

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Meeting Name: CMP315 Workgroup 6/CMP375 Workgroup 3

Date: 13 September 2021

Contact Details

Chair: Ian Ascroft

Contact details: ian.ascroft@nationalgrideso.com

Proposer (CMP315): Nick Sillito

Contact details: nsillito@peakgen.com

Proposer (CMP375): Grahame Neale

Contact details: grahame.neale@nationalgrideso.com

Key areas of discussion

Nick Sillito (NS) delivered a presentation on Intertrips and asked for comments on what the Workgroup felt these should or should not be included in the EC. The Workgroup raised the following queries and suggestions:

- Intertrips can only be efficiently used if the system is well planned and well prepared
- The ESO considers Intertrips as the most cost-effective solution to deliver incremental capacity
- The implication of system to generator Intertrip explained in slide 5 needs more clarity
- Trips occur frequently and incur huge costs
- Intertrips could be covered either in the EC or Security Factor, however it must be ensured that double counting does not occur.

Matt Wootton(MW) delivered a presentation on the Tariff Model to the Workgroup. There was a response that the presentation was informative but on its own does not resolve the issue of what data should be included and excluded from future calculations.

Grahame Neale (GN) presented considerations of data types and sources in relation to CMP 375 and raised three questions for the Workgroup to answer. He explained that at this stage the intention is to collect views and collate the range of data the industry need. A Workgroup member suggested that rather than collecting views from the Workgroup via open questions, a more streamlined approach should be taken before proceeding to a wider consultation.

The Workgroup's responses to the questions are provided below:

Question 1. Whether it is feasible to use non-TO sources of data (EU TSOs, DNOs, commodity prices, manufacturer prices etc.) added or instead of TO data:

- ESO should be open and transparent with data
- The selection should be broad enough to cover different circuit types; Distances vary depending on the circuit type.
- There should be a workable, structural methodology in place first before considering data loading and data publishing process
- A better understanding of project statistics will be useful to industry planning and operations
- Wider EU data would only be useful if projects were similar in nature

Question 2. Whether to wait until historical data is available to apply to a new methodology or implement and add data when available:

- Determining minimal linear length rather than time would be more appropriate.
- If applying waiting factor, to be mindful of discontinuity of the same technology.
- Collect long term investment figures of minimum 10 years for expansion. In future, this can be used for reference. This is more important than frequency of recalculation

Question 3. Any additional benefit of using a combination of historic and forecast data:

A workgroup member commented that it will be difficult to forecast without historic data.

GN delivered a presentation on Refresh Frequency to the Workgroup and asked for comments and suggestions. There was no consensus on whether less frequently or more frequently is better. The Workgroup suggested the following:

- Consider the shape and performance of the underlying variable to determine frequency. This will primarily depend on how the expansion constant varies overtime.
- Frequency of a recalculation of the EC / EF should be determined from resetting and not internal data collection. Thus, consider separating recalculation from setting will be more useful

GN concluded that from discussions, the Workgroup seem to be more interested in actual historical data – directly sourced from TOs. A Workgroup member suggested the Proposer create and circulate a process map including timelines to industry and request feedback. This will help them know what industry agree with.

Next Steps

The Chair clarified that the Workgroup have now reviewed all three themes identified in Workgroup 1. MW and GN will flesh out the proposed solutions and present to the Workgroup in the next Workgroup meeting on 19 October 2021.

Robert Longden asked if the Proposers had any actions for the Workgroup to prepare ahead of next meeting. The Proposers are open to more views from Workgroup members.

Actions

- Grahame P to share data pertaining to Intertips mentioned in the meeting if there are no issues around confidentiality
- The Proposers to prepare more refined versions of the solutions