

# CMP288 & CMP289 Workgroup Meeting 10

**20 January 2022**

**Online Meeting via Teams**

# WELCOME



nationalgridESO

# Objectives and Timeline

# Workgroup Responsibilities

## Expectations of a Workgroup Member

Contribute to the discussion

Be respectful of each other's opinions

Language and Conduct to be consistent with the values of equality and diversity

Do not share commercially sensitive information

Be prepared - Review Papers and Reports ahead of meetings

Complete actions in a timely manner

Keep to agreed scope

## Your Roles

Help refine/develop the solution(s)

Bring forward alternatives as early as possible

Vote on whether or not to proceed with requests for Alternatives

Vote on whether the solution(s) better facilitate the Code Objectives

# Workgroup Alternatives and Workgroup Vote

# Can I vote? and What is the Alternative Vote?

To participate in any votes, Workgroup members need to have attended at least 50% of meetings

## Stage 1 – Alternative Vote

- Vote on whether Workgroup Alternative Requests should become Workgroup Alternative CUSC Modifications.
- The Alternative vote is carried out to identify the level of Workgroup support there is for any potential alternative options that have been brought forward by either any member of the Workgroup OR an Industry Participant as part of the Workgroup Consultation.
- **Should the majority of the Workgroup OR the Chair believe that the potential alternative solution may better facilitate the CUSC objectives than the Original then the potential alternative will be fully developed by the Workgroup with legal text to form a Workgroup Alternative CUSC modification (WACM) and submitted to the Panel and Authority alongside the Original solution for the Panel Recommendation vote and the Authority decision.**

# Can I vote? and What is the Workgroup Vote?

To participate in any votes, Workgroup members need to have attended at least 50% of meetings

## Stage 2 – Workgroup Vote

- 2a) Assess the original and WACMs (if there are any) against the CUSC objectives compared to the baseline (the current CUSC)
- 2b) Vote on which of the options is best.

# Background

## CMP288 Explicit charging arrangements for customer delays and backfeeds &

## CMP289 Consequential change to support the introduction of explicit charging arrangements for customer delays and backfeeds via CMP288

These modifications were raised by National Grid Electricity Transmission on 23 February 2018 and a joint Workgroup was formed to evaluate both modifications.

Since the February 2018 Panel, National Grid Electricity System Operator (NGESO) became legally separate from National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET).

NGET was approved by the Authority to become Proposer of CMP288 as they were deemed to be materially affected by the defect of the modification. NGESO maintained to be the Proposer of CMP289.

Nine Workgroup meetings were held between May 2018 and December 2019 before the modifications were put on hold due to Panel Prioritisation of other modifications.

The CMP288 Proposal was withdrawn by NGET on 22 July 2021 and it was adopted by NGESO. NGESO are now the Proposer of both modifications.

# Proposer's Solution:

Background;

Proposed Solution;

Scope; and

Assessment vs Terms of Reference

**Ken Doyle – National Grid ESO**

Currently no explicit arrangements within the CUSC for recovery of additional costs incurred as a result of transmission works undertaken early due to a user requested delay to the completion date of the works or backfeed (or a combination of these).

These proposals will apportion these additional costs to the party causing the cost to occur rather than socialising these costs to consumers and other TNUoS liable parties.

Previously it was proposed that a charge would be calculated by the SO using standard formulae to be added to Section 14.4.

Our current proposal is to introduce a relatively simple change to section 14 which clarifies that this is a cost pass through as per each TO's Charging Statement (i.e. NGENSO will not alter or change these values calculated by TOs).

Propose to add short legal text into Section 14 of the CUSC which sets out this clarification (around one or two sentences).

The text will need to take account of the fact that all three TOs Charging Statements deal with these costs differently.

ESO will not decide the methodology nor do the calculation but will facilitate discussions regarding calculation errors on a case by case basis (including use of existing charging dispute provisions if required).

We would expect regular and timely communication between all parties to help understand and/or mitigate these charges wherever possible.

## TO Charging Statements

NGET = <https://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/electricity-transmission/document/136361/download>

SHETL = <https://www.ssen-transmission.co.uk/media/5418/shet-21-22-charging-methodology-final.pdf>

SPT = [https://www.spenergynetworks.co.uk/userfiles/file/SPT2021\\_Charging\\_Statement.pdf](https://www.spenergynetworks.co.uk/userfiles/file/SPT2021_Charging_Statement.pdf)

# Terms of Reference

# Next Steps