Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Meeting name: CMP316 Workgroup 4

Date: 22 November 2021

Contact Details

Chair: Jennifer Groome Contact details: Jennifer.Groome@nationalgrideso.com

Proposer: Nicola White Contact details: Nicola.White@nationalgrideso.com

Key areas of discussion

- The following points were discussed:
  - There were questions regarding how the Original solution works when TEC is altered or transferred and how unused connection assets are managed.
  - Given that there has been some unease about using CEC as “installed capacity” in the pro-rata equation, the Workgroup was asked whether they could suggest a better item to use for this. The Workgroup also agreed to ask this as one of their Workgroup Consultation questions.
  - The Workgroup agreed it was important that examples are stepped through in the Workgroup Consultation so readers can understand how the solution applies in different circumstances.
  - The Proposer was asked to justify why their solution does not use a declarations process.
    - It was explained that in the TDR modifications, the concept was binary – whether sites were Non-Final Demand or Final Demand. Whereas in the context of CMP316, the proportion of technology types on a site is more variable. An alternative view was given that the TDR was not as binary as explained and that unique site circumstances are common.
    - There are already data items available for to use in the equation for CMP316, whereas there were no data items to determine whether sites are FD or NFD for the TDR. It was considered by the proposer that it would be better to use data that is available rather than creating a new process to achieve this.
  - The declaration process was further explored:
    - It was questioned what would happen if not all users had declared their proportions of technology before the set deadline to determine the tariffs. It was queried whether this would require a mid-year tariff reset. It was also suggested

that some could miss the deadline if it was in their favour to, so there would need to be stringent rules/fines in place. It was also noted that there may be a risk that the generator cap (which keeps total TNUoS recovery from generators within the range of €0-2.50/MWh) could be exceeded if some sites missed the deadline, and there had to be an adjustment following this that exceeded the cap.

  - It was considered that collocated generators could pollute the generic ALF and that the impact of this would need to be looked at.
  - It was questioned what would happen if a site changed technology within the same charging category.
  - It was discussed that the solution currently only applies when there is a 1:1 relationship with technology type and BMU. It was suggested that if more than one technology sits behind an inverter, and therefore only has one BMU, it may need to be the dominant technology type that the charge is based on. A risk was considered that this could lead to some sites putting their different technology types behind one BMU if it suited them to be charged on their dominant technology type.
  - It was advised that the Workgroup Consultation document should reference CMP331 which looks to change how to calculate ALFs.
  - It was questioned whether the CMP316 solution is intending to be voluntary or mandatory.
  - It was agreed that it needs to be made clear in the report that non-co-located sites are not required by this modification to act on anything.
- Given that there were still several items that the Workgroup need to further consider. It was agreed by the Workgroup that the timeline should be pushed back so that the Workgroup Consultation could be published when the actions taken away had been discussed.
- The Workgroup developed CMP316 specific Workgroup Consultation questions.
- The actions from the meeting are summarised in the table below.

Open Actions

Action Number	Workgroup raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
1	WG1	NW/AH	Examples of the various permutations.	Six examples provided in WG2. Provided WG3: - 3 technology type - At least 2 months of temporary TEC (LDTEC and STEC) For WG4: - Positive and negative tariffs (made up) - Extreme case examples on large and small load factors - TEC transfer - How does the mod work when TEC is altered. - Unused connection assets - What happens if a site adds/changes technology within the same category - If a site goes co-located to single	WG3	Open

				fuel - two technologies behind one meter. eg storage and intermittant		
6	WG2	JG/RGA	Include within WG Consultation/Report any discussion on how this process would work for embedded gens with less than 100MW TEC	So far discussed concerns that some of these do not have TEC. Flag consultation to DNOs. Ensure clear in the report that an assumption has been made that if TNUoS is extended to embedded gens less than 100MW then this will be based on TEC	WG4	Open
11	WG3	NW	Different technologies behind an inverter - how does this work	Working assumption is that there is a separate BMU. Example to be provided.	WG4	Open
13	WG4	JG/RGA	Include table within consultation document - number of colocated projects published on latest TEC register		Post-WG5	Open
14	WG4	JG/RGA	Include scenarios within the con doc		Post-WG5	Open
15	WG4	NW	Confirm formal process for the Original (what in contract applies and what in CUSC)- following internal discussions with connections team		WG5	Open
16	WG4	JG/RGA	Make clear in consultation non-colocated sites not affected		Post-WG5	Open
17	WG4	NW	Confirm whether the mod is optional or mandatory		WG5	Open
18	WG4	NW	Consider any impact on private wires	To be covered in metering arrangement discussions	WG5	Open

Next steps

- The next Workgroup meeting is on 6 December 2021.

For further information, please contact Jennifer Groome.