

Meeting summary

Transmission Charging Methodologies Forum and CUSC Issues Steering Group 115

Date: 03/06/2021 Location: WebEx

Start: 09:30 End: 11:00

Participants

Attendee	Company	Attendee	Company
Jon Wisdom (JW)	National Grid ESO (Chair / Presenter)	Matt Wootton (MW)	National Grid ESO
Jennifer Groome (JG)	National Grid ESO (TCMF Tech Secretary)	Matthew Paige-Stimson (MPS)	National Grid Electricity Transmission
Paul Mullen (PM)	National Grid ESO (Presenter)	Nicola Fitchett (NF)	RWE
Sean Donner (SD)	National Grid ESO (Presenter)	Grace March (GM)	Sembcorp
Neil Bennett (NB)	SSE (Presenter)	Joe Underwood (JU)	Energy UK
Amy Wong (AW)	National Grid ESO (Presenter)	Chia Nwajagu (CN)	Orsted
Sean Gauton (SG)	Uniper	Garth Graham (GG)	SSE Generation
Josh Logan (JL)	Drax	Claire Warren (CW)	Haven Power
Max Taylor (MT)	Scottish Power	Jo Zhou (JZ)	National Grid ESO
Marc Smeed (MS)	RIDG	Graham Panel (GP)	Fred Olsen Renewables
Simon Lord (SL)	Engie	Lisa Waters (LW)	Waters Wye Associates
Dennis Gowland (DG)	Neven Point Wind Ltd	Alan Currie (AC)	Ventient Energy
Robert Longden (RL)	Cornwall Insight	Rustam Majainah (RM)	OVO
Jenny Wignall (JWI)	National Grid ESO	Ander Madariaga (AM)	Ocean Winds
Katharina Birkner (KB)	National Grid ESO	Jessica Richardson (JR)	Intergen
Simon Vicary (SV)	EDF Energy		

Agenda, slides and modifications appendices

<https://www.nationalgrideso.com/charging/transmission-charging-methodology-forum-tcmf>

TCMF and CISG

Please note: These notes are produced as an accompaniment to the slide pack presented and detail discussion themes.

Meeting Opening – Jon Wisdom, National Grid ESO

JW opened the meeting providing an overview of the agenda items for discussion. GG raised that he had an item of AOB.

Code Modifications Update – Paul Mullen, Code Administrator - National Grid ESO

PM shared details of the progress of current modifications, details available on the slides.

- No questions

BSUoS Clarification Modification – Sean Donner, National Grid ESO

SD provided a BSUoS Clarification Modification update. NGESO are looking to raise a modification to address a few minor issues in Section 14 of the CUSC. The four areas for which clarity is being sought are detailed on the slides. SD explained the changes, shared the draft legal text and asked the forum for feedback.

Discussion themes / Feedback

- SV and GG commended this work in tidying up the CUSC.
- SV raised concerns that CMP308 and other BSUoS modifications are being worked on at the moment and questioned whether what version of the CUSC baseline text the Code Administrator are using to consult on. SD confirmed that the text has not yet been proposed, but the changes are relatively minor so should not have a big effect. Further, that the CMP308 and CMP361/2 workgroups are aware of these changes and will work to ensure consistency... SV repeated his support but requested to see a draft to check against CMP308 as the legal text will be finalised this month. JW assured the forum that the ESO will review the timelines for all of the modifications in question to that the correct version of legal text is used for consultations.

User Commitment – ENA Working Group Product – Neil Bennett – SSEN Transmission

NB gave a presentation detailing User Commitment – ENA Working Group Product also known as WS2 Product 5 (Workstream 2 Product 5). It is generally agreed that CUSC 15 is an improvement to the previous Final Sums methodology, however it has been identified that there are still several areas that could be improved or tweaked to ensure there is a reasonable balance between security / liability amounts and a barrier to entry. In order to facilitate any changes, an ENA working group has been set up to explore this. The details are on the slides.

NB introduced what the Working group was looking to do, how far they have got with the work so far and the stakeholder feedback they have so far received. NB explained that the group are looking to expand their work through this forum and other channels and asked the forum for feedback on several issues so far identified - of which a selection was presented to the group. NB requested that the forum attendees look at the issues in their own time and provide feedback through to NB at neil.bennett@sse.com

Discussion themes / Feedback

- GG requested a link be added to the slides so that forum attendees can review the 30 issues. He highlighted that depending on the outcome of CMP371, which seeks to change the governance so that only one mod need be raised when the proposal is to change both non-charging and charging elements of the CUSC.
- Forum members raised concerns that the wider industry had not been consulted on this work, and that the ENA Working Group itself isn't sufficient representation across industry. GG highlighted that the work at this stage has been high level and further detailed work will need to be carried out through CUSC Workgroups. RL agreed.
- RL suggested that it would be helpful if the ENA Working Group could share their minded-to positions for the consultation to enable more focussed responses.
- LW queried how this fits in with the charging review, and the work on User Commitment. JW advised that he did not think User Commitment work to be included in the charging review.
- LW echoed the point made about industry representation on the Working Group not being so far sufficient. And voiced that there is currently a high volume of consultations currently being published and that it would be a better use of industry's time if parties could get together and co-create with this.
- LW suggested some additions to the list of issues regarding; setting up connections for pathfinder projects, how the connections process works and the relationship between the TO and ESO in that process, and the commercial framework that supports what parties do when they connect. NB stated that the TO's have no input on the balancing side of it and wouldn't be able to bring that forward as part of this working group because of that.
- RL echoed LW's point regarding when there are two parties dependant on the process working. He shared his view that it is better for parties to test ideas with the other parties as to whether those ideas fly. There is an appropriate stage which you ask the other party whether the proposed actually works. RL shared his appreciation for LW's point about being a developer and having to charter a path through the process, jumping through loops and going to multiple parties, and echoed the point that the process could be better. NB stated that the Code Review could solve some of these issues – i.e. merging codes together to align these processes a lot more. There is a lot of alignment that could be done between the CUSC and the STC. He shared some improvement that has so far happened in having pre application calls. This is a free service so parties can understand what the likelihood of connection dates, costs etc would be. He shared that more communication of these services could be an improvement.

Offshore Coordination Update – Amy Wong, National Grid ESO

AW firstly introduced what the Offshore Coordination project is, and what it aims to do, before sharing the Phase 1 key findings with the forum. AW then shared what Phase 2 of the project will involve. They will also be presenting at the Markets event on the 22 June on Offshore Coordination. All the sign up details are now available on our website [here](#).

Discussion themes / Feedback

- GG shared his appreciation that this being brought to TCMF and asked when the CUSC mods would be brought forward in this area. He advised that sooner is better.
 - AW understood the interactions Offshore Coordination may have with different regulatory frameworks, for example the Trade and Corporation Agreement.
 - CN asked whether there is adequate representation from industry on the workgroup, considering the impacts this will have on generators. AW clarified that there are different OTNR partners that are working together on this project. The ESO are also working with various stakeholders. AW encouraged any further feedback to be shared with the project.
 - RL voiced that with major projects like this, there can be issues if direction is not given by the appropriate authority.
 - GG shared that it is also important to note what OTNR is **not** doing to enable stakeholders to understand what work needs to be picked up by other workstreams.
-

- MS who sits on the OTNR charging group, shared that the group has recently made some concessions that they will have to look at.

AOB

- GG updated the forum regarding the CMP317/327 CMA decision, that SSE have made a claim for judicial review that was issued to the court last Friday.
- He stated that this is a 2-stage process and its important people understand that. Stage 2 only applies if granted by a judge. SSE is seeking an expedited manor to be determined by the 31 October this year. That is for the court to decide and accommodate.
- LW requested that GG notify the forum attendees when the documents are made available? GG agreed to if possible.

Action Item Log

Action items: In progress and completed since last meeting

ID	Month	Agenda Item	Description	Owner	Notes	Target Date	Status
21-4	June	BSUoS Clarification Modification	ESO to reach out to all the proposers of the impacted modifications and share what they're proposing to do so any views can be fed into the panel meeting at the end of the month.	SD	Proposers have been contacted and feedback will be considered. To note this modification has not been raised this month so will not be included in the June panel meeting.	June	Completed