Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Meeting name: CM087 Workgroup Meeting 4

Date: 25/04/2023

Contact Details

Chair: Catia Gomes, ESO catia.gomes@nationalgrideso.com

Proposers: Stephen Baker, ESO Stephen.Baker@nationalgrideso.com

Gareth Stanley, ESO gareth.stanley@nationalgrideso.com

Key areas of discussion

The aim of Workgroup 4 was to discuss and develop the solution.

Bespoke STC Process

The Proposer revisited the 'Bespoke STC Process' and communicated the perceived benefits. The Workgroup agreed with the Proposers suggestion that it is essential to establish clear, high level principles and processes that inform the actions and responsibilities of the 3 leading parties.

The Workgroup was then invited to discuss the Proposers updated comments on the questions shared in Workgroup Meeting 3.

1. What measures need to be implemented to avoid the need for additional circuit breaker between the (CA)TO asset and (I)TO?

The Proposer felt the working assumption is that an Additional Circuit breaker would not be required. It was communicated to the Workgroup that principles would be established via a number of high level reference diagrams. Workgroup members agreed referenced diagrams to inform boundaries would negate the need for an additional circuit breaker if issues were reflected, and principles applied to provide consistency.

- **2.** Use of TP/TS Transmission Procedures are they available to all parties? The proposer explained to the Workgroup that the Main Connection Compliance proforma TP130 is owned by ESO.
- 3. Should Project Sub-group jointly commission connection design contract? The Proposer did not believe this should be the case. The Proposer considered it to be appropriate for the (A)TO to commission the connection design which would then be reviewed by a Design Panel consisting of an (A)TO, CATO and the ESO.

1



The Workgroup debated the timing and stage of the tender process at which a conclusion is made on the connection agreement. Several Workgroup members were concerned with the uncertainty of when the conclusion occurs before the CATO becomes a licensee/STC Party and if they would have the level of detail to understand the connection requirements. The Proposer agreed but felt any post award changes needed to be reasonable and would be discussed at an Investment Planning Subgroup. The Proposer also explained that any further disputes would be dealt with by an independent engineer.

Several Workgroup members questioned the role of existing TOs in the design commission process and felt it could be passing risk to the TO. One Workgroup member could see the pros and cons but was not sure why the decision would be made by the TO solely. The Proposer assured TO's would be compensated for activities they carry out because of Early Competition but there was still uncertainty around what is required.

4. Do we need a Section K for CATO-TO Connections?

The Proposer felt Section K was not required if the Connections Process points to the Grid Code European Connection Conditions.

5. Should process apply to all TO-TO Connections?

The Proposer stated that it was felt this question was beyond the remit of CM087 modification.

STC Proposed Alterations

Three options were presented to the Workgroup on determining an equivalent STCP 19.3 for the (CA)TO-(A)TO Connection Compliance Process. The Proposer's preferred option was described as the creation of an additional STCP 19.3a (removing User references) pointing to the Grid Code 'European Connection Conditions' addressing gaps in the STC.

Several Workgroups members agreed to minimal change but did not fully agree on the preferred option. One Workgroup member agreed to investigate the possibility of a fourth option to evolve the existing process.

(CA)TO-(A)TO Interface

The Proposer described how principles would be established via high level reference diagrams displaying clear ownership boundaries, informing CATO-TO interfaces. The Proposer explained Interface Agreements would then be used to establish aspects such as access rights, responsibilities, and security.

Several Workgroup members felt referenced diagrams were a promising idea if they considered all possibilities such as differences in Scotland. A few Workgroup members felt a greater level of detail was required to ensure consistency. The Proposer agreed that there was a lot of detail which still needed resolving and invited the Workgroup to consider what additions they feel are necessary.

NB – (I)TO and (A)TO refer to the Incumbent/Antecedent Transmission Owner.

Next Steps

- Chair to circulate presentation, share the Proposers updated and the meeting summary ahead of the next Workgroup.
- Workgroup to consider options and revert feedback by the 12th of April.

Actions

For the full action log, click here.

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
3	WG1	WG	WG to suggest any SME's that would be relevant to the Mod	N/A	WG2	Ongoing
7	WG3	Proposer	To check if the further feasibility studies required are already part of TOs obligations or if they will be a new requirement	N/A	WG4	Open
8	WG3	RW	Investigate current STC user commission process and revert to Workgroup	N/A	WG4	Open
9	WG3	Proposer	Investigate how additional TO costs to incorporate CATOs are dealt with	N/A	WG4	Open
11	WG4	Proposer	Further consider Question 3 looking at consistency and revisit in next WG	N/A	WG5	Open
12	WG4	RW	Investigate a possible fourth option in proposed changes to STCP 19.3	N/A	WG5	Open
13	WG4	Chair	Prepare timeline options	N/A	WG5	Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Catia Gomes	CG	Code Administrator, ESO	Chair
Claire Goult	CLG	Code Administrator, ESO	Tech Sec
Stephen Baker	SB	ESO	Proposer
Gareth Stanley	GS	ESO	Proposer
Alana Collis- Dugmore	ACD	ESO	Observer
Anthony Johnson	AJ	ESO	SME
Coreen Campbell	CC	SSEN Transmission	Observer
Gavin Baillie	GB	SSEN Transmission	Observer

Meeting summary

ESO

GS	SHETL	Alternate
HE	SSEN Transmission	Observer
JM	Diamond Transmission Corp	Workgroup Member
MF	TINV	Alternate
MMS	SHETL	Workgroup Member
ML	TINV	Workgroup Member
PM	ESO	SME
RW	NGET	Workgroup Member
TJ	Ofgem	Authority Representative
	HE JM MF MMS ML PM RW	HE SSEN Transmission JM Diamond Transmission Corp MF TINV MMS SHETL ML TINV PM ESO RW NGET