

Respondent	Issue / defect	Theme
DONG, RWE, Orkney Islands Council, Prospect	The current TNUoS methodology does not recognise that low load factor, intermittent generation requires less transmission investment to accommodate its output pattern than a conventional generator at a particular location. It is appropriate to investigate the continued application of a uniform scaling approach as a proxy for load factor across GB under the current charging mechanism.	Theme 1
NGET	The current TNUoS methodology does not recognise the possibility of sharing transmission capacity between generators (eg sharing of capacity to reflect increased volumes of variable generation).	Theme 1
SSE, Poyry, International power, Orkney Islands Council, Pelamis wave power, Smartest Energy, Statoil	Examine whether the contribution of the locational and socialised elements of the current TNUoS charging methodology should continue to be based on capacity and peak demand (eg replace existing capacity based cost signals with charges based on MWh for all or part of the charging mechanism).	Theme 1
Renewable UK, SCDI	The current TNUoS methodology does not recognise the potential impact on transmission cost that the operating characteristics of storage and peaking plant provide.	Theme 1
PX Limited, Orkney Islands Council, Piccsi, Renewable UK, SCDI, Scottish Government	The current charging model produces zonal locational differentials across GB. There are perceived issues with the scale of the zonal differential. These respondents noted a desire to reduce or smooth the scale in the disparity/variance of zonal TNUoS tariffs (eg modify zoning criteria), or remove geographical differentiation completely.	Theme 2
NGET, SCDI, Orkney Islands Council, OREF, Pelamis Wave Power, Renewable UK	The current TNUoS methodology does not consider the treatment of transmission links to island users.	Theme 2 and 6.
Centrica, OREF, Pelamis wave power, Renewable UK, RWE, SSE, SCDI, Scottish Government	The current TNUoS methodology contains locational charging elements and socialised charging elements. It is appropriate to consider the current split between these elements and the treatment of local (user specific) infrastructure assets and the local/wider boundary in particular (ie extension of the principle of postalisation to all Local Infrastructure Assets or the maintenance of some sort of user specific signal).	Themes 2, 3 and 6.
Centrica, DONG, EDF Energy, NGET, HIE, Orkney Islands Council, Renewable UK, RWE, SCDI, Statkraft, Statoil	The current TNUoS charging methodology does not reflect the growth of an offshore transmission network. It is appropriate to examine the impact of OFTO revenues and the dominance of the local charge under the current charging mechanism.	Themes 2, 3 and 6.
International Power, NGET, Tim Russell	The ICRP model does not explicitly recognise the existence of spare capacity and/or the level of redundancy (or lack of). The actual 'security factor' will vary from place to place on the network and will depend on demand and generation dispatch. It is appropriate to	Theme 3

	consider arrangements that better reflect regional or individual security.	
DONG, Eon, ESB International, Renewable UK, RWE, SCDI	The current TNUoS methodology does not recognise the treatment of HVDC links (or network technology change in general).	Theme 4
HIE, RWE, Voith, Tim Russell, Renewable UK	There are issues with the manner in which the TNUoS methodology models the cost of expanding the network and providing capacity. There is a need to review the main unit costs of providing capacity under the current TNUoS methodology to ensure it is reflective of accurate unit costs.	Theme 5
AEP, Consumer Focus, Drax, EDF Energy, International Power, Mainstream Renewable Power, NGET, OREF, Orkney Islands Council, REA, Renewable UK, SCDI, Scottish Government, Scottish Power	The current TNUoS methodology reflects an arbitrary G:D split proportion. It is appropriate to investigate the possibility of altering the arbitrary split of transmission costs between G:D. Examine current split to ensure that generators located within GB are not at a competitive disadvantage to those exporting into GB from Europe.	Theme 6
Other prevalent points		
Apply a cap to TNUoS island charges/renewable potential		The responsibility for the application of a cap under S185 rests with the Secretary of State.
Treatment of distributed generation under the current TNUoS methodology		We consider the resolution of this issue is not deliverable within the timeframes of the proposed SCR process.
Review interconnector charging policy with a view to removing BSUoS and losses charges.		TransmiT is limited to changes to the TNUoS methodology.