

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

CMP330/CMP374 Allowing new Transmission Connected parties to build Connection Assets greater than 2km in length & CMP374: Extending contestability for Transmission Connections Workgroup 18

Date: 6 April 2023

Contact Details

Chair: Milly Lewis , NationalGrid ESO Milly.lewis@nationalgrideso.com

Proposer: Andy Pace, andy.pace@energy-potential.com

Key areas of discussion

The Workgroup discussions are summarised according to agenda items:

Workgroup Objectives

The Chair advised the Workgroup on the expectations and objectives for the meeting, and that the consequential modification has been raised and will be sent to Panel, the Chair clarified that ESO representative will be the Proposer for the consequential modification.

Workgroup Report Review

The Chair shared the Workgroup Report with the Workgroup for review. Main highlights were:

- Workgroup member questioned if CMP330 is going to be withdrawn as we are not voting on it. The Proposer advised that as the two modifications (CMP330 and CMP374) have been merged we can't withdraw it. The Chair will check what is the best route for this and revert to the Workgroup.
- Workgroup member suggested adding to the impacts section the perspective and opinions of some Workgroup members with regards to the risks perceived if the changes proposed in this modification are applied – Workgroup member will provide the wording to add to this section.
- Workgroup member suggested that the justification for the change could be more robust in terms of explaining the need for the modification. Other Workgroup member suggested using part of the impacts and benefits assessment to build on the justification for the change. The Proposer agreed.
- Workgroup member raised a point regarding the appeal rights and the fact that this has been amended to “refer to section 7.4 of the CUSC”, which is an arbitration rather than pointing to Ofgem. Workgroup member mentioned that one of the points in the Intervention Criteria is protection to the end consumer and questioned where arbitration will have sufficient scope and powers to decide where an intervention is protecting end consumers, where Ofgem would. The Proposer advised that this point was discussed a few times and that arbitration would be the first point to try and resolve any issues. The ESO representative advised that Ofgem was present in one of the Workgroup

meetings and the advice was to take this route. The Chair suggested clarification from Ofgem might be needed in this point.

- Workgroup member advised that even though he understands that the Workgroup Report needs to offer a comprehensive view of the Workgroup discussions, it might be worth to not include the options discussed but later dismissed by the Workgroup as they didn't contribute to the end solution. Workgroup member suggested to make a small reference to those but to avoid extensive writing about them and concentrate on the points that are a relevant part of the solution - these include "12 scenarios", "Pre-Qualification Process" and "132v in Scotland". The Chair advised that a possible solution will be to link to the Workgroup Consultation for full details.
- Sole use infrastructures - Workgroup member advised that he feels that this section should include a TOs view of the pros and cons of this section, he advised that conversations with the Scottish TOs will happen next week and after he will be able to provide some wording to add to this section.
- Supplementary application – Workgroup member suggested that the title for this section isn't reflecting the correct scope, as this is about where another User comes along and wants to build adjacent to contestable works, meaning contestable works might become shared. Workgroup agreed to change the title to "How to manage second comers".
- Intervention Criteria – Workgroup member advised that a more through section is required about the Intervention Criteria and all the discussion around it, as it involves the TO investment, the ESO right to intervene and the direction from Authority. The Workgroup agreed with the comments and the Workgroup member, and the Chair will work on adding this section – The Chair advised that clarity from Ofgem might be required, and it might be worthy contacting the Ofgem representative.
- CMP376 Interaction – Workgroup member advised that the level of risk for this modification will increase depending on the approval of CMP376, as it increases the probability of projects being terminated. Other Workgroup member advised that exception criteria on CMP376 will also impact this modification and that this should be flagged in the Workgroup Report. The ESO representative will check with the SME's involved in CMP376 and revert to the Workgroup. Chair will investigate CMP376 and add to this section.
- Workgroup member stated that with regards to WACM1 there is a lack of justification from the ESO to why this route is beneficial. The ESO representative agreed to provide a justification to WACM1.
- Additional Risks – License Changes- Workgroup member suggested that further wording might be required in this section, he agreed to provide feedback once the meeting with the Scottish TOs happens.
- Workgroup member raised a point with regards to the CUSC Charging objectives being used and the assessment made. Workgroup member advised that the changes to Section 14 are not altering the existing text only removing parts, he suggested that looking into the non-Charging objectives would be beneficial as those are the ones we are considering. The Proposer advised that he is happy for the current assessment regarding the CUSC Charging objectives, but he will look to add to those. The Proposer will send the updated objectives to the Chair.

Terms of Reference Review

The Workgroup reviewed the Terms of Reference and with regards to point g) a Workgroup member advised that some supplement needs to be added with regards to the license point about performance management.

Workgroup member raised a question regarding the Terms of Reference for the consequential modification and the possibility of the CUSC Panel setting different Terms of Reference to the ones in this modification and the need to consider them. The Proposer (a CUSC Panel member) advised that the Terms of Reference usually are replicated as it is seen as a supporting modification, but ultimately it will be a CUSC Panel decision.

AOB / Next Steps

The Chair summarised next steps as follows:

- Workgroup Report and STC consequential modification to go to April CUSC Panel.
- Chair to circulate the updated Workgroup Report.

Action Number	Date Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
70	06.04.23	Chair	To check the best route for CMP330		WG20	Open
71	06.04.23	RW	To provide wording for the piece around the impacts if the modification is approved		WG20	Open
72	06.04.23	RW	To provide feedback on the meeting with Scottish TOs regarding the Sole use infrastructure and provide wording for the license piece		WG20	Open
73	06.04.23	ND	To check with CMP376 ESO representatives about the risks and expectation criteria and revert to Workgroup		WG20	Open
74	06.04.23	ND	To provide supporting statement for WACM1		WG20	Open
75	06.04.23	Proposer	To provide extra objectives assessment		WG20	Open
76	06.04.23	Chair	To check with Ofgem around the dispute piece and Section 7.4		WG20	Open

Participants

Attendees	Initials	Company	Position
Milly Lewis	ML	Code Administrator National Grid ESO	Chair
Catia Gomes	CG	Code Administrator National Grid ESO	Technical Secretary
Andy Pace	AP	Energy Potential	Proposer
Richard Woodward	RW	NGET	Workgroup Member
Neil Dewar	ND	ESO	Workgroup Member
Michelle Macdonald Sandison	MMS	SSE	Alternate
Ruth Mathews	RM	ESO	Observer
Barney Cowin	BC	Startkraft	Workgroup Member
Andrew Colley	AC	SSE Generation Ltd	Workgroup Member

For further information, please contact the Code Administrator.