ESO

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Meeting name: CM087 Workgroup Meeting 3

Date: 30/03/2023

Contact Details

Chair: Catia Gomes, ESO catia.gomes@nationalgrideso.com

Proposers: Stephen Baker, ESO Stephen.Baker@nationalgrideso.com
Gareth Stanley, ESO gareth.stanley@nationalgrideso.com
Alistair Grey, ESO alistair.grey@nationalgrideso.com

Key areas of discussion
The aim of Workgroup 3 was to complete a Process Walkthrough and develop the proposed solution.

Process Walkthrough

- The Proposer shared a high-level presentation with the Workgroup that illustrated were we are currently with this modification and the considerations needed for the TO-TO process, that include Section D of STC and STCP 16-1.
- The Proposer communicated the perceived benefits of the proposed process, that includes providing a clear and concise forum that ensured all parties were represented and would make clear the deliverables of all parties. The workgroup agreed this represented the principles they had discussed in the previous Workgroups.
- The Proposer shared a list of 6 essential questions that he felt needed to be considered by the Workgroup:
    1. Clear, high-level principles that inform the actions and responsibilities of 3 leading parties need to be established
    2. What measures need to be implemented to avoid the need for additional circuit breaker between the (CA)TO asset and (I)TO?
    3. Use of TP/TS Transmission Procedures – are they available to all parties?
    4. Should Project Sub-group jointly commission connection design contract?
    5. Do we need a Section K for CATO-TO Connections?
    6. Should process apply to all TO-TO Connections?

The Workgroup agreed to discuss the proposed process first and to return to the questions at the end of the discussion to reconsider them with more clarity.

ESO

Develop solution

The Workgroup discussed the proposed diagram of the "UDFS Underpinned Process" in detail, the main highlights were:

- A Workgroup member stated that he agrees with the need to add additional processes, but with the view to facilitate the entrance of new CATOs as opposed to redefine the entirety of the TO-TO interface process. The Workgroup agreed that the STC already incorporates a lot of the requirements that are used for other parties and that can be used for CATOs, however there are gaps that need to be considered and addressed to fully incorporate CATOs.
- A Workgroup member expressed concern regarding the absence of detail during the tender process and felt clarity was required to progress, advising that clarity was needed regarding the specifications of the tender process and what needs to be codified, suggesting that if the details of the tender process were comprehensible and requirements specified up front then the obligations of parties would be clear and transparent.
- One Workgroup member felt there should be coordination with other onshore TO's to work collaboratively in terms of asset design. The Proposer advised that it won't be possible to establish what the full asset design will be until the post preferred bidder stage, and this will be influenced and controlled through the tender process.
- Workgroup member stated that he believes that we need a process that is kin to STCP 16-1 but just to address the requirements for works on the adjacent network, clarifying that with regards to build, CATOs should follow the existing process for TOs, the only complexity is with regards to how the new assets are then connected into the GB network, which might require existing TOs to extend or modify their networks to incorporate it. The Proposer agreed and stated that the asset design stage is outside the connection process.
- A Workgroup member questioned the need for further feasibility studies as part of the tender process to facilitate the CATO entrance, the ESO SME advised that the feasibility studies will be required. The Workgroup member asked how that is to be procured from the TOs as it is not codified, the Proposer agreed to check with the ESO SME's if this fall within the current TOs obligations or if is an additional obligation that needs to be codified and revert to the Workgroup.
- One Workgroup member felt a mechanism was required to incorporate CATO assets in onshore recovery costs. The Proposer believed this was recovered from price control but agreed clarification was needed.
- The Workgroup discussed the use of the User Data File Structure (UDFS) as part of the process diagram in detail. A Workgroup member felt this section did not create a level playing field as onshore TO's do not have the same obligation to supply this level of data exchange and questioned the necessity. One workgroup member challenged that if this data is not required by current TOs it may be dealt with elsewhere in STC obligations. ESO representative advised that in terms of compliance extra data maybe required. Further discussion needed.
- Workgroup member questioned the User Commissioning Process being used, stating that this isn't required for TOs, advising a different process is used. The Workgroup member highlighted that there is a licence obligation that supersedes all and needs to be followed, and provisions on the STC that TOs need to comply with, that he expects

CATOs to have to follow as well. The Proposer advised that he is happy to consider that process and asked the Workgroup member to provide further information.

- The Proposer talked through the CATO Pre-Award process with the Workgroup and agreed to incorporate the comments from the Workgroup.
- The Workgroup looked at the Proposer key questions after discussions around the process diagram and one Workgroup member wanted to add an extra question: How are the additional costs incurred by onshore TOs to incorporate CATOs dealt with? The Proposer agreed to investigate it and revert to the Workgroup.
- It was the Workgroup view that an end-to end process on the CATOs is needed, and it was agreed with the Proposer to put this together as the solution for this modification is developed.

Next Steps-

- Chair to circulate the updated Pre-Award process and Proposer questions with Workgroup.
- Workgroup to revert feedback by Friday 14th of April.

Actions

For the full action log, click here.

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
3	WG1	WG	WG to suggest any SME's that would be relevant to the Mod	N/A	WG2	Ongoing
7	WG3	Proposer	To check if the further feasibility studies required are already part of TOs obligations or if they will be a new requirement	N/A	WG4	Open
8	WG3	RW	Investigate current STC user commission process and revert to Workgroup	N/A	WG4	Open
9	WG3	Proposer	Investigate how additional TO costs to incorporate CATOs are dealt with	N/A	WG4	Open
10	WG3	All	Consider Proposer's key questions and provide feedback	N/A	WG4	Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Catia Gomes	CG	Code Administrator, ESO	Chair
Claire Goult	CLG	Code Administrator, ESO	Tech Sec
Stephen Baker	SB	ESO	Proposer

Gareth Stanley	GS	ESO	Proposer
Anthony Johnson	AJ	ESO	SME
Coreen Campbell	CC	SSEN Transmission	Observer
Gavin Baillie	GB	SSEN Transmission	Info only
Greg Stevenson	GS	SHETL	Alternate
Joel Matthews	JM	Diamond Transmission Corp	Workgroup Member
Mark Fitch	MF	TINV	Alternate
Michelle MacDonald Sandison	MMS	SHETL	Workgroup Member
Mike Lee	ML	TINV	Workgroup Member
Paul Matthew	PM	ESO	SME
Richard Woodward	RW	NGET	Workgroup Member
Sarah Owen	SO	Eclipse Power	Observer
Thomas Johns	TJ	Ofgem	Authority Representative