

Public

Code Administrator Meeting

Summary

Workgroup Meeting 2: CMP446 Increasing the lower threshold in England and Wales for Evaluation of Transmission Impact Assessment (TIA)

Date:

Contact Details

Chair: Milly Lewis, milly.lewis@nationalenergyso.com

Proposer: Martin Cahill, martin.cahill@nationalenergyso.com

Key areas of discussion

The Chair noted that the purpose of Workgroup 2 is primarily to:

- Review the actions that were taken at the last Workgroup meeting
- Discuss the Workgroup consultation, including whether any Workgroup members plan to raise Alternatives.

Action Updates

The Proposer updated Workgroup members on the actions that were taken away from Workgroup 1.

Action 1 – Scenario testing (action to remain open)

The Proposer presented a table that showed different scenarios of MW that could be requested, and whether in each scenario projects would need to go through the TIA process if this Modification is implemented.

Workgroup members discussed the need to clarify the definitions of different capacities (registered, developer, installed, and export) to ensure everyone is on the same page when evaluating scenarios where the threshold being discussed in this Modification will apply.

Workgroup members agreed that, for the purpose of reviewing scenarios, the definition of Registered Capacity would be as defined in the DCode, and the definition of Developer Capacity would be as defined in the CUSC. A majority of the Workgroup thought Registered Capacity was

Public

the most appropriate to use for applying thresholds, though this was not unanimous and Workgroup members wanted to see each tested in the scenarios.

Workgroup members discussed GSPs that have no fault level headroom and therefore would be subject to current processes. A Workgroup member took an action to investigate whether a list of these GSPs could be provided.

A Workgroup member took an action to update the table of different scenarios with columns for existing and requested capacities. This table will include columns for installed and export capacity and whether a TIA would be required for each capacity type per scenario.

Action 2 – Future risks and mitigations (action closed during the meeting)

The Proposer noted that this action related to future risks, including what would happen if there was an Increase in generators in the 1–5 Mw range following this Modification being implemented.

The Proposer noted that this Modification does not include a “roll back” option. If a different threshold is deemed more appropriate in the future, a new Modification will need to be raised in order to change it.

A Workgroup member queried whether there should be a cap on cumulative MW being applied for at GSP level. The Proposer noted that this is not included in the Original Solution, and there would be limited time to analyse what the cap should be. The Workgroup agreed that if this is to be included, raising as a WACM may be more appropriate.

Action 3 – Clarity on data (action closed during the meeting)

The proposer took a new action to send an up-to-date pie chart confirming total accepted DER by technology in MW to Workgroup members and to ensure the up-to-date figures are added into the Workgroup consultation.

Action 5 – CMP446 Timeline (action will remain open)

The Proposer talked Workgroup members through the timeline of CMP446 and the CM04+ Modifications and how the various key dates interact.

The Proposer noted scenarios in which the TM04+ Modifications and CMP446 were implemented at different times and with alternative solutions.

With regards to the legal text, a Workgroup member questioned whether the legal text for this Modification would be combined with the legal text for CMP435. The Proposer noted that the legal text changes different sections so would not need to be combined, though a slightly different version would be needed if WACMI of CMP434 is approved to ensure there are no conflicts.

Public

The Proposer took an action to make it clear that implementation refers to legal text implementation, to add some example timings, and to make it clear that removal of existing REPs only refers to yet to be connected

The Proposer took an action to confirm the plan for communications for existing projects, whether they do or do not have to do apply for Gate 2. It was noted that this could be the responsibility of DNOs, however this will be confirmed.

Action 7 – Legal text definition (action to remain open)

Workgroup members discussed the proposed legal text for the CUSC. The Proposer noted that some amendments had been made following feedback from Workgroup 1.

The Proposer took an action to update the wording in the proposed legal text to change “it is agreed that” to “it is acknowledged that”... “only an Embedded Small Power Station which is 5MW or above is a Relevant Embedded Power Station requiring the submission of an Evaluation of Transmission Impact to The Company in accordance with Paragraph 5.1(a)”

Following feedback from Workgroup 2, NESO to determine whether the proposal should include a definition of capacity to be used in the legal text.

Action 8 – Scotland Codification (closed during the meeting)

The Proposer noted that NESO’s position remains that the defect only applies to England and Wales, therefore the solution only applies in England and Wales. It was also noted that SP Energy Networks plan to review their thresholds, so codifying now could act as a potential blocker, as well as the challenge with certain GSPs in Scotland that use a different threshold.

Action 10 – Clean Power 2030 (closed during the meeting)

Workgroup members discussed interactions between this Modification and CP30.

A Workgroup Member took an action to create a list of scenarios where there could be a cross over between this Modification and Clean Power 2030 to look at in the next Workgroup meeting.

Summary of actions:

The Chair noted the status of the following actions on the action log:

- Action 1 – to remain open
- Action 2 – closed during Workgroup 2
- Action 3 – closed during Workgroup 2
- Action 4 – closed during Workgroup 2
- Action 5 – to remain open
- Action 6 – completed

Public

- Action 7 – to remain open
- Action 8 – closed during Workgroup 2
- Action 9 – completed
- Action 10 – closed during Workgroup 2

Workgroup consultation

The Chair talked Workgroup members through the first draft of the Workgroup consultation. Workgroup members confirmed they are in agreement with the topics that will be included in the Workgroup consultation based on the discussions in the first two Workgroup meetings.

Next Steps

The Chair noted that the next Workgroup meeting will be extended to allow further time for discussions around key topics. The Chair will also add a placeholder for an additional Workgroup meeting should it be required.

The Chair noted that the Workgroup consultation will be further developed prior to and during the next Workgroup meeting.

Actions

1	WG1	Martin Cahill	Develop a table or flowchart to illustrate various scenarios for how generators will be treated under the proposed threshold change. This will provide clarity and will be reviewed by the Workgroup to help to refine the proposed solution. To include different MW sized generators, new vs change to capacity, and demand connections with generation attached.	03/02	Open
5	WG1	Martin Cahill	The Proposer took an action to develop the implementation timelines for CMP446 in relation to CMP434 and CMP435 further, considering different decision outcomes.	03/02	Open
7	WG1	Martin Cahill	Clarify the definition of MW capacity to be used, as different terms such as installed capacity, export capacity, and developer capacity are used inconsistently.	03/02	Open
11	WG2	Daniel Clarke	Workgroup members discussed GSPs that have no fault level headroom and therefore would be subject to current processes. A Workgroup member took an action to investigate whether a list of these GSPs could be provided.	03/02	Open

Public

12	WG2	Brian Hoy	A Workgroup member took an action to update the table of different scenarios with columns for existing and requested capacities. This table will include columns for installed and export capacity and whether a TIA would be required for each capacity type per scenario.	03/02	Open
13	WG2	Martin Cahill	The proposer took an action to send an up-to-date pie chart confirming total accepted DER by technology in MW to Workgroup members and to ensure the up-to-date figures are added into the Workgroup consultation.	03/02	Open
14	WG2	Martin Cahill	The Proposer took an action to make it clear that implementation refers to legal text implementation, to add some example timings, and to make it clear that removal of existing REPs only refers to yet to be connected	03/02	Open
15	WG2	Martin Cahill	Confirm the plan for communications for existing projects, whether they do or do not have to do apply for Gate 2. It was noted that this could be the responsibility of DNOs, however this will be confirmed.	03/02	Open
16	WG2	Martin Cahill	The Proposer took an action to update the wording in the proposed legal text to change "it is agreed that" to "it is acknowledged that"... "only an Embedded Small Power Station which is 5MW or above is a Relevant Embedded Power Station requiring the submission of an Evaluation of Transmission Impact to The Company in accordance with Paragraph 5.1(a)"	03/02	Open
17	WG2	Martin Cahill	Following feedback from Workgroup 2, NESO to determine whether the proposal should include a definition of capacity to be used in the legal text and whether this should be based on Registered Capacity, Developer Capacity or anything different.	03/02	Open
18	WG2	Kate Teubner	A Workgroup Member took at action to create a list of scenarios where there could be a cross over between this Modification and Clean Power 2030 to look at in the next Workgroup meeting.	03/02	Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Milly Lewis	ML	NESO Code Administrator	Chair

Commented [ML1]: After the Chair, Tech Sec, Proposer the attendees should be in alphabetical order

Public

Kat Higby	KH	NESO Code Administrator	Tech Sec
Martin Cahill	MC	NESO	Proposer
Alex Markham	AM	NESO	NESO Representative
Alison Price	AP	NESO	NESO SME
Andrew Colley	AC	SSE Generation	Alternate
Brian Hoy	BH	Electricity North West	Workgroup Member
Ciaran Fitzgerald	CF	Scottish Power	Workgroup Member
Dan Clarke	DC	National Grid Electricity Transmission	Workgroup Member
Drew Johnstone	DJ	Northern Powergrid	Workgroup Member
Garth Graham	GG	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member
Helen Stack	HS	Centrica	Workgroup Member
Jack Purchase	JP	National Grid Electricity Distribution	Workgroup Member
Jo Greenan	JG	NESO	Workgroup Observer
Joe Colebrook	JC	Innova Renewables	Workgroup Member
Kate Teubner	KT	Low Carbon	Workgroup Member
Kostas Fouskis	KF	Gridserve	Workgroup Observer
Mohammad Bilal	MB	UK Power Networks	Alternate
Nina Sharma	NS	Drax	Workgroup Member
Ross O'Hare	RH	SSEN	Workgroup Member
Zivanayi Musanhi	ZM	UK Power Networks	Workgroup Member
Pete Ashton	PA	Roadnight Taylor	Observer