

# Code Administrator Meeting Summary

## Meeting Name: CMP298 Workgroup 10

Date: 22 September 2021

## Contact Details

Chair: Paul Mullen

Contact details: [paul.j.mullen@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:paul.j.mullen@nationalgrideso.com)

Proposer: Grahame Neale

Contact details: [grahame.neale@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:grahame.neale@nationalgrideso.com)

## Key areas of discussion

- CMP298 seeks to introduce a more efficient aggregated assessment of Distributed Generators (DG) that have or may have an impact on the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS). This process (known in the industry as the Appendix G process) has been trialled by Network Operators over the last few years and the learning from this will be applied to the CMP298 change. This new process will sit alongside the current process (the Statement of Works process) with a small change being applied to this existing process to clarify that multiple projects can now be applied for at the same time.
- Workgroup Consultation was issued 12 August 2021 and closed 5pm on 10 September 2021 with 7 non-confidential responses received. The Workgroup met to discuss the Workgroup Consultation Responses which can be summarised as follows:
  - Majority supportive of change and implementation approach although a clear desire for Workgroup to develop a more detailed implementation plan to give confidence that the revised contractual arrangements can be all put in place within 24 months of Ofgem decision;
  - STC changes needed to be understood and developed and sufficiently set out such that minimal risk of having to unpick the CMP298 solution(s). There was also a desire to present the Final Modification Reports for the CUSC and the STC changes at the same time (or as near to) to Ofgem for decision;
  - In terms of publication of information to assist stakeholders to understand where the gaps are, respondents welcomed ESO publishing data but noted that interested parties still need to engage with Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) to understand the options. Also, for the data to be really useful to stakeholders, it needs to show the

capacity available - I recall we recognised in previous Workgroups the difficulty of doing this.

- Potential alternatives discussed were:
  - As per Original but DNO updates to Appendix G are deemed to be accepted unless ESO confirm otherwise rather than the ESO Approve/Reject process proposed in the Original; and
  - As per Original but remove the need for a validation fee to be charged by the ESO to DNOs to confirm that the requirements of the Transmission Impact Assessment (known in the industry as Appendix G) are met.
- Further clarity/commentary on the concept of Planning Limit needed.
- Workgroup discussed the current timeline and noted it was clear from the responses to the Workgroup Consultation and subsequent discussion that the STC changes need to be defined more fully, the implementation plan needs to be further developed and there are possible alternatives to consider. This means the Workgroup Report will not be ready for October 2021 Panel – the Chair agreed to flag this to CUSC Panel on 24 September 2021 (**Post Meeting Note – Completed**).
- The Workgroup agreed the issues (previously identified and/or as part of the responses to the Workgroup Consultation) that needed further development and they agreed next steps for each of these (see below). They noted that progression of the STC changes was key.

## Next Steps

Category	What?	Who?	When by?
<b>STC</b>	STC changes needed to be understood and developed ahead of Workgroup Report being finalised	Grahame Neale, Terry Baldwin, and the Onshore Transmission Owners	Grahame Neale to speak to Terry 1 <sup>st</sup>  Update on 6 October 2021
<b>Implementation</b>	Break down the 24 months implementation plan into key components/deliverables	Zivanayi Musanhi, Brian Hoy, Grahame Neale, Matthew Paige-Stimson	Ahead of next Workgroup  Discuss on 6 October 2021
<b>Planning Limit</b>	What further clarity can we provide on Planning Limit?	Grahame Neale (Product Document) – <i>Brian Hoy to be consulted</i> Paul Mullen (Workgroup Report)	Ahead of next Workgroup Report  Discuss on 6 October 2021
<b>Validation Fee</b>	Under what circumstances would the ESO charge a validation fee /reject DNO submission	Grahame Neale (with Connections team)	Ahead of next Workgroup

			Discuss on 6 October 2021
<b>Publication of Data</b>	What data will be published and where and how frequently?	Paul Mullen (add to Workgroup Report)	Ahead of next Workgroup  Discuss on 6 October 2021
<b>Workgroup Alternatives</b>	Alternative 1 - As per Original but DNO updates to Appendix G are deemed to be accepted unless ESO confirm otherwise rather than ESO Approve/Reject process	Brian Hoy to draft Grahame Neale (Legal text)	Ahead of next Workgroup  Discuss on 6 October 2021
<b>Workgroup Alternatives</b>	Alternative 2 - As per Original but to remove the need for a validation fee to be charged by the ESO to DNOs to confirm requirements of Transmission Impact Assessment are met	Brian Hoy to draft Grahame Neale (Legal text)	Ahead of next Workgroup  Discuss on 6 October 2021
<b>Workgroup Alternatives</b>	Alternative 3 - As per Original but to remove the need for a validation fee to be charged by the ESO to DNOs to confirm requirements of TIA are met and DNO updates to Appendix G are deemed to be accepted unless ESO confirm otherwise rather than ESO Approve/Reject process	TBC	To be written up after Alternative 1 and 2
<b>Workgroup Alternatives</b>	Alternative 4 – Instead of effectively implementing the Appendix G Mkii process, implement the Appendix G Mki process with a dynamic adjustment of Headroom value	Matthew Paige-Stimson	Ahead of next Workgroup  Discuss on 6 October 2021  <b>(Post Meeting Note – No longer required)</b>

For further information, please contact Paul Mullen.