

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

CMP430 /CMP431: Workgroup Meeting 1

Date: 06/03/2024

Contact Details

Chair: Deborah Spencer (Deborah.spencer@nationalgrideso.com)

Proposer: Neil Dewar (neil.dewar@nationalgrideso.com) /Keren Kelly (keren.kelly1@nationalgrideso.com)

Key areas of discussion

Introductions and Code Process Overview

The Chair welcomed the Workgroup and introductions were completed. The Chair outlined the Code Modification Process, clarified the Workgroup membership and Workgroup voting rules.

Objectives and Timelines

The timeline agreed at the CUSC Panel on Friday 23 February 2024, were shared and agreed by the Workgroup.

The Authority representative advised the Workgroup, that if it is deemed absolutely necessary to implement a modification for the next charging year, the Authority can make a decision after the cut-off point.

Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference specific to these modifications and agreed at February's CUSC Panel, were shared and agreed.

Proposer presentation

The background and rationale for the modifications were shared with the Workgroup by the Proposer. The Proposer highlighted the scope for these modifications and advised that there wasn't an intention to raise a subsequent BSC modification. A Workgroup member suggested that the scope of these modifications is wider than the charging changes and queried if these are the modifications that deliver the Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS) requirements for CUSC for the MHHS Programme. The Proposer clarified that they are not anticipating any changes to the CUSC under the SCR process.

The Proposer agreed that clarity is needed around the scope, so it is very clear for the Workgroup what is going to be considered in these modifications.

A Workgroup member advised that on the Extra High Voltage (EHV) sites, they cannot be classified as Measurement Class A as this is constrained by Licence Condition 14 statements on the Distribution Network Operators (DNO) side. The Proposer agreed to update the table to reflect this.

A Workgroup member queried the cost of the "Do nothing", solution option. The Proposer clarified that for context, the proposal form notes that the demand locational element of TNUoS is expected to be £112m for Charging Year starting April 2024.

A Workgroup member expressed concerns with the "Move all sites to the 4-7pm peak methodology from the start of Migration" option, advising that from a UMS migration perspective they are currently via P434, mandated to move as a half hourly by the M11 milestone (March 2025).

The Proposer advised that the solution ideally needs to work for an indefinite period until the TNUoS Task Force recommends the long-term changes and consequential modifications are raised. A Workgroup member

suggested linking to milestones and advised it would be helpful to avoid further charging changes during the migration window.

A Workgroup member highlighted the need to consider the cross-code interactions /impacts across industry. The Proposer agreed to take an action on this and revert to the Workgroup.

The Authority representative asked the Workgroup if they knew who had the information/data about impacted Meter Point Administration Numbers (MPANs):

- How many would be affected by baseline at the moment.
- How many would change between charging methodologies.
- How many would change under this proposal.

Elexon’s representative agreed to take an action to see if the data could be gathered.

Next Steps

- Send invites for the Workgroup meetings – Workgroup members to accept or advise who the Alternate will be.
- Circulate Summary and actions log to Workgroup members;
- Circulate Workgroup 2 Papers

Actions

For the full action log, click here.

| Action number | Workgroup Raised | Owner | Action | Comment | Due by | Status |
|---------------|------------------|----------|--|---------|--------|--------|
| 1 | WG1 | Proposer | To consider industry cross-code impacts | | WG2 | Open |
| 2 | WG1 | Elexon | To provide data on impacted MPANs on the Authority points: -How many would be affected by baseline at the moment. -How many would change between charging methodologies. -How many would change under this proposal | | WG2 | Open |

Attendees

| Name | Initial | Company | Role |
|-----------------|---------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| Deborah Spencer | DS | Code Governance, ESO | Chair |
| Catia Gomes | CG | Code Governance, ESO | Tech Sec |
| Neil Dewar | ND | ESO | Proposer |
| Keren Kelly | KK | ESO | Proposer Alternate |
| Lee Stone | LS | Npower Commercials Gas Limited | Workgroup member |
| Hugh Boyle | HB | EDF Energy | Workgroup member |

| | | | |
|------------------|----|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Gareth Evans | GE | WWA | Workgroup member |
| James Knight | JK | Centrica | Workgroup member |
| Keith Aldwinckle | KA | Ecotricity | Workgroup member |
| Andrew Colley | AC | SSE Generation | Workgroup member |
| Karl Maryon | KM | Drax | Workgroup member |
| Neil Geddes | NG | Scottish Power Transmission | Observer |
| Colin Berry | CB | Elexon | Observer |
| Jason Brogden | JB | Elexon | Observer |
| David Tooby | DT | Ofgem | Authority Representative |