

Public

CMP432 Improve Locational Onshore Security Factor for TNUoS Wider Tariffs

Workgroup 4 (21 February 2025)

Online Meeting via Teams

WELCOME

Agenda

Topics to be discussed	Lead
Introductions	Chair
Action Log Review	Chair
Workgroup Consultation Review/ Specific questions	All
NESO Guidance Pack	Proposer
Presentation – How TO's plan the MIT's system – SSEN (12pm)	Steven Doherty
Any Other Business	Chair
Next Steps	Chair

Public

Expectations of a Workgroup Member

Contribute to the discussion

Be respectful of each other's opinions

Language and Conduct to be consistent with the values of equality and diversity

Do not share commercially sensitive information

Be prepared - Review Papers and Reports ahead of meetings

Complete actions in a timely manner

Keep to agreed scope

Email communications to/cc'ing the .box email

Your Roles

Help refine/develop the solution(s)

Bring forward alternatives as early as possible

Vote on whether or not to proceed with requests for Alternatives

Vote on whether the solution(s) better facilitate the Code Objectives

Workgroup Membership

Role		Name		Company	Alternate	Name
Chair		Sarah Williams		NESO		
Tech Sec		Prisca Evans		NESO		
Proposer		John Tindal		SSE	Alternate	Damien Clough
Workgroup Member		Neil Dewar		NESO		
Workgroup Member		Tom Steward		RWE	Alternate	Lauren Jauss
Workgroup Member		Ryan Ward		Scottish Power Renewables	Alternate	Hector Eduardo Perez
Workgroup Member		Andrew Rimmer		Engie	Alternate	Simon Lord
Workgroup Member		Paul Jones		Uniper	Alternate	Sean Gauton
Workgroup Member		Alan Kelly		Corio Generation	Alternate	Marc Smeed
Workgroup Member		Paul Youngman		Drax	Alternate	Nina Sharma
Workgroup Member		Giulia Licocci		Ocean Winds		Nina Brundage
Workgroup Member		Binoy Dharsi		EDF	Alternate	Hugh Boyle
Workgroup Member		Als Scrope		Northland Power	Alternate	Emanuele Dentis / Grant Anderson
Observer		Loukas Papageorgiou		RWE		
Observer		Kyle Murchie		Roadnight Taylor	Alternate	Catherine Cleary
Observer		Sally Young		SSE		
Observer		Zahira Rafiq		NESO		
Authority Representative		Sinan Kufeoglu		OFGEM		

What is the Alternative Request?

What is an Alternative Request? The formal starting point for a Workgroup Alternative Modification to be developed which can be raised up until the Workgroup Vote.

What do I need to include in my Alternative Request form? The requirements are the same for a Modification Proposal you need to articulate in writing:

- a description (in reasonable but not excessive detail) of the issue or defect which the proposal seeks to address compared to the current proposed solution(s);
- the reasons why you believe that the proposed alternative request would better facilitate the Applicable Objectives compared with the current proposed solution(s) together with background information;
- where possible, an indication of those parts of the Code which would need amending in order to give effect to (and/or would otherwise be affected by) the proposed alternative request and an indication of the impacts of those amendments or effects; and
- where possible, an indication of the impact of the proposed alternative request on relevant computer systems and processes.

How do Alternative Requests become formal Workgroup Alternative Modifications? The Workgroup will carry out a Vote on Alternatives Requests. If the majority of the Workgroup members or the Workgroup Chair believe the Alternative Request will better facilitate the Applicable Objectives than the current proposed solution(s), the Workgroup will develop it as a Workgroup Alternative Modification.

Who develops the legal text for Workgroup Alternative Modifications? ESO will assist Proposers and Workgroups with the production of draft legal text once a clear solution has been developed to support discussion and understanding of the Workgroup Alternative Modifications.

Public
Timeline for CMP432 as of 29 January 2025

Pre-Workgroup		
Proposal raised	07/03/2024	
Proposal submitted to Panel	22/03/2024	
Workgroup Nominations	09/04/2024	
Urgency Decision Granted	21/01/2025	
Workgroups		
Workgroup 1	29/01/2025	Objectives and Timeline/Review and Agree Terms of Reference / Proposer presentation
Workgroup 2	05/02/2025	Solution Development / Workgroup Discussions/Legal Text
Workgroup 3	14/02/2025	Draft Legal Text/Draft Workgroup Consultation /Specific Questions
Workgroup 4	21/02/2025	Final Workgroup Consultation Review
Workgroup Consultation	26/02/2025 – 06/03/2025	
Workgroup 5	13/03/2025	Review of Workgroup Consultation Responses / Alternative Requests Discussion/Review Solution position
Workgroup 6	20/03/2025	TOR Discussion/Alternative Requests Presentations and Vote (if required)/
Workgroup 7	26/03/2025	Draft Legal text and WACMs Legal text (if required) review
Workgroup 8	03/04/2025	Final Workgroup Report Review / ToR Sign-off / Final Legal Text Review (WACMS legal text)

Timeline for CMP432 as of 29 January 2025

Post Workgroups		Key info
Workgroup Report submitted to Panel	14/04/2025	
Panel to agree whether ToR have been met	17/04/2025	Special Panel invites to be shared
Code Administrator Consultation	22/04/2025 – 02/05/2025	
Code Administrator Consultation Analysis and DFMR generation	02/05/2025 – 08/05/2025	
Draft Final Modification Report to Panel	09/05/2025	
Panel Recommendation Vote	15/05/2025	Special Panel
Final Modification to Ofgem	15/05/2025	
Decision Date	30/09/2025	
Implementation Date	01/04/2026	


Public

CMP432 - Terms of Reference

Workgroup Term of Reference	Location in Workgroup Report (to be completed at Workgroup Report stage)
a) Consider EBR implications	
b) Consider the methodology for calculating the security factor (Locational Onshore Security Factor Section 14.15.88 – 14.15.90) and the further objectives of the Charging Methodology set out in Section 14. 14.11	
c) Consider whether reinforcement with a larger capacity circuit, compared with the previous, increases the fault condition.	
d) Consider the impact of whether reinforcement is achieved by upgrading an existing circuit to a larger capacity, therefore increasing the fault condition	
e) Consider whether some types of technology require additional MITS redundancy, e.g. large inflexible conventional such as nuclear	
f) Consider and evaluate the evidence that the current Security Factor is reflective of how TOs make network reinforcement decisions	
g) Consider the scope of work identified and whether this is achievable within the timeframe outlined in the Ofgem Urgency decision letter	

Action Log Review

Sarah Williams - NESO Code
Administrator




Action Log

Action	Description	Owner	Due	Status
1	Share the SECULF model with the work group to enable replication of the calculation	ND	WG 2	Open
3	NESO to speak to teams internally to request industry access to VBA code within the Transport and Tariff Model	ND	WG2	Open
10	NESO to respond to the Workgroup member's email regarding the data request	ND	WG 4	Open
11	Query internally with NESO if an independent auditor is an option, as well as a written response on data sharing blockers, supported by a legal opinion.	ND	WG4	Open


Workgroup Consultation Review/Specific questions

Sarah Williams – NESO Code
Administrator




NESO Guidance Pack

John Tindal - SSE




Presentation - How TO's plan the MIT's system

Steven Doherty - SSEN



Any Other Business

Sarah Williams – NESO Code
Administrator



Next Steps

Sarah Williams – NESO Code Administrator

