

# Code Administrator Meeting Summary

## Meeting name: CMP405 -TNUoS Locational Demand Signals for Storage Workgroup Meeting 3

---

Date: 10/08/2023

### Contact Details

Chair: [catia.gomes@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:catia.gomes@nationalgrideso.com)

Proposer: [damian.clough@sse.com](mailto:damian.clough@sse.com)

---

## Key areas of discussion

The aim of Workgroup 3 was to review the defect as per the original proposal form and for a presentation on the draft external analysis commissioned by the proposer to be shared.

### Review of Defect - Proposal Form and Proposer Analyses Overview

The Proposer gave a presentation reviewing the defect and the draft external analysis to support CMP405.

A Workgroup member asked if this was only removing the floor for storage, the Proposer clarified and rationalised that is looking at a small subset to make manageable and targeted to allow modification to progress. Other modifications are looking at demand to follow, but this modification hopefully sets the direction of travel.

The Proposer clarified general Workgroup discussions that the modification is hoping to provide an investment signal and **not** looking at dispatch or locational signals.

A Workgroup member suggested the need to be clear in the Workgroup Report how CMP405 aligns with grid planning and current inflight modifications.

The Authority representative stated that TNUoS is not an operational signal. The Proposer commented that an increase in boundary capacity may not be required and on different zones where ALF is not appropriate. It would as suggested be useful to look at what the SQSS has on this.

A Workgroup member stated that reducing flows and constraints are not the same. The Proposer commented that reducing flows leads to reducing constraints but again CMP405 is looking at investment signals. The Authority representative questioned if storage is alleviating constraints at certain times and if it is right to reward storage through TNUoS. The Proposer shared his thoughts that reward maybe not be the right word as it's an investment signal and stated the is more about balancing it, as in some areas it may not be a disincentive. A Workgroup member agreed and suggested it's how storage impacts the system.

The Proposer clarified after workgroup discussion that the analysis presented was conducted on the current problem today to demonstrate justification for change rather than analysis on any solution to the problem.

A Workgroup member suggested the Workgroup needs to be mindful of other solutions in play on re-zoning and that those could also help. The Proposer commented that storage has generation and demand so may not be as useful. An Observer asked that with CMP393 inflight and considering ALF', how would it impact CMP405. The Proposer stated that CMP405 is independent of other modifications. The ESO representative also reminded the Workgroup that assumptions cannot be made on Authority decisions and the current CUSC baseline is what should be considered when considering CMP405.

A Workgroup member asked if the average duration of a constraint could be provided to add some context of the relief on the system. The Proposer agreed to try and provide this information.

[As discussed and shared in the MS Team meeting chat, the links to the TNUoS model training recordings can be found here.](#)

Review of Terms of Reference

The workgroup reviewed the Terms of Reference

Review of Timeline

The workgroup reviewed the Timeline and agreed dates for next meetings.

---

**Next Steps**

Final proposer external analysis to be provided to the workgroup late September, following that Workgroup 4 scheduled to take place 12 October 2023.

---

**Actions**

For the full action log, click [here](#).

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
2	WG1	All	Workgroup to consider what additional analysis is required for the consultants that has not yet been extracted.		09/02/2023	Open
4	WG1	Proposer	Consider timeline for external consultants		24/02/2023	Open
6	WG2	AP/RDL	ESO to request initial data from ESO ENCC		WG3	Open

7	WG3	ALL	Workgroup members to consider the 4 solutions the proposer presented and provide any feedback.	15/09/2023	New
8	WG3	Proposer	To clarify: Year-Round Demand	WG3	Open
9	WG3	Proposer	Consider a suggested analysis question: Does the charge happen at the same time as constraints?	WG3	Open
10	WG3	Proposer	Provide the average duration of a constraint	WG3	Open

**Attendees**

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Catia Gomes	CG	Code Administrator, ESO	Chair
Andrew Hemus	AH	Code Administrator, ESO	Tech Sec
Damian Clough	DC	SSE Generation	Proposer
Stephan Dale	SD	ESO	ESO Rep
Damian Jackman	DJ	Field Energy	Observer
David Jones	DAJ	Ofgem	Authority Rep
Jo Zhou	JZ	ESO	Observer
John Prime	JP	Amp Energy	Workgroup Member
John Tindal	JT	SSE Generation	Workgroup Alternate
Joseph Henry	JH	ESO	Observer
Paul Youngman	PY	Drax	Workgroup Alternate
Robert Newton	RN	Zenobe	Workgroup Member
Ryan Ward	RW	Scottish Power	Workgroup Alternate
Susan Stead	SS	SSE Generation	Workgroup Alternate
Tom Steward	TS	RWE	Workgroup Alternate