made
- Multiple modifications are being “sent back” by Ofgem to workgroups for further analysis. We think there are two drivers here:
 - o Ofgem’s engagement with ongoing modifications is often light-touch. We appreciate Ofgem attendees at workgroups cannot influence the development of the modification or make any comment on its merits. But they should (indeed must) provide feedback to workgroups on

whether the analysis being carried out is likely to be sufficient for Ofgem to make a decision, and provide guidance on further analysis which Ofgem will need. We recommend Ofgem formally assigns an individual to each live code modification, with responsibility for providing guidance to the workgroup on the analysis which will be required for Ofgem to make a decision

- o For some modifications, in particular to the DCUSA, impact analysis can only be carried out by the DNOs because transparency is poor (for example only the DNOs have access to populated charging models for higher voltage users). DNOs have no obligation nor any incentive to provide such analysis, and as a result have an effective veto on modifications by simply not providing analysis
- The need for prioritisation is often driven by a lack of resource in code administration teams. This is certainly the case in CUSC where multiple modifications are effectively on hold because the code administrator does not have resource to progress them. The proposed new approach to prioritisation will only be effective if that bottleneck is removed. We recognise that industry resource may also be a challenge. Industry can and will resource up to the demands of ongoing modifications – but can only do so if it has confidence that such additional resource will be used on code modifications rather than those code modifications being sat on hold waiting for resource from the code administrator to come available

Secondly, the proposed prioritisation criteria are likely not fit for purpose when comparing modifications with very different attributes. In particular, it is not clear from the criteria whether “tactical” proposals which may have relatively limited impact but are quick and easy to develop should be prioritised over “strategic” proposals which are highly impactful but complex and hard to develop. Tactical modifications are unlikely to align with the SDS because they typically relate to discrete, new issues which arise over time and so would not be considered by the SDS. We fear the changes will lead to “tactical” proposals being consistently de-prioritised. **Any prioritisation approach which prevents quick wins from progressing quickly is not fit for purpose.** We suggest Ofgem considers a differentiation between “tactical”

modifications (which progress as high priority in all instances to deliver quick wins) vs “strategic” modifications which are subjected to the more rigorous proposed prioritisation approach.

Thirdly, the proposed criteria are subjective and vague. Different parties will have different views on importance and it will be challenging for Panels to clearly convey how they have reached a decision based on this criterion. Complexity is poorly defined – it is not established whether high complexity is to be prioritised above low or vice versa.

Finally, we think there are issues with the proposed categorisations of “urgent”, “high” and “standard”:

- The definition of “urgent” and the implications of a modification being classed as urgent differs materially across codes (for example it is very different between CUSC and DCUSA). This appears to be a missed opportunity for alignment
- We expect most modifications will be prioritised as “standard”
 - o In the context of CUSC in particular, where Panel prioritisation is routinely required to manage code administrator resource constraints, this is not fit for purpose. The change process currently relies upon a more detailed breakdown of prioritisation enabling the Panel (not code administrator) to decide which non-urgent modification to progress first when resource allows. Categorising most modifications simply as “standard” will remove this differentiation
 - o Under DCUSA where prioritisation does not currently exist, we infer that the code administrator is implicitly doing its own prioritisation (based on our experience of the modification for which we are the proposer being held up by modifications related to Market Wide Half Hourly Settlement). Again, prioritising most modifications as standard will leave this implicit prioritisation to be done opaquely by code administrators. That is not their role.

We would be happy to discuss any of the points raised in this response in more detail as required.

Question 1: Do you agree with the policy and associated code modifications proposed in Section 1. Prioritisation process?

- Agree

Comments: We agree that standardisation across codes is appropriate, that code panels should determine priority for each modification and that code panels should take into consideration the Proposer's view when doing so. We would also recommend Ofgem takes this opportunity to standardise across codes the criteria for a modification being classed as urgent and the implications of that classification for its development.

However, as noted above, the proposed policy will only be effective if:

- Code administrators have sufficient resource to progress code modifications
- Ofgem is an active participant in workgroups providing direction on analysis required for it to make a decision
- Ofgem can make timely decisions on modifications

Question 2: Do you agree with the policy and associated code modifications proposed in Section 2. Prioritisation criteria and governance?

- Disagree

Comments: As per our opening comments, the proposed criteria are not fit for purpose. They are simultaneously subjective and vague in their definitions and too prescriptive to enable code panels to effectively prioritise. They also do not allow for differentiation between tactical, quick-win modifications vs strategic, harder to develop modifications, and risk tactical modifications always being deprioritised, or worse not raised at all due to the perceived barriers to their progression from prospective proposers. That would be a poor outcome, misaligned with the fundamental concept of open governance arrangements in codes.

Question 3: Do you agree with the policy and associated code modifications proposed in Section 3. Prioritisation reporting and governance?

- Agree

Comments: The proposed assessment cycle and associated reporting appears appropriate. However, we disagree with the proposal to not include an appeals process for proposers to challenge the priority assigned. The lack of an opportunity to appeal will undermine industry confidence in the new prioritisation process and leave proposers unable to correct any potential misinterpretation of modifications by code panels.

Question 4: Do you agree with the policy and associated code modifications proposed in Section 4. Policy implementation?

- Agree

Comments: Applying the new prioritisation process to live modifications is the only sensible option to avoid a messy situation of assessing two sets of modifications against different prioritisation criteria and prioritisation categories.

Question 5: Do you agree with our proposed implementation date of 28 days from the publication of the related prioritisation policy decision notice?

- Agree

Comments: None

Question 6: Do you agree with the proposed guidance in ‘Annex A: Proposed Authority guidance on code modification prioritisation’?

- Don't know/no view

Comments:

Question 7: Do you agree with the proposed code text drafting published in annexes B-L?

- Don't know/no view

Comments:

Template part 3: general feedback

We believe that consultation is at the heart of good policy development. We welcome any comments about how we've run this consultation. We'd also like to get your answers to the following questions.

Question	Response
Do you have any comments about the overall process of this consultation?	
Do you have any comments about its tone and content?	
Was it easy to read and understand? Or could it have been better written?	
Were its conclusions balanced?	
Did it make reasoned recommendations for improvement?	
Any further comments?	

Your response, data and confidentiality

You can ask us to keep your response, or parts of your response, confidential. We'll respect this, subject to obligations to disclose information, for example, under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, statutory directions, court orders, government regulations or where you give us explicit permission to disclose. If you do want us to keep your response confidential, please clearly mark this on your response and explain why.

If you wish us to keep part of your response confidential, please clearly mark those parts of your response that you *do* wish to be kept confidential and those that you *do not* wish to be kept confidential. Please put the confidential material in a separate

appendix to your response. If necessary, we'll get in touch with you to discuss which parts of the information in your response should be kept confidential, and which can be published. We might ask for reasons why.

If the information you give in your response contains personal data under the General Data Protection Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2016/679) as retained in domestic law following the UK's withdrawal from the European Union ("UK GDPR"), the Gas and Electricity Markets Authority will be the data controller for the purposes of GDPR. Ofgem uses the information in responses in performing its statutory functions and in accordance with section 105 of the Utilities Act 2000. Please refer to our Privacy Notice on consultations, see Appendix 4.

If you wish to respond confidentially, we'll keep your response itself confidential, but we will publish the number (but not the names) of confidential responses we receive. We won't link responses to respondents if we publish a summary of responses, and we will evaluate each response on its own merits without undermining your right to confidentiality.