

Meeting minutes

Transmission Charging Methodologies Forum and CUSC Issues Steering Group 100

Date:	09/01/2020	Location:	Webex
Start:	10:30 AM	End:	11:45 AM

Participants

Attendee	Company	Attendee	Company
Jon Wisdom (JW)	National Grid ESO (Chair)	Robert Longden (RL)	Cornwall Insight
Stephen Marshal (SM)	National Grid ESO (Presenter)	Sally Lewis	NGV
Paul Mullen (PM)	Code Administrator, National Grid ESO (Presenter)	Grace March (GM)	Sembcorp
Hannah Urquhart	National Grid ESO (TCMF Technical Secretary stand in)	Simon Vicary (SV)	EDF Energy
Grahame Neale (GN)	National Grid ESO	Tim Aldridge (TA)	Ofgem
Sarah Chleboun (sc)	National Grid ESO (Presenter)	Victoria Macleod	SSE
Rebecca Yang (RY)	National Grid ESO (Presenter)	Nicola Fitchett (NF)	RWE
Tom Laskowski	National Grid ESO (Presenter)	Paul Mott	
Rachel Kettles (RK)	SSEN (Presenter)	Niall Coyle	E.ON
Alex Ikonic	TNEI	Neil Bennett	TNEI
Colin Prestwich	Smartest Energy	Matthew Cullen (MC)	E.ON
Daniel Hickman (DH)	Npower	Iwan Hughes (IH)	Vitol Group
Garth Graham (GG)	SSE	Paul Jones (PJ)	Uniper

Agenda, slides and modifications appendices

<https://www.nationalgrideso.com/charging/transmission-charging-methodology-forum-tcmf>

TCMF and CISG Discussion and details

Please note: The minutes are produced as an accompaniment to the slide pack presented. The purpose of the minutes is to capture the main discussion points from the meeting only.

Actions update – Jon Wisdom, National Grid ESO

There were no open actions

CUSC Issues Steering Group

Code Admin Update – Paul Mullen, National Grid ESO

PM updated on the progress of current CUSC modifications, explained new modifications will not be raised this month and will be prioritised in March due to priority of TCR modifications and requested any feedback on live updates (slides 5-10).

- 1) CMP280, CMP281, CMP319, CMP303, CMP306: TA clarified decisions on the pending modifications are due in early 2020.

Forecasting TNUoS Tariffs for 2021 onwards – Sarah Chebourn and Rebecca Yang, National Grid ESO

SC presented a proposed TNUoS Tariff Forecast Timeline (slides 32-35).

- 2) DH requested initial tariff feedback for 2020-21 as early in March as possible, SV also agreed with both stating the current high level of change in industry as reason for the request.
- 3) MC queried if the March 2020 forecast is going to be more uncertain than previous initial forecasts and if so, by how much? RY clarified the initial forecast is under assumption of TCR go live from 2020 and will be highly indicative, however a list of assumptions the forecast which the forecast is based on will be published alongside the forecast.
- 4) SV queried if a scenarios or models will be published to industry . RY confirmed we will look to release an updated TNT model following the 2021 update, however this will again be indicative due to pending TCR decisions. The TNT model will allow industry to set and check their own tariffs based on a set of assumptions.
- 7) IH queried if we could publish the likely scenarios tariffs would be based upon and requested a 5-year view in early 2021 if possible. IH expressed suppliers will experience a great amount of uncertainty if this is not provided. SC responded the 5-year view will likely be available by March 2021.
- 8) NF expressed generators require a 5-year view as close to the capacity market as possible. RY responded to say she will consider what can be accommodated.
- 9) IH requested what variability can we consider adding in the March 2020 forecast for 2021. JW confirmed he would take this on board and determine what is possible, however expressed this may be difficult. RY added banding is a new concept and we want to ensure meaningful data is released in a timeframe that works for industry.
- 10) RL expressed more than TCMF required to determine which models are of most benefit to industry. JW confirmed there will be a consultation on priority of timelines, scenarios and accuracy.

Accelerated Loss of Mains Change Programme (ALoMCP) – Stephen Marshal, National Grid ESO

SM presented an update on ALoMCP (slides 15-16). And explained more facts and figures related to the programme will be made available on the website w/c 13th January.

- 11) RL queried the difference between application for each window and payments for work, is the work done over time or is the benefit materialised in the window? SM clarified NGESO provides generators with a maximum

completion deadline, by which all work must be complete and is based upon generators official forecast to ensure the benefit is realised.

- 12) NC queried if there is any appetite to further accelerate the programme further. GG explained E3C are currently looking to accelerate the programme further. SM confirmed NGENSO are not currently looking to accelerate but appreciate there may be an ask from E3C.
- 13) PJ expressed the need to ensure most cost-effective solutions are put in place. SM to attend April TCMF to explain and update on the costs of the programme.

TNUoS data requirements modification – Tom Laskowski, National Grid ESO

TL presented the background on the data requirements mod in addition to the current issues and requested feedback on the issue (slides 17-25).

- 14) RL stated that as we are looking to use new data points or data set we need to ensure the data has sufficient weight for the purpose.
- 15) GG stated there is currently no guarantee around FES statement, if FES changes this could have a knock-on consequence for tariffs. GG questioned whether we need another data set, instead of week 24 or FES as an additional solution.
- 16) GM expressed concerns with FES being used for tariff setting as FES states it is not a prediction, but in order to use for tariff setting it will need to be defined as a forecast or prediction and not a set of potential outcomes.

Authority decision on SHEPD island contribution proposals – Rachel Kettles, SSEN

RK explained the authority decision on CUSC modification for SHEPD island contributions (slides 26-31).

- 17) PJ asked for clarification on whether Ofgem agree the modification should be raised, or if they agree to approve. RK confirmed Ofgem are recommending the mod is raised, and not that it goes directly to approval at this point in time.
- 18) PJ expressed it wasn't clear how this change would affect the remainder of the TNUoS methodology and regulatory cashflow, for example HBRS etc RK confirmed netting to feed into distribution is part of the approved decision. RK to provide feedback in writing.
- 19) RL requested NGENSO's formal view as it effects charging. GN responded the proposal would need to make clear exactly how it flows through TNUoS methodology in order for industry to impact assess to be able to go straight to code admin consultation. If this is not made clear, GN advised a Work Group would be required.
- 20) GG expressed there are no changes to the distribution recovery scheme and this is not part of the CUSC. GN confirmed it is the impact on the TNUoS methodology which requires investigating and should be made clear in the request.
- 21) JW queried if there are any license changes required, and if so, are they progressing. RK confirmed there are license changes required, which affect the DNO and TO, and these have been talked through and outlined with Ofgem and there is a current focus on understanding what the license changes are. JW stated the modification proposal needs to make clear any license changes and therefore a Work Group may be required to define the changes, will need to be prioritised in the January panel to understand when Work Group process is able to commence.

AOB

- 22) GN explained the forward plan commitments around the "sandbox modifications" including that new, unconventional methods and processes to be trialled without entirely sticking to the CUSC and asked for feedback on how pressing the mod is to industry and how it should be prioritised.
- 23) GG stated it was raised with CUSC panel charges in section 14 are cost reflective and therefore sandboxes may give rise to non-cost reflective prices in principle issues and legal aspects to EU law and connection agreements will need to be discussed. GG confirmed his view of the mod being lower on the priority list
- 24) RL informed that if this is a significant issue and requires a sandbox way around then a part is able to request a derogation. PJ agreed with GG and RL.

Action Item Log

Action items: In progress and completed since last meeting

ID	Description	Owner	Due	Status	Date
ID	Update on costs of ALoMCP	Stephen Marshall	April	Open	14/01/2020