

## Code Administrator Meeting Summary

**Meeting name: CMP316 Workgroup 2**

**Date:** 14 October 2021

### Contact Details

**Chair:** Jennifer Groome

**Contact details:** [Jennifer.Groome@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:Jennifer.Groome@nationalgrideso.com)

**Proposer:** Nicola White

**Contact details:** [Nicola.White@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:Nicola.White@nationalgrideso.com)

### Key areas of discussion

- The Proposer gave an update on their actions from the first meeting.
  - Treatment of temporary TEC
    - An action was taken for an example to be developed to clarify how temporary TEC is treated.
  - Impact on distributed connected generation sites
    - It was discussed that small distributed generation sites with  $\geq 100$  MW of TEC would not be impacted through this modification as they do not currently pay TNUoS. However, the Workgroup agreed that they should consider how the solution would work if they were included, as they may pay TNUoS in the future.
  - Declaration of capacity vs source from contracts
    - The Original solution currently sources the TEC from connection contracts to use in the proposed pro-rata calculation. The Proposer advised that this gives signals to the system of any changes. The following considerations were discussed:
      - Using contracts means that mod-apps would have to be raised, which would have associated costs (which declarations wouldn't have).
      - TEC in contracts is usually more than TEC used so it was suggested this may not be cost reflective.
      - It was suggested that a user-declared method may be easier to manage, particularly if small distributed generators were to be included in this in future.
      - If a declaration method was to be used, Workgroup members advised that this would need to be mandatory rather than optional. As it may be in the interests of some sites that their predominant TEC is used, which could lead to some sites deciding not to make declarations.

- Transitional arrangements for implementation
  - It was suggested that wider engagement needs to happen on this with sub-groups and trade associations.
- The Proposer presented some examples of co-located sites and explained how the pro-rata method would work for these.
- The Workgroup members were satisfied with the current timeline for the modification and the progress made against it so far.
- The actions from the meeting are summarised in the table below.

## Open Actions

Action Number	Workgroup raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
1	WG1	NW/AH	Examples of the various permutations.	Six examples provided in WG2.  Further examples to be provided: - 3 technology type - At least 2 months of temporary TEC (LDTEC and STEC) - Positive and negative tariffs (made up)	WG3	Open
2	WG1	NW/AH	Consider declaration process vs contracts	Further explore declaration process route  Provide further evidence to support using capacity in contracts. And explanation of how the proportions are derived.	WG3	Open
5	WG1	NW	Consider transitional arrangements for implementation	Talk to sub-groups and trade associations.	WG3	Open
6	WG2	JG/RGA	Include within WG Consultation/Report any discussion on how this process would work for embedded gens with less than 100MW TEC	So far discussed concerns that some of these do not have TEC. Flag consultation to DNOs.	WG4	Open
7	WG2	All	Explain impacts on ALF setting process	Confirm - if there are no separate meters - what ALF is used.	WG3	Open
8	WG2	AH	Provide relevant published documents on how many co-located sites there may be in the future		WG3	Open

## Next steps

- The next Workgroup meeting is on 2 November 2021.

For further information, please contact Jennifer Groome.