ESO

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Meeting name: CMP419: Generation Zoning Methodology Review Workgroup Meeting 2

Date: 08/11/2023

Contact Details

Chair: Milly Lewis, National Grid ESO milly.lewis@nationalgrideso.com

Proposer: Nitin Prajapati, National Grid ESO nitin.prajapati@nationalgrideso.com

Key areas of discussion

The aim of Workgroup 2 was for the Proposer to present and answer questions.

Introductions

The Chair opened and led introductions to Workgroup 2.

Timeline and Terms of Reference

Minor amends to ToR by the CUSC Panel were agreed by the Workgroup.

Action Log

The Chair led the Workgroup through a review of the Action Log, closing Actions 2, 3, 5 and 6.

- **Action 2 Verbal update**: The Proposer confirmed they were, happy to move implementation date to 2026. This will enable enough time to implement into the Transport and Tariff model once a decision is made by the Authority and provide sufficient notice the industry of any changes.
- **Action 3 Verbal update:** The Proposer confirmed there are no codes or formal governance which specifically govern ETYS boundaries but there is the ETYS Joint Planning Committee (JPC) to discuss ETYS boundaries with the TO. The STC confirms how discussions, and the relationship between the ESO and the TOs should operate. The JPC has subgroups including Investment Planning, Modelling and ETYS. In the last 10 years one boundary has been created approximately every 2 years. They noted that the CMP419 solution considers the major ETYS zones as basis for generation zones, which change even less frequently approximately once every five years.
- **Action 4 Verbal update**: The Proposer explained that a key emphasis behind the bootstrap is to help decrease the constraints and offer another route for energy to flow from North to South. One of reasons a constraint develops is a result of the volume of

generation in a specific area without sufficient network to move that power, so the bootstrap is mechanism to help alleviate the constraints on the network. In terms the trajectory of constraints, noting the HND bootstrap will help, there is a general expectation for an increase in constraints through the network although different areas of the network will be impacted differently.

Following the Proposer update on the action and Workgroup discussion **Action 4** clarified for the Proposer to investigate the interaction of bootstraps with zone movement and zone creation.

Proposer presentation and questions

The Proposer gave a presentation and answered questions following the slides within the Workgroup Meeting 2 Papers.

The Workgroup discussed and asked for additional zones and boundaries maps. The Proposer agreed to investigate **(Action 8 and Action 9)**.

The Proposer clarified that the referenced use of ETYS in the commercial area "User Commitment" on slide 11 was an example of application as opposed to any linkage to "User Commitment".

A Workgroup member questioned the assertion around stability stating if the Proposer does not know when ETYS zones will change. The Proposer stated that how often do generation zones change is in the ToR and that this will be discussed at future Workgroup meetings.

A Workgroup member suggested exploring what happens when there are significant infrastructure developments and to assess what this means in terms of predictability, while discussing the benefits of the proposed solution on slide 12.

A Workgroup member suggested that re-zoning methodology solution is already within the CUSC, so any solution needs to be better than the baseline. The Proposer stated that as zones fixed at 27 it is not in the CUSC, and the Workgroup member agreed.

A Workgroup member commented that it is difficult to have all three elements (stability, cost reflectivity and predictability). The Proposer agreed this was a challenge, and through this Workgroup process the Workgroup will need to weigh up and balance the three element and decide which holds more weight (if any) when considering the solution.

The Workgroup discussed the methodology prior to being fixed at 27 zones and the merits of looking at the CUSC baseline prior to implementation of CMP324. Review CMP324 analysis and look at what ideas the Workgroup could present. **(Action 10)**

The Proposer asked the Workgroup if rezoning was part of the defect, it was confirmed that it was the CUSC Panel's view was that it was part of the defect and now being progressed and so was legitimate to explore.

A Workgroup member noted that the proposed approach to treating DC circuits seemed like the only method. So, calculating the boundary flows and then back calculating the reactance.

Another Workgroup member commented that it is important to focus on the power flow from the offshore generator to the onshore node and not just the power flow from an onshore node, through the offshore network and back onto an onshore node.

Cross Code Impacts

The Workgroup discussed and agreed that CMP419 has no cross-code implications.

Any Other Business

None

Next Steps

The next Workgroup meeting is scheduled for 12 December 2023

Actions

For the full action log, click here.

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
1	WG1	DG	Provide views to ESO on potential anomalies in charging methodology	Carried forward to WG3	WG3	Open
2	WG1	NP	Investigate with Revenue as to whether implementation date can be moved forward, or provide justification if not	Implementation agreed to be moved to 01 April 2026.	WG2	Closed
3	WG1	NP	Investigate who is responsible for Governance of ETYS boundaries and how many new boundaries have been created in the past 10 years	No specific no codes or formal governance for ETYS boundaries but: - JPC discuss ETYS boundaries with the TO, which has subgroups including Investment Planning, Modelling and ETYS - STC governs the discussions and the relationship between the ESO and the TOs. In the last 10 years one boundary has been created approximately every 2 years.	WG2	Closed
4	WG1	NP	Investigate potential effect on boundaries if constraints are removed by the bootstrap. Also investigate expected trajectory of constraints. - Investigate Interaction of bootstraps with zone movement and zone creation.	The Workgroup requested further information on this action.	WG2	Open
5	WG1	NP	Circulate a document which provides an overview of the ETYS Boundaries and ETYS Zones	Shared within Workgroup Meeting 2 Papers - Document provides detail in pages 4 and 6	WG2	Closed

6	WG1	ML	Create Microsoft Form for Workgroup members to feed interactions into	Link	WG2	Closed
7	WG2	NP	Clear usable map illustrating ETYS zones (Shape file, zoomable, more interactive the better).		WG3	Open
8	WG2	NP	ETYS boundaries and zones on one map.		WG3	Open
9	WG2	AH	Circulate CMP324/325 documentation links with Workgroup.	CMP324/325 webpage link	WG3	Open
10	WG2	AH	Circulate “Approach to understanding generation rezoning” document link	“Approach to understanding generation rezoning” document link	WG3	Open
11	WG2	NP	ESO Revenue team to attend WG4 and present analysis.		WG3	Open
12	WG2	NP	Look at CUSC 14.15.12 and investigate if this could be used.		WG3	Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Milly Lewis	ML	Code Administrator, ESO	Acting Chair
Andrew Hemus	AH	Code Administrator, ESO	Technical Secretary
Nitin Prajapati	NP	ESO	Proposer
Alan Kelly	AK	Corio Generation	Observer
Claire Hynes	CH	RWE	Workgroup Member
Damian Clough	DC	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member
Graz Macdonald	GM	Waters Wye & Associates	Workgroup Member
John Morgan	JM	Green Power International	Alternative Workgroup Member
Lauren Jauss	LJ	RWE Supply & Trading GmbH	Workgroup Member
Paul Jones	PJ	Uniper	Workgroup Member
Paul Youngman	PY	Drax	Workgroup Member
Pedro Arcain	PA	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Robin Dunne	RD	InterGen	Workgroup Member
Ryan Ward	RW	Scottish Power Renewables	Workgroup Member
Tom Edwards	TE	Cornwall Insight	Observer