

## Minutes

<b>Meeting name</b>	CUSC Modifications Panel
<b>Meeting number</b>	193
<b>Date of meeting</b>	26 August 2016
<b>Location</b>	National Grid House, Warwick

## Attendees

Name	Initials	Position
Mike Toms	MT	Panel Chair
Heena Chauhan	HC	Panel Secretary
John Martin	JM	Code Administrator
Andy Wainwright	AW	National Grid Panel Member (alternate)
Cem Suleyman	CS	Users' Panel Member
Garth Graham (dial-in)	GG	Users' Panel Member
James Anderson	JA	Users' Panel Member
Paul Jones	PJ	Users' Panel Member
Paul Mott	PM	Users' Panel Member
Kyle Martin (dial-in)	KM	Users' Panel Member
Bob Brown	BB	Consumers' Panel Member
Abid Sheikh	AS	Authority Representative
Nicholas Rubin	NR	ELEXON
Louise Schmitz	LS	CMP264/CMP265 Chair (update)
Mary Teuton (dial-in)	MTe	CMP262 Proposer (update)

## 1 Apologies

Apologies were provided from Simon Lord (SL) and Nikki Jamieson (NJ). Simon Lord passed his voting rights to Paul Jones.

*All presentations given at this CUSC Modifications Panel meeting can be found in the CUSC Panel area on the National Grid website:*

<http://www2.nationalgrid.com/UK/Industry-information/Electricity-codes/CUSC/Panel-information/>

## 2 Introductions

5547. Introductions were made around the group. Louise Schmitz joined the Panel to provide an update for CMP264 and CMP265 and Mary Teuton from VPI Immingham joined the Panel via teleconference to support discussions for CMP262.

## 3 Approval of Minutes from the last meeting

5548. The minutes of the Special CUSC Panel meeting held 19 July 2016 and the CUSC Panel meeting held on 29 July 2016 were approved and are available on the National Grid website. Comments from AS, BB, GG and HC were approved by the Panel.

## 4 Review of actions

5549. **Minute 5435: To issue a copy of the new modification templates for Panel members to review.** HC noted that these templates were issued to the Panel and that the Panel were requested to provide any comments back to JM by 3 August 2016. JM confirmed that no comments had been provided and that the new templates would be used from CMP271 onwards.
5550. **Minute 5440: To provide an NGET response to the questions raised by GG on the GLDPM Implementation Rules.** AW noted that NJ had issued a note outlining the next steps for this issue and confirmed that this had been circulated to the Panel on 4 August 2016. This action is now closed.
5551. **Minute 5441: To discuss the current strain on industry resources with Ofgem colleagues and provide feedback to the Panel.** The Panel agreed to close this item as it was included as a separate agenda item for discussion.
5552. **Minute 5470: NJ to provide feedback to the Panel considering the concept of releases to better manage workload.** The Panel agreed to close this item as it was included as a separate agenda item for discussion.
5553. **Minute 5473: JM to feedback on what best practices may look like and how the process can support urgent modifications and the co-ordination across multiple industry codes.** The Panel agreed to close this item as it was included as a separate agenda item for discussion.
5554. **Minute 5474: NR to ask the ELEXON codes team to contact JM and Naomi Regan.** NR noted that he had discussed this with his ELEXON colleagues and that this team had been in contact with Gemserve. JM confirmed that he was supportive of this and the action is now closed and also would be in contact with the ELEXON Code Admin Team.
5555. **Minute 5475: All Panel members to send proposals for mitigation the current situation to HC by 18 August.** MT confirmed that he had received comments from BB and PM. The Panel agreed to close this item as it was included a separate agenda item for discussion.
5556. **Minute 5475: HC to send Panel proposals to MT by 19 August 2016.** The Panel agreed to close this item as it was included a separate agenda item for discussion.
5557. **Minute 5512: JM to investigate the National Grid £10,000 material impact threshold and report back to the Panel.** JM confirmed that value had not changed for a long period of time and industry parties could raise a modification to address this if they believed it to be a defect. CS asked where this figure has come from and why it was set to this value.

### **Action – JM to confirm how long this value been set to £10,000.**

MT noted that if the Panel believed this to be inaccurate then the Panel could suggest a party raise this as a modification. AW noted that this did not presently impact ongoing Industry proposals and hence would not be of benefit to any parties at present.

5558. **Minute 5522: Caroline Wright to arrange facilities to enable non Workgroup members to dial into CMP264/CMP265 Workgroup meeting on 11 August 2016.** This action is complete.
5559. **Minute 5541: NJ to speak with Rob Wilson regarding changes to the BCA for Emergency Disconnection of Embedded Generations that could impact the CUSC.** AW noted that he had spoken with Rob Wilson regarding this issue and that Rob had been able to

confirm that this issue had been withdrawn at the Grid Code Review Panel. GG asked for confirmation to ensure that the BCA had not been changed as a result of this issue.

**Action: AW to confirm back to Panel that no changes have been made to the BCA as a result of Emergency Disconnection of Embedded Generations.**

## **5 New CUSC Modification Proposals (plus CMP264 /CMP265 update)**

5560. Two new modifications were presented to the Panel at this meeting. As these proposals will be developed by the CMP264 / CMP265 Workgroup, the Panel agreed it would be sensible to also discuss the progress of CMP264 / CMP265 at this point of the meeting and LS joined the Panel to provide the Panel with an update on the progress of these Workgroups.

5561. **CMP269 'Potential consequential changes to the CUSC as a result of CMP264'** This modification aims to address a number of consequential changes required to non-charging sections of the CUSC to reflect the CMP264 Proposal or any alternative proposals agreed by the CMP264 Workgroup.

### **And**

5562. **CMP270 'Potential consequential changes to the CUSC as a result of CMP265'**. This modification aims to address a number of consequential changes required to non-charging sections of the CUSC to reflect the CMP265 Proposal or any alternative proposals agreed by the CMP265 Workgroup.

5563. The Panel agreed that as both of these modifications were proposed to be progressed by the Workgroup for CMP264 and CMP265 they would be assessed together.

5564. JA noted that these were consequential modifications and as yet full details had not yet been agreed but that the Workgroup anticipated changes to Section 3 and Section 11 of the CUSC.

5565. LS noted that although this extended the scope of the CMP264 / CMP265 Workgroup this would be the most efficient way to progress these proposals but it would increase the time required for voting.

5566. The Panel agreed that the Terms of Reference for these modifications would be covered within CMP264 / CMP265.

5567. The Panel reviewed the proposed timetables and discussed the merits and issues of progressing modifications without a Workgroup consultation. GG supported having a Workgroup Consultation but acknowledged that this may not be achievable. JM confirmed that the Panel could remove this requirement from the Workgroup and PJ noted that the Panel had an obligation to act in a reasonable manner. The Panel agreed by majority that in this particular case, a Workgroup Consultation would not be required as the Proposals did not raise any issues of substance.

5568. The Panel reviewed the proposal and recommended that it should be developed by the existing CMP264 Workgroup working towards an aligned timetable without the requirement for a Workgroup Consultation.

5569. BB queried the deliverability of the Legal Text for all four Proposals and LS confirmed that a sub team had been set up to support the delivery of the legal text with the support of a member of AW's team, the National Grid Legal department and Workgroup members. LS noted that this was still challenging as the team only had a fortnight to complete this.

5570. AS noted that a new objective had been introduced to the CUSC Objectives as part of CGR3 implementation. The Panel discussed when this would come into effect and asked AS for guidance. GG asked AS to refer to guidance provided during the implementation of CGR1 and CGR2 as these maybe relevant.

**Action: AS to confirm when the new CUSC objective needs to be included within the Workgroup/ Panel voting.**

5571. **CMP264 Embedded Generation Triad Avoidance Standstill**

This proposal has been raised by Scottish Power and seeks to change the Transport and Tariff Model and billing arrangements to remove the netting of output from New Embedded Generators until Ofgem has completed its consideration of the current electricity transmission Charging Arrangements (and any review which ensues) and any resulting changes have been fully implemented.

**And**

5572. **CMP265 'Gross charging of TNUoS for HH demand where embedded generation is in Capacity Market'**

This proposal has been raised by EDF Energy and specifically seeks to address the issue that half hourly metered (HH) demand for TNUoS purposes is currently charged net of embedded generation.

5573. LS joined the Panel to provide the Panel with an update on the progress of the Workgroup considering these two proposals. LS noted that the Workgroup Consultation had closed and three meetings were scheduled to take place over the next two weeks to review the responses, agree options for WACMs, and vote. The Workgroup report is expected to be issued on 22 September 2016. LS confirmed that forty-five responses had been received to the Consultation with one response being forty pages long. The Workgroup were expecting one additional late response and had also received twenty-three options for WACMs to add to the existing five that had been identified by the Workgroup.

5574. LS confirmed to the Panel that the responses to the Consultation had been from a good cross section of the industry. MT queried if this included embedded generators, suppliers and customers. LS confirmed that they did and she was confident that the responses represented the expertise of different sectors of the industry. LS was also able to confirm to AS that one embedded customer had submitted 10 options for WACMs.

5575. When reviewing the timetable, LS noted that although on paper the timetable looked achievable in reality it was very tight. LS and some Workgroup members considered that an accelerated process might restrict the ability of smaller industry parties to participate in the Workgroup.

5576. LS did not request the Panel for an extension to the timetable at this point in time although she noted that views of Workgroup members were split with some members of the Workgroup pushing for an extension. LS also noted that additional options to address this defect had the potential to widen the scope of this Proposal and that the Workgroup may need additional time to further develop these, although the time needed for this was not known at this stage.

5577. MT acknowledged that LS had a challenging task in being able to manage different views and arguments to progress these discussions forward and noted that a strong case to provide an extension could emerge due to the material content of responses. The Panel also acknowledged that LS was unable to request (and therefore was not requesting) an extension at this stage as it would be important to understand exactly what work may be required within the extended timescales. This will not be not possible to assess prior to the Workgroup meetings to review the consultation responses.

5578. GG queried if all options addressed the defect in the Proposal(s). LS confirmed this to be the case.

NR observed that this would also impact the BSC with changes to the Data Transfer Catalogue. This would need careful co-ordination which may result in many more BSC modifications being raised with corresponding legal text. JA noted that the CUSC can have multiple WACMs but the BSC can only have one WACM. There could therefore be a need to raise multiple modifications to the BSC. LS noted that this had been discussed by the Workgroup and had suggested that the owner of the WACM should originate the BSC modification. GG agreed with this approach as it supported the 'Proposer ownership' principle. The Panel concluded that Proposer ownership is preferred (but not mandated). Where a party is not able to raise the BSC modification (i.e. not a BSC Party) National Grid's Code Administration team would work with Elexon to support the process and establish the best way forward.

5579. The Panel noted that the Workgroup may ask for an extension in the future and request a Special CUSC Panel to be organised. LS noted that although the Workgroup had mixed views regarding the timescales to deliver the Workgroup report it was also very important to produce a report which fully discharged the WG's terms of reference and minimised the risk of a send back.

5580. PM acknowledged that the Workgroup had been very forward-looking and had addressed options for WACMs very early on in the process.

5581. GG suggested listing consultation alternative requests by the proposing parties and then linked to any WACM(s) raised. LS confirmed that this has been considered and a matrix would be developed to clarify options.

5582. MT noted that he had received a letter from Lesley Nugent from Ofgem asking if Ofgem should exercise its power to appoint another Panel member with embedded generation expertise and inviting him to take the Panel's views on this possibility into account.

5583. MT set out for discussion the proposition that the Panel has broad expertise and experience amongst its members, that Workgroup members also provide expertise to aid the development of a proposal and additionally, commentary provided during Consultations also provides broader views to assist the Panel when making its recommendation.

5584. CS agreed with this view and did not see the need for the Authority to appoint a new member. PJ and PM also agreed, noting the considerable experience of embedded generation issues amongst Panel members. AW agreed but noted that this maybe something that may need to be considered in future proposals. JA considered that this suggestion could be to the detriment of effective functioning of the Panel and agreed with MT's proposition. BB noted that the Workgroup Report would need to clearly articulate the materiality and consumer impact of the modification and that from his perspective it should satisfy his need to protect the consumer.

5585. KM noted that this could be seen as an issue of larger CUSC parties' verses smaller CUSC parties. In relation to other mods expertise may be required from particular sections of the industry. GG noted, by way of example, that a number of Panel members' organisations had embedded generation interests; including his own, with many 100s of MW of embedded generation plant or, like EnergyUK, had members with embedded generation plant; although Panel members acted impartially.

5586. JM noted that the Panel still had vacancies for alternates for the Panel.

5587. AS noted that it was useful to hear the views of the Panel on this matter and that the issue had been raised in the context of the CMP264 / CMP265 discussions but that this was also a

broader governance issue. The Panel was content for MT to write back to Lesley Nugent at Ofgem expressing the view that there is sufficient industry expertise available to the Panel in relation to CMP264 and CMP265 at present.

5588. LS inquired whether, as Panel members were independent, CMP264 / CMP265 Workgroup members could contact Panel members for guidance? Panel members confirmed that they would welcome any requests from Workgroup members.

## 6 Workgroups / Standing Groups

5589. The latest CUSC Modifications 'Plan on a Page' was shared with the Panel and referred to as the Panel were provided with updates to the current modifications in progress.

5590. **CMP250 'Stabilising BSUoS with at least a twelve month notice period'**

CMP250 aims to eliminate BSUoS volatility and unpredictability by proposing to fix the value of BSUoS over the course of a season, with a notice period for fixing this value being at least 12 months ahead of the charging season.

5591. HC noted that the Workgroup is on track. The Workgroup met on 1 August 2016 and are due to meet again on 12 September 2016 where they are expected to vote on this modification.

5592. **CMP259 'Clarification of decrease in TEC as a Modification'**

CMP259 proposes to enable a User to request both a TEC reduction and a subsequent TEC increase in the form of a single modification application to National Grid.

5593. HC noted that the Workgroup is on track. The Code Administrator Consultation has been issued and will close on 13 September 2016. The Panel are due to vote on this Proposal at the September meeting.

5594. **CMP261 'Ensuring the TNUoS paid by Generators in GB in Charging Year 2015/16 is in compliance with the €2.5/MWh annual average limit set in EU Regulation 838/2010 Part B (3)'**

CMP261 aims to ensure that there is an ex post reconciliation of the TNUoS paid by GB generators during charging year 2015/16 which will take place in Spring 2016 with any amount in excess of the €2.5/MWh upper limit being paid back, via a negative generator residual levied on all GB generators who have paid TNUoS during the period 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016 inclusive.

5595. JM noted that the Workgroup is not on track. A meeting is scheduled to take place on 30 August to confirm the legal position for this modification. As the length of the extension is not known, the Panel approved a confirmed that the Workgroup Report can be presented back at the Special CUSC Panel meeting on 20 September 2016 or at the regular September meeting.

5596. **CMP262 'Removal of SBR/DSBR costs from BSUoS into a 'Demand Security Charge''.**

CMP262 was proposed by VPI Immingham and aims to create a new cost recovery mechanism, a 'Demand Security Charge' specifically for recovery of all SBR/DSBR costs, which is only levied on demand side Balancing Mechanism Units (BMUs).

5597. JM presented an update to the Panel proposing that, following concerns raised by Ofgem, the baseline arrangements regarding the existing BSUoS methodology for SBR/DSBR utilisation cost recovery were not clear in the Code Administrator Consultation and that the Workgroup will be re-formed to re-assess their understanding and re-vote if necessary.

5598. MTe joined the Panel via teleconference as the Proposer of this modification to support the discussion with the Panel.

**ACTION: AW to confirm SBR and DSBR procurement arrangements for this winter.**

5599. MTe confirmed that she had no further comments to add to the presentation.

5600. AS noted that until the lack of clarity around baseline is resolved it would be difficult to assess this defect.

5601. JM confirmed that twelve responses had been received to the Code Administrator Consultation and that these would be discussed by the Workgroup. An updated document with tracked changes to the Code Administrator Consultation document would be issued to twelve respondents.

5602. AW queried the wording of the description of the baseline on consultation document which had been extracted from the Proposers Proposal form. The Panel agreed that the description could be changed so long as the Proposer provided consent (CUSC 8.20.17).

5603. The Panel agreed that a Code Administrator consultation should be re-issued for a five day period.

5604. The Panel agreed that the Workgroup should reconvene and issue a marked up version of the Code Administrator Consultation document as soon as possible. The Panel also acknowledged that retrospectivity may need to be considered by the Workgroup and recommended that this should also be discussed by the Workgroup at their meeting. AW asked AS if the Ofgem representative for this Workgroup could lead this discussion and AS confirmed that they could.

**ACTION: JM to ensure that the lessons learnt exercise carried out by Workgroup to be shared at a future Panel meeting.**

5605. **CMP266: Removal of Demand TNUoS charging as a barrier to future elective Half Hourly settlement.** This proposal seeks to prevent double charging of TNUoS for a meter electing to be HH settled, all demand within Measurement Class F & G will be charged under the TNUoS NHH methodology from April 2017 up until HH settlement is mandatory for all consumers.

5606. HC noted that this Workgroup is not on track and expect to issue the Workgroup Consultation document to the Industry on 8 September 2016. The Panel approved the Workgroups request to provide a one month extension to report back to the Panel on October and to reduce the Workgroup consultation from 15 days to 10 days. The Panel noted that that Ofgem have clarified the direction in which this need to be developed and expect these changes to be implemented in early 2017.

5607. **CMP267 'Defer the recovery of BSUoS costs, after they have exceeded £30m, arising from any Income Adjusting Events raised in a given charging year, over the subsequent two charging years'**. CMP267 aims to defer unforeseen increase in BSUoS costs arising from an Income Adjusting Event (IAE) by two years. This proposal only applies to IAE's which, in their total in any given charging year, have a combined effect on "raw BSUoS" of over £30m.

5608. JM noted that the Workgroup are on track and that the Workgroup Consultation document has been issued to the Industry for comment.

5609. **CMP268 'Recognition of sharing by Conventional Carbon plant of Not-Shared Year-Round circuits'** CMP268 proposes to change the charging methodology to more appropriately



recognise that the different types of “Conventional” generation do cause different transmission network investment costs, which should be reflected in the TNUoS charges that the different types of “Conventional” generation pays ideally ahead of the December Capacity Auction.

5610. JM noted that following the Authority’s decision that CMP268 should be progressed on an urgent basis, the Panel were asked to agree CA proposed urgent timetable that would be submitted to Authority after the Panel meeting.
5611. The Panel reviewed three timetables. The Panel supported the second timetable prepared by the Code Administrator which allowed ten day consultations; four Workgroup meetings and seven working days for the Authority to make a decision.
5612. The Panel also noted that the Urgent timetable would not allow for existing CMP213 analysis to be refreshed and implementation would almost certainly require changes to be made to the National Grid CAB (Charging and Billing) system. The cost and implementation timescale to make changes to this system will also need to be considered for this proposal.
5613. The Panel recommended that if possible the number of WACMs should be limited as this could result in the need for more information.

**ACTION: AS to confirm to HC who the recommended timetable will need to be sent to at Ofgem.**

5614. **Governance Standing Group (GSG).** GG noted that no meeting had been held since the last CUSC Panel meeting and therefore there was nothing to report.
5615. **Transmission Charging Methodologies Forum (TCMF).** AW noted that the next meeting would be held on 7 September 2016. The Panel noted that this was taking place on the same date as the CMP264 / CMP265 Workgroup meeting that National Grid would provide an overview to Workgroup members.
5616. **CUSC Issues Steering Group (CISG).** AW noted that the next meeting would be held on 7 September 2016. The Panel noted that this was taking place on the same date as the CMP264 / CMP265 Workgroup meeting.
5617. **Commercial Balancing Services Group (CBSG).** No meeting had been held since the last CUSC Panel meeting and therefore there was nothing to report. The requirement for the next CBSG meeting will be assessed in September 2016. No new date agreed.
5618. **Balancing Services Standing Group (BSSG).** No meeting had been held since the last CUSC Panel meeting and therefore there was nothing to report. The requirement for the next BSSG meeting will be assessed in September 2016. No new date agreed.

## 7 European Code Development

5619. AS advised that there was no Ofgem European updates to provide to the Panel this month.
5620. **Joint European Stakeholder Group (JESG).** GG noted that many issues had been discussed at the last JESG meeting held on 24 August; including the Connection Codes, the System Operation Code, GB Banding levels and Balancing.

## 8 CUSC Modifications Panel Recommendation Vote



5621. **CMP251 'Removing the error margin in the cap on total TNUoS recovered by generation and introducing a new charging element to TNUoS to ensure compliance with European Commission Regulation 838/2010'.**

CMP251 seeks to ensure that there is no risk of non-compliance with European Regulation 838/2010 by removing the error margin introduced by CMP224 and by introducing a new charging element to the calculation of TNUoS.

5622. JM noted the baseline legal text for CMP251 has now changed due to the approval of CMP255. AW confirmed that the changes reflected the changes to the most current CUSC baseline, not the intent of the proposal.

**Action: JM to issue summary of changes to CMP251 Legal Text to Panel**

5623. The Panel noted that Ofgem had invited the CMP261 Workgroup to meet their legal team to discuss the CMP261 request for analysis on 30 August 2016.

5624. The Panel debated if this may have a material impact CMP251 and if voting should be deferred to the Special CUSC Panel meeting on 20 September 2016. The Panel agreed that by deferring their vote to the Special CUSC Panel that this would not impact the implementation timescales associated with this Proposal.

5625. JM noted that this was a Proposer ownership issue. GG noted that he was concerned from a process perspective and this could lead to further delays experienced due to the Authority's decision.

5626. JA noted that any decision the Authority made would be based on the DFMR and it may not be efficient to vote based on the uncertainty of CMP261 which could result in a send back from the Authority. BB agreed with JA and noted that CMP251 did not have time bound constraints that prevented the Panel from deferring their vote until after the meeting with Ofgem for CMP261. BB also noted that it was possible that the Panel may be presented with further information after the meeting on 30 August 2016 that could be relevant and may need to be considered by the Panel before they vote. AW supported this view. CS agreed with these views but on balance considered that voting should go ahead at the meeting as planned as the Panel had not been provided with enough information about the meeting for CMP261. PM supported deferring the vote to the Special CUSC Panel meeting. KM agreed with GG's view confirming that it would be beneficial to have additional information and did not agree with deferring the vote. PJ noted both views and acknowledged that from a procedural issue, a decision should be based on best information available at the time.

5627. JM asked AS if Ofgem had a view on whether they were likely to assess both CMP261 and CMP251 together. Additionally the Panel also acknowledged the new CUSC Objective and asked AS if the Panel were required to vote against this Objective for CMP251. AS was unable to confirm this at the meeting and AW noted that it seemed sensible to delay voting on CMP251 until the outcome of the CMP261 meeting was understood. On balance, Panel agreed by majority that the CMP251 vote should be deferred to 20 September.

**Action: AS to confirm if the Panel are required to vote on the additional objective introduced as part of CGR3 when voting on CMP251**

## **9 Authority Decisions as at 21 July 2016**

5628. There has been one Authority decisions since the last meeting. CMP255 WACM1 was approved and implemented 18 August 2016.

5629. AS noted that the CMP244 / CMP256 decision had been re-issued following comments from GG at the last Panel meeting.

**ACTION: HC to republish decision letter for CMP244 / CMP256 on National Grid website.**

5630. AS confirmed that the CMP243 and CMP237 decisions were still under consideration by the Authority.

## **10 Update on Industry Codes/General Industry updates relevant to the CUSC**

5631. MT noted that Ofgem have a team to implement CMA requirements. New licence changes would mean future SCRs would be led by the Code Administrators. AS confirmed this to be the case and noted this would be implemented over the next two to three years.
5632. JM presented slides to the Panel providing an update for CGR3. JM confirmed that CGR3 would impact the Code Administrator, the Panel and the Industry. The new templates for CUSC would be effective from 30 August 2016 and CMP271 onwards. JM noted that guidance on materiality would be provided at the September 2016 Panel meeting.

**ACTION: JM to send link to Panel members to the single modifications register housed on the Gemserve website.**

## **11 CUSC Modification Workload Management**

5633. The Panel discussed the CUSC Modification Workload Management paper prepared by MT and JM.
5634. MT noted that the CMA and Ofgem have both signalled that Panels will be expected to produce forward work-plans in future and asked the Panel consider these requirements. The Panel discussed these requirements and were asked to send comments by 2 September 2016.
5635. BB noted input from National Grid regarding Charging Review expectations provided more visibility helping the Industry to identify outputs and AW noted more work would need to be carried out at existing forums, for example TCMF and CISG.
5636. MT noted that the Code Administrator and National Grid would need to work closely to ensure improvements to initial stage assessment of future modifications. JA noted that this may require more time before CUSC Panel Papers day for modifications to be submitted. MT envisaged this filtering of information could take place between Papers day and the Panel meeting where necessary. BB queried how other Code Administrators managed this requirement.

**ACTION: JM to investigate how other Code Administrators manage Initial Stage assessments of modifications.**

5637. The Panel discussed the requirements of "Release Management" and GG noted that he was interested to see that this suggestion was different to that previously put forward by Ofgem in its CGRs.

Following a note to the Panel from PM, the Panel discussed the management of modifications which address two different objectives; these are commonly referred to as "dual modifications". GG noted that the Governance Standing Group could look to clarify wording stated in Section 14 of the CUSC and the impact this would have on other sections of the Code.

**ACTION: All Panel members to send comments on paper to MT and JM by 2 September. An updated paper will be recirculated after this date by MT and JM.**

## **12 Next meeting**

5638. The next meeting of the CUSC Modifications Panel will be held on 30 September 2016. A Special CUSC Panel meeting has also agreed on 20 September from 9am to 10am to discuss CMP251, CMP261 and CMP267.