

# Code Administrator Meeting Summary

## CMP316 - Workgroup 13 - TNUoS Arrangements for Co-located Generation Sites

Date: 22/01/2024

### Contact Details

Chair: Deborah Spencer, ESO Code Administrator [deborah.spencer@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:deborah.spencer@nationalgrideso.com)

Proposer: Martin Cahill, ESO [martin.cahill@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:martin.cahill@nationalgrideso.com)

### Review Actions

The Proposer confirmed that actions 1-5 had been completed and recirculated to the Workgroup where required. Updates to the actions log can be viewed in the table below.

### Worked Examples

The Proposer outlined worked examples to the Workgroup. These can be found within the [papers](#) for Workgroup 13.

One Workgroup member queried whether there was scaling of ALFs within the Original, but the Proposer clarified that scaling of ALFs only applies to WACM1. The Proposer noted that the ALF is different for WACM1, noting that since the last Workgroup, a table had been added into the Worked examples (Page 5) to allow stakeholders to compare the Original and WACM1. The Proposer also noted that the methodology is slightly different when wider tariffs are negative, with this being outlined within the Worked examples. One Workgroup member queried whether it was possible to have a mix of positive and negative tariffs for the same power station, which the Proposer confirmed. The Workgroup member noted that it would be useful to have this called out within the Worked examples, which the Proposer agreed to include.

One Workgroup member asked for clarity within the written section for the Original worked example where negative tariffs apply, which the Proposer agreed to provide. A Workgroup member queried the negative tariff methodology use for a Power Station with both negative and positive tariffs; the Proposer agreed these would be calculated separately. Another Workgroup member queried whether a mixed example would be useful for stakeholders. It was clarified that there were mixed examples within the spreadsheet, and the Proposer agreed to signpost stakeholders towards the spreadsheet.

One Workgroup member queried the difference between the terms 'Child Station' and 'BMU'. The Proposer noted that these were the same and agreed to make terminology consistent.

One Workgroup member queried how to find the Original tariffs for WACM1 negative tariffs. Another Workgroup member explained how to use the spreadsheet of examples. The Proposer agreed to add a mixed example for the Original into the spreadsheet.

The Proposer outlined how the ALF is calculated differently under WACM1. Information regarding this can be found within the Worked examples. The Proposer noted that the ALF for technology type could exceed 100%, but that this would not exceed 100% for the station ALF.

One Workgroup member queried how elements of the Year-Round calculation that did not use ALF would apply, querying what the ALF is intended to do, and highlighting the need to ensure the correct charges apply, given that some technology types do not use ALF.

One Workgroup member queried whether clarity could be added to page 10 of the worked examples, noting that it was not clear where some of the figures were coming from. The Proposer agreed to make the terminology more consistent to provide this clarity.

One Workgroup member queried the scaling of the ALFs, noting that some were scaled up and some scaled down. They noted that wind can generate more than the MTPSTEC, and that the relative size of technology proportions would have an impact on tariffs. It was noted that the methodology does not perfectly cover all scenarios, but that changes to the methodology may create more issues. Another Workgroup member highlighted an inconsistency with decimals, which the Proposer agreed to address.

One Workgroup member noted that the totals are not presented for some types of charge within the tables on page 11. The Proposer agreed to address this. One Workgroup member noted that the same type of examples should be used for the Original and WACM1 for the tables on page 11, to ensure clarity to stakeholders.

Another Workgroup member queried whether it was possible for WACM1 costs to be lower than the Original. The Proposer noted that the ALF is divided by MTPSTEC rather than TEC, so believed it was unlikely for the Original to be higher. The Workgroup member noted that it would be useful to have this tested to ensure this would always occur. Another Workgroup member noted that WACM1 costs would be more extreme, either being more positive or more negative than the Original solution. They also noted that the potential combinations to test would be numerous and believed that there was not capacity for the Workgroup to undertake this, noting that the Original and WACM1 would affect different parties differently.

One Workgroup member noted that a spreadsheet had previously been shared for the Original solution, which showed impacts on the 27 zones, and suggested that this be produced for WACM1. Another Workgroup member noted that this could take significant time.

### **Finalise Code Administrator Consultation**

The Workgroup reviewed the Code Administrator Consultation, with the Proposer highlighting the changes to the Workgroup. One Workgroup member noted that the new terms being introduced need to be made clear within the summary for WACM1. Another Workgroup member highlighted the need for ensuring changes since the last modification stage need to be clear to stakeholders.

The Proposer queried whether scaled generic ALFs were still referred to within the legal text and agreed to investigate this offline.

### **Timeline**

The Chair queried whether the Workgroup were happy for the modification to proceed to Code Administrator Consultation immediately, or whether they wanted a further Workgroup prior to this. The Workgroup agreed to review the documents offline and to hold a further meeting to finalise the Code Administrator Consultation.

### **Next Steps**

The Chair noted the next steps as follows:

- Documents to be re-circulated to the Workgroup by 29 January 2024.
- Workgroup members to review documents by 02 February 2024.
- Next meeting scheduled for 15 February 2024.

### **Actions**

For the full action log, [click here](#).

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
1	WG12	MC	Add a 'total row' to the Multi Technology Power Station calculation table on the Original and WACM1	NA	WG2	Closed
2	WG12	MC/LJ/GC	Clarify/make more explicit what is measured at each child station and outline in the DFMR	NA	WG2	Closed
3	WG12	MC	Update the typo in the Effective Alf section of the legal text	NA	WG2	Closed
4	WG12	MC	Tidy and share the spreadsheet to enable members to put in their own numbers into the calculation	NA	WG2	Closed
5	WG12	GM	Provide a worked example of how the calculation would work with a negative tariff with support from MC and LJ	NA	WG2	Closed
6	WG12	MC	Update legal text to include negative tariffs	NA	WG2	Open
7	WG13	MC	<p>Address the following issues within the worked examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First sentence for original solution reword.</li> <li>• Add a note to original for what happens when there is a positive and negative mix.</li> <li>• Update wording in table to Chargeable MTPSTEC</li> <li>• In negative original example make clear that 10 day separation applies to an individual unit</li> <li>• Provide clarity within Original worked example where negative tariffs apply.</li> <li>• Ensure consistency within terminology for Child Station and BMU, and in terminology on page 10.</li> <li>• Address inconsistency with decimal places.</li> <li>• Provide totals for all types of charge within the tables on page 11.</li> <li>• Provide same types of examples within the tables on page 11.</li> <li>• Add additional examples to Appendix so all negative and mixed examples included.</li> </ul>	NA	WG3	Open

- Correct number for baseline in comparison at end of doc

8	WG13	GM	Update spreadsheet of examples to include a mixed example for the Original solution and mixed/negative examples to be on separate tabs	NA	WG3	Open
9	WG13	MC	Clarify new terms being introduced within WACM1 CAC summary.	NA	WG3	Open

**Attendees**

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Deborah Spencer	DB	Code Administrator, ESO	Chair
Lizzie Timmins	LT	Code Administrator, ESO	Technical Secretary
Martin Cahill	MC	ESO	Proposer
Chiamaka Nwajagu	CN	Orsted	Observer
Edda Dirks	ED	SSE	Alternate
George Douthwaite	GD	ITPEnergised	Observer
Grace March	GM	Sembcorp	Workgroup Member
Joe Colebrook	JC	Innova Capital Limited	Workgroup Member
Kyran Hanks	KH	Waterswye	Observer
Lauren Jauss	LJ	RWE	Workgroup Member
Rob Smith	RS	Enso Energy Limited	Workgroup Member
Robert Longden	RL	Cornwall Insight	Workgroup Member
Sinan Kufeoglu	SK	Ofgem	Authority Representative