

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Meeting name: CMP402 – Workgroup Meeting 4

Date: 20/04/2023

Contact Details

Chair: Jess Rivalland, ESO Code Administrator Jess.Rivalland@nationalgrideso.com

Proposer: David Witherspoon, ESO David.witherspoon@nationalgrideso.com

Key areas of discussion

The aim of Workgroup 4 was to gain clarity on the consideration questions and discuss the comments made to the working document shared after the last Workgroup meeting.

Current User Commitment principles remain fit for purpose when AI element applied?

A Workgroup member asked if the above is interpreted as being different to the existing user principles. The proposer explained that the user principles would be the same as they are today but extended out. Workgroup members discussed security liabilities, sharing scenario's and how these could be quite costly. The group also discussed the risks involved. The proposer confirmed to the group that during the engagement with Stakeholders last summer the feedback was the same as received during this Workgroup.

Solution based on capacity of assets and which Party would carry out the assessment? Ofgem via the Early Stage Cost Assessment?

A Workgroup member stated that if extra risks are to be taken on, this should be considered when the cost assessment is being carried out, but it is a consequence of this modification that cannot be addressed. It should be dealt with during early cost assessment. The other workgroup members agreed with the comment. Another added they agreed with concerns on locking up and potential re opener of subsequent early stage cost assessments would just expose the initial user to very high risk.

Local Asset Reuse Factor (LARF) could be applied. How and which party would determine the calculation? This is currently calculated by the TO's

A Workgroup member suggested LARF, or an alternate should be used, they also suggested that a new acronym be found as this is not the solution. This is more of a System Reuse Factor and if some of the assets become stranded another user could use the available seat. Another member suggested the input of transmission owners would be important due to their experience along with ESO and potential developers. It was suggested by a workgroup

member that LARF is bespoke for the project, the member also found a clause in the connection charging mythology with details on the reuse assets and offered to share it with the group.

Capping elements aligned to typical FID and consider alternate numbers to original proposal

Several pros and cons were shared such as this would provide certainty to the later developer, and that it could result in more risk being passed onto the consumer. The proposer advised the group that this was something that Ofgem would need to take on and we should be mindful not to put costs onto consumers.

AI costs liabilities to be calculated on case-by-case basis

One member stated that providing cost assessment is key.

If G2 doesn't connect for any reason, then would you use the initial figure in terms of the next project.

It was stated by a Workgroup member that this was not in scope for this modification, another member agreed stating if G2 doesn't connect for a reason, it falls out of what is being discussed today. There was a suggestion to see if there was anything in the CUSC that could be used for guidance.

Later users need to be liable and that would depend on their capacity, therefore if the initial user uses 1GW then the later users liable for 50% of this

The group discussed the point, the proposer said all comments were valid, but the group had entered the realms of early stage assessment which is not what we are trying to achieve here.

Later users that come along need to go back to an early cost assessment stage

The proposer acknowledged that the discussion around early cost assessment fed into how this translates into security liabilities, but it is still out of scope for this modification.

Potential for onshore users to use the HDVC lines capacity

As some members were unclear as to the above, the chair explained this was discussed in the previous workgroup regarding the bootstrap in the East coast with the two HDVC lines going in there, that there is a potential for onshore to use the bootstrap and utilise the capacity if the Offshore generator doesn't go online.

Cost incorporated into the TNUoS recovery from the relevant OFTO

The proposer advised that the CMP411 Workgroups will most likely be addressing this.

Next Steps

The Workgroup Consultation will be sent out for comments and to determine if proposal questions have been addressed.

Actions

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
1	4	JR	Circulate consultation document for Workgroup members to review	NA	03/05/2023	Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Jess Rivalland	JR	Code Administrator, ESO	Chair
Deborah Spencer	DC	Code Administrator, ESO	Tech Sec
David Witherspoon	DW	ESO	Proposer
Angeles Sandoval Romero	ASR	SSE Generation	Observer
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
Joel Matthew	JH	Diamond Transmission	Observer
Matthew Paige-Paige Stimson	MPS	National Grid Electricity Transmission	Workgroup Member
Oyvind Bergvoll	OB	Equinor	Workgroup Member
Robert Newton	RN	Zenobe Energy	Workgroup Member
Ryan Ward	RW	Scottish Power	Workgroup Member
Shannon Murray	SM	Ofgem	Authority Rep
Umer Ameen	UA	BP	Workgroup Member