

# Code Administrator Meeting Summary

## Meeting name: CMP402 – Workgroup Meeting 5

---

Date: 17/05/2023

---

### Contact Details

Chair: Claire Goult, ESO, [claire.goult@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:claire.goult@nationalgrideso.com)

Proposer: David Witherspoon, ESO [David.witherspoon@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:David.witherspoon@nationalgrideso.com)

---

### Key areas of discussion

The Chair introduced the Workgroup to the aims and expectations for the meeting. The aim of Workgroup 5 was to review the Workgroup Consultation and discuss any specific questions.

#### Workgroup Consultation Review and specific questions

The Chair shared the draft Workgroup Consultation document with the Workgroup, the main highlights were:

- Workgroup member suggested that the objective of the change should include the developers and not only the consumers, as the risk will be reduced for developers also, the Proposer agreed to provide wording for this section.
- Workgroup member pointed out that the first bullet point included in the summary of potential solution (s), could be used as a specific Workgroup Consultation question – “Does the Current User commitment principles remain fit for purpose when AI element applied?” the Proposer agreed with the suggestion.
- Workgroup member suggested adding an extra bullet point to the section where Ofgem consultation was cited, to include further information, the Proposed agreed to add it on. Workgroup member questioned the wording below the Ofgem consultation section, and if it was the Ofgem words or the ESO interpretation – the Proposer advised that it was ESO’s views. Another Workgroup member advised that when we are citing Ofgem it needs to be quoted, Proposer to correct the text.
- Workgroup member advised that they did not agree with the “AI concept” in the “Why Change?” Section, as Ofgem’s decision put forward the reasons for UC. The Proposer agreed to look at this and change the wording.
- Workgroup member advised that the triggered date should be defined, another Workgroup member suggested adding any supporting information in the annex for the

industry to consider. The Proposer stated that he could include the potential scenarios shared in Workgroup 1 as an annex for the Workgroup Consultation.

- Workgroup member questioned the triggered dates and advised of conflicting documents on this topic, stating that clarification could be needed here. The Chair asked the Workgroup member to share those documents with the Workgroup and the Proposer will look into them and revert to the Workgroup.
- Workgroup member questioned the wider system benefit that needs to be considered by AI and advised that it may be best to consider AI for wider systems as a non-AI. The Proposer agreed with the point and advised that a steer from Ofgem might be required. The Ofgem representative advised that it would be worth having an offline conversation with the Proposer to consider the non-AI scenarios to make considerations and revert to the Workgroup. The Ofgem representative questioned if this is in scope of the modification, or if consideration should be given to a new modification that considers the benefits for wider systems separately.
- Workgroup member questioned the solution being based on capacity assets and explained that he does not understand what assets mean in this context. The Proposer will look at this and re-word if necessary.
- Workgroup member questioned the considerations given to the capping elements aligned to typical FID, and the statements made in the Workgroup Consultation regarding this topic. Another Workgroup member suggested objective criteria should be applied to the numbers stated. The Proposer advised that the feedback from stakeholder was to keep this simple and therefore they did a lift and shift from data that is currently used.

### **Workgroup Consultation specific questions**

The Chair shared specific questions suggested by the Proposer for consideration. A Workgroup member questioned if the Proposer was set on the solution, or if they were open to alternatives/suggestions. The Proposer advised that they were open to considering any suggestions. The Workgroup agreed to add the suggested questions to the Workgroup Consultation and the Proposer will add them to the document ahead of it being shared with the Workgroup

**Next Steps**

- The Chair will update the timeline and share with the Workgroup.
- The Proposer will make the agreed changes to the Workgroup Consultation document ahead of it being shared with the Workgroup.
- The Chair to circulate the updated Workgroup Consultation.

**Actions**

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
1	4	Chair	Circulate consultation document for Workgroup members to review	NA	03/05/2023	Closed
2	5	Proposer and Ofgem Rep	To discuss offline the scenarios for the non-AI benefits	NA	Workgroup 6	Open
3	5	Proposer	To update the Workgroup Consultation document with the agreed changes and add the specific questions	NA	19/05/2023	Open
4	5	ALL	To review the update Workgroup Consultation document and question	NA	23/05/2023	Open

**Attendees**

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Claire Goult	CG	Code Administrator, ESO	Chair
Catia Gomes	CAG	Code Administrator, ESO	Tech Sec
David Witherspoon	DW	ESO	Proposer
Claire Hynes	CH	RWE Renewables LTD	Workgroup Member
Damien Clough	DC	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member
Faiva Wadawasina	FW	Bellrock and Broadshore Off shore Windfarms	Workgroup Member
Matthew Paige-Paige Stimson	MPS	National Grid Electricity Transmission	Workgroup Member
Ryan Ward	RW	Scottish Power	Workgroup Member
Tom Kenyon-Brown	TKB	Ofgem	Authority Rep
Umer Ameen	UA	BP	Workgroup Member