



# Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Workgroup Meeting 8: CMP446 Increasing the lower threshold in England and Wales for Evaluation of Transmission Impact

## **Assessment**

Date: 24 February 2025

## **Contact Details**

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

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

# Key areas of discussion

This Workgroup meeting aimed to ensure that CMP446 and its WACMs were thoroughly reviewed, discussed, and finalised in preparation for the workgroup vote and submission to the Panel.

# **Action Updates**

### Action 26 (closed during the meeting)

The Proposer of WACMI confirmed that the terminology to be used within WACMI will be "MW" rather than "MVA"

## Action 34 - Fault level headroom treatment (closed during the meeting)

The Proposer took the Workgroup through a table of scenarios that show how projects will be treated with regards to fault level headroom at a GSP.

Based on feedback from the Workgroup, the following new actions were agreed:

- Clarification on MW Ranges: The Proposer will adjust the table of scenarios to clearly define the MW ranges, specifically changing the middle row to "1 to less than 5 MW" and the bottom row to "equal to or greater than 5 MW".
- **Mitigation for 1 to 5 MW**: The Proposer will consider including a note in the report about the possibility of quicker responses for 1 to 5 MW connections if no works are required, as suggested by a Workgroup member, who will provide wording. Note that this is for further information only and does not change the solution
- Fault Level Headroom Definition: A Workgroup Member to check if the definition of fault level headroom at the T to D boundary is captured adequately in Appendix G/Appendix G processes or if it there needs to be any clarification included in the legal text.





## Action 37 - Capacity Definitions (closed during the meeting)

The Proposer presented advantages and disadvantages of using the Grid Code vs the D-Code Capacity definition. Workgroup members debated the two definitions.

The Proposer's preferred option remains the Grid Code definition due to its alignment with definitions used in SQSS, CUSC, and Small/Medium/Large categorisation.

## Action 24 (closed), 35 (closed) and 36 (to remain open) - Legal text

The Proposer confirmed that the legal text has been updated, addressing actions 24 and 35, relating to fault level headroom scenarios.

Workgroup members discussed the need to clarify the 5 MW threshold to one decimal place. This action (36) remains open for the proposer to consider whether it is necessary to add any additional clarification in the legal text.

The Proposer took 4 new actions:

- Review the necessity of adding an additional paragraph of legal text rather than updating the existing text in 6.5.1a and update the Workgroup on this
- Review the wording "it is acknowledged that" to ensure that wording is clear and concise
- Double-check the definitions to ensure the correct use of "relevant embedded small power station."
- Ensure the legal text does not conflict with the legal text for modifications CMP434 and 435 and consider a tidy-up exercise if needed.

#### Additional Workgroup scenarios check

Workgroup members discussed responses from the Workgroup Consultation regarding additional scenarios proposed for inclusion within the Workgroup Report table.

Workgroup members agreed that responses 3, 6 and 10 were already covered by the existing scenarios.

Workgroup members agreed by a unanimous vote that response 21 is outside of the scope of this modification and will therefore not be included within the scenario table in the Workgroup Report.

The Proposer took an action to add a footnote or additional text to the scenarios table to clarify the proposed processes around fault level headroom and the requirement for a TIA if there is not sufficient headroom.





# **WACM Discussion and Legal Text**

#### WACM1

- **MW vs. MVA**: The Proposer confirmed that he is happy with using MW instead of MVA for the capacity measure. This will be reflected in the Workgroup Report.
- **Scenarios table**: The Proposer took an action to update the scenarios table in the Workgroup Report to reflect the WACMI approach, which uses export capacity, as well as the Original Proposal.
- **Legal Text Clarity**: The Proposer of WACMI took an action finalise the definition for export capacity to be included in section II (with specific reference to 6.5.1(f))

#### WACM2

- Improvement over the baseline: The Proposer of WACM2 to confirm the operability and improvement over the baseline following questions raised by the Workgroup. The Proposer will also need to confirm the definition source for Registered Capacity (Grid Code or Distribution Code).
- **Default Threshold**: There was a discussion on whether a default threshold should be included in the legal text. Concerns were raised about the lack of a specified threshold, which could lead to ambiguity.

## WACM3 and WACM4

- **25 MW Cap**: The Workgroup requested further rationale of how the 25 MW cap was calculated. The Proposer of WACM3 and WACM4 took an action to confirm this.
- **Legal Text for Capping**: The Proposer of WACM3 and WACM4 took an action to draft legal text, ensuring it clearly defines the cap and its application.
- **Future Adjustments**: The Workgroup acknowledged that the 25 MW cap could be adjusted in the future based on further analysis and the impact on the transmission network. This flexibility was seen as a way to refine the cap as more data becomes available.

# Legal text comparison

The Chair presented a table containing the legal text comparison between the Original Proposal and WACMs 1-4.



# NESO National Energy System Operator

## **Public**

## **Terms of Reference Check-in**

The Chair talked Workgroup members through the Terms of Reference and noted the location of each within the Workgroup Report.

It was noted that the Workgroup Report will be checked to ensure that the example of projects reducing capacity to get under the threshold has been included.

# **Workgroup Report Overview**

The Chair took Workgroup Members through the Workgroup Report and invited members to comment on any areas they thought needed to be added to or amended. Notes were added to the Workgroup Report where amendments will be considered.

# **Next Steps**

The Chair noted that the final Workgroup meeting is due to be held on 26 February. The Chair will add an additional meeting in for 27 February in case it is required.

Actions					
Action Number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
38	WG8	Martin Cahill	Adjust the table of scenarios to clearly define the MW ranges, specifically changing the middle row to "I to less than 5 MW" and the bottom row to "equal to or greater than 5 MW"	26/02/2025	Open
39	WG8	Martin Cahill / Brian Hoy	Consider including a note in the report about the possibility of quicker responses for 1 to 5 MW connections if no works are required, as suggested by a Workgroup member, who will provide wording.	26/02/2025	Open
40	WG8	Daniel Clarke	Check if the definition of fault level headroom at the T to D	26/02/2025	Open





	 h	-
$\overline{}$		11( :

Public					
			boundary is captured in Appendix G or if it needs to be included in the legal text.		
41	WG8	Martin Cahill	Review the wording "it is acknowledged that" to ensure that wording is clear and concise	26/02/2025	Open
42	WG8	Martin Cahill	Double-check the definitions to ensure the correct use of "relevant embedded small power station."	26/02/2025	Open
43	WG8	Martin Cahill	Ensure the legal text does not conflict with CMP434/435 and consider a tidy-up exercise if needed.	26/02/2025	Open
44	WG8	Martin Cahill	Add a footnote or additional text to the scenarios table to clarify the processes around fault level headroom and the requirement for a TIA if there is not sufficient headroom.	26/02/2025	Open
45	WG8	Martin Cahill	Update the scenarios table in the Workgroup Report to reflect the WACMI approach, which uses export capacity, as well as the Original Proposal.	26/02/2025	Open
46	WG8	Garth Graham	Finalise a definition for export capacity to be used in section 11	26/02/2025	Open
47	WG8	Kate Teubner	The Workgroup requested further rationale of how the 25 MW cap was calculated. The Proposer of WACM3 and WACM4 took an action to confirm this.	26/02/2025	Open





48 WG8 Kate Draft legal text, ensuring it 26/02/2025 Open

Teubner clearly defines the cap and its

application.

# **Attendees**

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Milly Lewis	ML	NESO Code Administrator	Chair
Kat Higby	КН	NESO Code Administrator	Technical
Rathigby	KH	NESO CODE Administrator	Secretary
Matthew Larreta	ML	NESO Code Administrator	Technical
Matthew Earrota		NEGO OGGO AGITIMISTICIO	Secretary
Martin Cahill	МС	NESO	Proposer
Alex Markham	АМ	NESO	NESO
Alex Marking III		NEGO	Representative
Andrew Colley	AC	SSE Generation	Alternate
Brian Hoy	ВН	Electricity North West	Workgroup
Bharrioy	DIT		Member
Dan Clarke	DC	National Grid Electricity	Workgroup
Dan Clarke	DC	Transmission	Member
Drew Johnstone	DJ	Northern Powergrid	Workgroup
		- Hortinerin eworgina	Member
Garth Graham	GG	SSE Generation	Workgroup
			Member
Grant Rogers	GR	Qualitas Energy	Workgroup
	OK .	Qualitus Eriorgy	Member
Helen Stack	HS	Centrica	Workgroup
			Member
Jack Purchase	JP	National Grid Electricity	Workgroup
GOOK I GIOIIGSE	51	Distribution	Member
Joe Colebrook	JC	Innova Renewables	Workgroup
			Member
Kate Teubner	KT	Low Carbon	Workgroup
			Member





Kostas Fouskis	KF	Gridserve	Workgroup Observer
Mohammad Bilal	МВ	UK Power Networks	Alternate
Paul Youngman	PY	Drax	Alternate
Pete Ashton	PA	Roadnight Taylor	Observer
Ross O'Hare	RH	SSEN	Workgroup Member
Zivanayi Musanhi	ZM	UK Power Networks	Workgroup Member

· · · · · · · · · · · (