

Public

CMP434 & CM095

Workgroup 31 Meeting

Summary

CM434 & CM095 Workgroup Meeting 31

Date: 22/10/2024 **Location:** Teams
Start: 10:30 AM **End:** 2:50 PM

Participants

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Claire Goult	CG	Code Administrator, NESO	Chair
Lizzie Timmins	LT	Code Administrator, NESO	Chair
Andrew Hemus	AH	Code Administrator, NESO	Tech Sec
Stuart McLarnon	SM	Code Administrator, NESO	Tech Sec
Graham Lear	GL	NESO	Proposer
Ruby Pelling	RP	NESO	Proposer
Alison Price	AP	NESO	SME
Dovydas Dyson	DD	NESO	SME
Mike Oxenham	MO	NESO	SME
Rory Fulton	RF	Ofgem	Authority
Alex Ikonic	AI	Orsted	Workgroup Member
Alexander Rohit	AR	Statkraft	Workgroup Member
Allan Love	AL	Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Member
Anthony Cotton	AC	Green Generation Energy Networks Cymru Ltd	Workgroup Member
Brian Hoy	BH	Electricity North West Limited (ENWL)	Workgroup Member
Ciaran Fitzgerald	CF	Scottish Power Renewables	Workgroup Member
Claire Hynes	CH	RWE Renewables	Workgroup Member

Public

Claire Witty	CW	Scottish Power Energy Networks	Workgroup Member
Ed Birkett	EB	Low Carbon	Workgroup Member
Garth Graham	GG	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member
Grant Rogers	GR	Qualitas Energy	Workgroup Member
Greg Stevenson	GS	SSEN Transmisson (SHET)	Workgroup Member
Helen Stack	HS	Centrica	Workgroup Member
Iain Symon	IS	Invenergy	Workgroup Member
Jack Purchase	JP	NGED	Workgroup Member
Joe Colebrook	JC	Innova Renewables	Workgroup Member
Kyran Hanks	KH	CUSC Panel member	Workgroup Member
Mark Field	MF	Sembcorp Energy (UK) Limited	Workgroup Member
Mohammad Bilal	MB	UK Power Networks	Workgroup Member
Muhammad Madni	MN	NGV	Workgroup Member
Paul Jones	PJ	Uniper	Workgroup Member
Paul Youngman	PY	Drax	Workgroup Member
Phillip Addison	PA	EDF Renewables	Workgroup Member
Ravinder Shan	RS	FRV TH Powertek Limited	Workgroup Member
Richard Woodward	RW	NGET	Workgroup Member
Sam Aitchison	SA	Island Green Power	Workgroup Member
Zygimantas Rimkus	ZR	Buchan Offshore Wind	Workgroup Member

Key Objectives for this Meeting

The key objectives for this meeting were to look at the Workgroup Reports and the Terms of Reference.

Public

Discussion and details

1. TMO4+ Update

NESO are still reflecting on financial instruments. NESO are planning on giving a customer seminar in November where a strategic narrative on the process will be given. A Workgroup member asked for the FAQs from the financial instruments seminar last week to be uploaded. Workgroup members discussed how the methodologies will be shared.

2. Action Log Review

Actions 78, 81, 83, and 86 were closed. Action 82 remained open to be discussed later in the meeting.

3. CMP434 Workgroup Report

The Chair shared the workgroup report and raised comments that had been left by Workgroup members. A Workgroup member noted that this document should be clear to the layperson, as other Workgroup members stated the wordings surrounding Reservation are overly complex. NESO agreed to try to simplify the language.

A Workgroup member asked for clarity on projects that do meet Gate 2, this Workgroup member believed this issue was a gap in the Proposal, as projects potentially could not progress even though they met all criteria. A Workgroup member stated they felt that this Workgroup report was too dependent on CP2030.

A debate was had on whether the correct term was "NESO" or "the NESO", where it was stated that NESO is to be used, with the following justification:

"When referring to NESO in your writing, do not place 'the' before it. NESO is an acronym which is made up of a group of first letters from the words and can be pronounced as a single word like NASA, NATO, and NESO.

In grammar, acronyms are treated like words and therefore we would not say 'the' NASA, or 'the' NATO or 'the' NESO. Initialisms are a version of acronyms where the group of abbreviated letters are pronounced separately like FBI, ATM, NHS and ESO.

In these instances, correct grammar dictates that we would say, 'the' FBI, 'the' NHS and 'the' ESO. However, when writing NESO out in full as the 'National Energy System Operator', always ensure you place 'the' before the words".

Workgroup members debated what TEC is and how Installed capacity and CEC relate, where many differing views on which term was correct were shared.

Workgroup members asked for the Proposer to clarify element 15 in the Proposal with respect to the 3-month obligation. A Workgroup member asked for Element 16 to be reviewed as they stated that it is not clear enough with respect to Interconnectors.

4. CMP434 Terms of Reference

A was made green after deliberation by the workgroup. B was left amber. C was proposed to be made green, however Workgroup members wanted it left amber until it could be confirmed there was no DCUSA impacts. D was left amber as it could not be confirmed if

Public

there was a DCUSA Modification in the works. E, G, H, K, and L were made green. Workgroup members debated which elements of ToR M have been met, and how NESO could undertake meeting these elements. There was a debate on whether all elements of ToR M were relevant to this Workgroup.

5. CM095 Workgroup Report Review

The Chair moved through the comments and tracked changes in the Report, accepting changes that the Workgroup agreed with. Workgroup members debated whether CM096 will go ahead, and if it should be withdrawn. Workgroup members debated how many times CM095 was discussed in depth in the joint workgroups.

6. CM095 Terms of Reference

A, C, D and G through K were made green. E was made amber.

Action Log

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
35	WG10	AC/AQ	ESO to confirm whether additional uncertainty clauses (which have been appearing in offers recently) will remain		TBC	Open
59	WG19	PM	Element 11 – Produce examples to provide clarification to the Workgroup (slide 25) on how using installed capacity could work in practice	To be added to the QM guidance (as relates to ongoing land compliance requirement) – follow up required to decide if 'installed capacity' is the correct term	TBC	Open
78	WG26	MO	Provide update on process and timescales to amend charging statements (re: application fees) and	TOs provide NESO with indicative information End Oct and	TBC	Closed

Public

			an indication on what scale of change could be seen to application fees.	we get the final information End Jan. We then finalise/update End Feb and publish 1st April, so developers will find out sometime in Q1 2025 what the applications fees look like re: TMO4+ / FY25/26.		
81	WG29	MO	Provide timelines for milestones within the TOCO process	These are to be / have been added with WG Report and Legal Text (CM095)	TBC	Closed
82	WG29	MO	Explain and then be clear in WG report how the non-project specific reserved capacity would be allocated by the NESO, as well as how who pays what and when both prior to it being allocated, and from the point at which it is allocated.	Text added to WG Report to explain. – Update as to where this is located in the Workgroup Report	TBC	Closed
83	WG29	MO	Clarity whether NESO will amend Proposal to publish i) which projects have Reservation contracted and/or ii) where NESO has reserved something non-project specific.	Proposal has not been amended and this will instead be considered more broadly in relation to connections data	TBC	Closed

Public

				transparency at a later date, separate to the code modifications e.g. Reservation, queue position, QM milestones, applications and offers (as well as acceptances), etc. Workgroup member stated in WG31 they did not support the non publication of data		
84	WG30	AP/BH	WACM1 - Brian H and Alison P to liaise and discuss the lower limit TIA and what the CUSC stated		TBC	Open
85	WG30	GR	WACM2 – Grant Rogers has data from previous WACM where this may be useful and will speak to Helen about this re wording.		TBC	Open
86	WG30	MO	Confirm NESO position on publication of queue	NESO position covered in action 83	TBC	Closed
87	WG30	BH/AQ	Brian and Angie to liaise directly on the legal text drafting for WACM1. Consider CUSC 6.5/Appendix G Schedule 2 and other locations where the		TBC	Open

Public

criteria may be different.

88	WG31	CG/Chair	To place the methodologies when published on the collaboration space for members but also to circulate to the wider distribution list for CMP434/CM095 with an agreement not to share beyond the workgroup membership	Methodologies proposed to be available by Friday 25 October	TBC	New
89	WG31	MO/GL	Review impact of CMP434 WACMs and whether any WASTMs are required		TBC	New

Next Steps

The report will be circulated again after today to allow people to view the changes that will be made following the discussions that happened in today's meeting. There is also wording to be added to the Workgroup Report about the discussion that was had around the ToR.