

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Meeting name: CMP417: Extending principles of CUSC Section 15 to all Users Workgroup Meeting 5

Date: 01/05/2024

Contact Details

Chair: Lizzie Timmins, National Grid ESO elizabeth.timmins@nationalgrideso.com

Proposer: Sean Nugent, National Grid ESO sean.nugent@nationalgrideso.com

Key areas of discussion

The aim of the Workgroup was to review actions and the Proposer's solution to agree next steps.

Timeline and Terms of Reference

The Chair led a brief review of the Timeline and Terms of Reference. No questions or comments were made by the Workgroup.

Actions Review

The Chair led the Workgroup through a review of the open actions, to which RM presented slides. With the following being noted:

Action 19 – Scaling factors

The Workgroup highlighted the following:

- Still a scenario where SIF is double securing, LARF looks at specific asset class regardless of whether generation or demand.
- LARF works on asset class not the end user.
- SIF has a place in demand, but more thought needed around being used in both directions with generation and demand.
- Clarification on assets reuse if whole scheme terminates and using asset in the same location.

The Proposer agreed to discuss this with TO's separately.

Re use factor

One Workgroup member asked if there was a definition of "Demand User" in the STC that could be reused in the LARF methodology, others commented that the current methodology is designed to accommodate whole scheme termination and in current climate most schemes

complete with others entering, with assets in location with multiple customers and that a reasonable level of security is required to de-risk for the TO and also avoid speculative schemes. The Proposer agreed to complete further work on this.

Question on Demand Capacity – MW or MVA?

The Workgroup agreed with the ESO view that Demand Capacity should be MW going forward.

Question from Workgroup Member – Wider Works

The consensus of the Workgroup was not to include Wider Works in the solution. It was also agreed that London was an exception currently when considering potential for greater Demand growth than Generation.

ESO view on Distributed Demand

The Workgroup suggested that a question should be added to the Workgroup consultation on the appropriateness of the same solution being applied across Embedded Generation and Embedded Demand.

Question on Naming of Product

The Workgroup suggested a Workgroup Consultation question to capture industry thoughts on any unintended consequences of migrating all existing arrangements to new arrangements. The ESO legal representative reminded the Workgroup that currently everybody is liable in the CUSC as Generation includes Storage. The Proposer commented that more thought on this question was required.

Question on Existing Final Sums Schemes

The Workgroup agreed to link this question to the fore mentioned suggestions for Workgroup Consultation questions.

Implementation Timescales (Action 13)

Action 13 closed.

Proposer's Presentation

RM led the Workgroup through presentation slides.

The Workgroup commented that the diagrams presented need to have the MITS nodes added for clarity. The Chair commented that the diagrams should be included in the Workgroup Consultation.

The Workgroup queried whether the currently methodology is being applied properly. The ESO advised any concerns in this area should be raised with individual contract managers.

The ESO legal representative suggested an example be provided on how who shares what is worked out.

Timeline

The Chair revisited the timeline and highlighted the considerable discussion in Workgroup 5 and suggested more Workgroups would be required to further develop the solution before opening a Workgroup Consultation.

ESO

The Workgroup agreed that although a fully formed solution isn't required for a Workgroup Consultation, more worked examples of SIF were required. Also worked examples of post solution retrospective applied example based on the new methodology.

The Chair shared that the Connections Reform Modifications had been raised and had requested to be treated as urgent. The Chair suggested that further work was required to progress the solution and suggested not to present a new timeline to the CUSC panel until more information was known. The Chair suggested that analysis work can continue in the background while the Connections Reform Modifications proceed, and the SME agreed that this could be progressed through subgroup meetings.

The Workgroup highlighted potential Connections Reform Gate 2 interaction with Modifications [CM096](#) and [CMP435](#) and agreed to this approach.

AOB

The ESO reminded the Workgroup that STC modification [CM093](#) has been raised, but will not be having further Workgroup meetings until the [CMP417](#) solution has been developed in CUSC further.

Next Steps

- SME / Proposer to further develop solution and worked examples prior to further Workgroups being held, possibly through utilising subgroups.

Actions

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

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
8	WG1	EW	Provide justification for solution within the Workgroup Consultation.	NA	TBC	Open
13	WG3	RM	Provide update on implementation date for existing Users	RM provided at WG5	WG4	Closed
16	WG4	Chair	Share links to modifications that relate to CMP417	CM094 , CMP428 and CM093	WG5	Closed
17	WG4	AQ	Provide more context for key Consent and show an example of what a key consent appendix looks like	AQ shared slide at WG5. No questions.	WG5	Closed
18	WG4	Proposer	Worked Examples to be provided on the various permutations mentioned on the User Commitment update relating to section 3.3.3. to give some life to the formulas.	Examples shared in Proposer presentation at WG5.	WG5	Closed

19	WG4	Proposers	Provide examples to see whether having a scaling factor to make sure that the overall liability sections isn't more than the cost of the asset and to look at the asset reuse factor and see if anything in that needs to be adjusted to cater for the peculiarities of demand or not. (Provide examples).	NA	WG5	Open
20	WG4	Proposers	To give an indication of their thoughts across the various areas such as arrangements for embedded arrangements.		WG5	Closed
21	WG5	RM	Investigate whether LARF methodology should be changed.		WG6	Open
22	WG5	RM	Provide further worked examples on SIF and more clarity on existing worked examples. This could be done through formation of a subgroup.		WG6	Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Lizzie Timmins	LT	Code Governance, ESO	Chair
Andrew Hemus	AH	Code Governance, ESO	Technical Secretary
Sean Nugent	SP	ESO	Proposer
Angela Quinn	AQ	ESO	Observer
Charles Deacon	CD	Eclipse Power Network	Workgroup Member
Christopher Patrick	CP	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Damian Clough	DC	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member
David Halford	DH	ESO	Observer
David Jones	DH	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Edda Dirks	ED	SSE Generation	Alternate
Gareth Williams	GW	SP Energy Networks	Workgroup Member
Harriet Eckweiler	GW	SHET	Workgroup Member
Jonny Clark	JC	SHET	Alternate
Matthew Paige Stimson	MPS	NGET	Workgroup Member
Mustafa Cevik	MC	UK Power Networks	Observer
Natalija Zaiceva	NZ	UK Power Networks	Observer

Neil Bennett	NB	SSE	Observer
Ruth Matthew	RM	ESO	SME
Syed Nadir	SN	UK Power Networks	Observer
Tim Ellingham	TE	RWE Supply & Trading GmbH	Workgroup Member