Meeting Summary

TNUoS Task Force Meeting 8

Date:	15/09/2023	Location:	Hogarths, Solihull
Start:	10.30	End:	16:30

Participants

Attendee	Attend/Regrets	Attendee	Attend/Regrets
Adam Morrison (AM)	Regrets	Joseph Dunn (JD)	Attend
Aled Moses (AMo)	Attend	Joshua Logan (JL)	Attend
Anthony Dicicco (AD)	Attend	Kyle Smith (KS)	Regrets
Binoy Dharsi (BD)	Attend	Lauren Jauss (LJ)	Regrets
Brendan Clarke (BC)	Attend	Louis Priday (LP)	Attend
Christian Parsons (CP)	Attend	Luke Davison (LD)	Regrets
David Tooby (DT)	Attend	Niall Coyle (NC)	Attend
Deborah Spencer (DS)	Regrets	Nick Everitt (NE)	Attend
Dena Barasi (DB)	Attend	Nicky White (NW)	Attend
Edward Smith (ES)	Attend	Milly Lewis (ML)	Attend
Elana Byrne (EB)	Attend	Paul Jones (PJ)	Attend
Francisco Celis Andrade (FA)	Attend	Ryan Ward (RW)	Attend
George Moran (GMo)	Regrets	Sam Davies (SD)	Regrets
Grace March (GMa)	Attend	Sam Hughes (SH)	Regrets
Griffin John (GJ)	Regrets	Sam Street (SS)	Attend
Harriet Harmon (HH)	Attend	Simon Lord (SL)	Regrets
James Stone (JS)	Regrets	Sinan Kufeoglu (SK)	Attend
Jamie Webb (JWe)	Attend	Stephen McKellar (SM)	Attend
John Tindal (JT)	Attend		
Jon Wisdom (JWo)	Regrets		

Agenda Point 1: Introduction and Welcome

The Chair welcomed those attending in person, noting the presence of Task Force members online and absences of Task Force members unable to attend.

The Chair raised the subject of the Strategic Transmission Charging Reform Letter which the Authority had published earlier that week and which ESO is reviewing. The Authority representative noted that the letter set out initial thinking on the future landscape across electricity transmission network charging as a whole and welcomed individuals feeding back thoughts or questions to them directly.

A Task Force member asked the Authority representative whether they would support efforts requesting information from Transmission Owners for progression of workstream projects. The Authority representative confirmed that support with requests would be given where needed.

The Chair took the group through the timings for the day before instigating the Action Review.

Agenda Point 2: Action Review

Actions were reviewed and updates noted (please see the Actions section at the end of the document).

Agenda Point 3: OpTIC Model: Overview & Feedback

A Task Force member and their invited colleague (DB) presented an overview of the OpTIC model as a possible alternative to the current TNUoS Investment Cost Related Pricing (ICRP) model. Feedback and questions were welcomed from the Task Force. Their slides are contained within the Slide Pack for Meeting 8 on the Charging Futures website. The following notes summarise key points from the discussion of these slides.

The Task Force member described how they had assessed the ICRP and had developed the OpTIC model as a more sophisticated and modern economic model to align with the planned future network.

The Task Force member suggested that a modification proposal would be to replace the transport module in the TNT model with the economically optimised OpTIC model which is based on the NOA (Network Options Assessment). It was noted that the OpTIC model would provide a long-run locational signal, but other reform would be needed to address short-run operational inefficiencies. The aim of the model would be to reflect network reinforcement, i.e., what is believed will be built.

When comparing the current approach and the OpTIC model, the presenting Task Force member explained how OpTIC takes the NOA inputs and outputs from the zonal PLEXOS model and works on the basis of an optimised network. It would run on an unconstrained basis to mimic realistic conditions, theoretically matching what is actually built over an extended period of time.

A separate Task Force member asked whether the model would be similar to what is planned for the central strategic network plan, which the proposing Task Force member confirmed. An ESO representative questioned whether there was an additional benefit for the network if inputs to OpTIC will be the NOA ‘outputs’. The proposers responded that the model would consider network build restrictions and inputs into NOA to a) be closer to NOA’s required in-service states and b) take cross-boundary capabilities into consideration. Zonal outputs had been considered as less volatile when considering future generation location compared to using actual outputs.

A Task Force member noted that optimised network planning assumes no planning errors (which will occur in reality) and also notable step changes in network development. When asked whether the OpTIC model will make those step changes smoother, the proposers expected that it would by featuring smaller iterative changes. It was noted that stepped network costs would however produce *some* stepped progression of network build regardless of the model.

An ESO representative referenced the absence of a ‘true-ing up’ stage where underestimation/ overestimations as a result of forecasting errors are addressed, and asked who would bear the risk of forecast assumptions being incorrect. The proposer noted that for a long-term signal, error from forecasts could not be

eliminated, but the model aims to mimic what an efficient signal from LMP (locational marginal pricing) would be rather than mirror actual LMP outputs.

A question was raised as to whether half a circuit could be built in PLEXOS which would test the limitations of the OpTIC model. The proposers took this point away to consider.

A Task Force member asked whether there was a risk of creating a feedback loop, i.e., if an optimised model determines what generation and demand act upon, would that in turn influence the model in the future? The proposer clarified that being based on NOA as a single, correct and optimal version, OpTIC would change as the NOA changes.

An ESO representative asked when the OpTIC model would be run considering the different phasing of outputs from the ESO which would influence it. The proposers expected the model to be run at the same time and frequency as NOA but took the point away to consider more fully.

When questioned by the ESO as to the use of Future Energy Scenarios (FES) in the model, the proposers said that the model had been based on using one FES scenario so far, and while adding others in was possible, it would add significant levels of complication. An ESO representative noted that if the input of FES scenarios become a driver for the system, different FES versions should be considered for their effect on prices. The proposers responded that they were assuming the 'least regret' scenario as the model input and wanted to align with established modelling wherever possible.

ACTION 1 (JD): a) check whether OpTIC would smoothen step changes in network development, b) check whether the model could cope with half a circuit, c) consider timing and frequency of phasing data with ESO outputs.

An example for how charges may work with a generator was shared in the slide pack, using examples of calculated charges in an unconstrained network scenario (market 1) versus a constrained and *optimised* market scenario (market 2). The proposers explained how the final Zonal OpTIC charge for a generator would be the result of deducting market 2's constrained value from market 1's unconstrained value, and that this resulting Zonal OpTIC charge was the appropriate long-term locational signal for network development.

When questioned by an ESO representative regarding getting enough revenue to cover network costs, the proposers clarified that they had no plans to change the residual.

A summary statement of the model was that it reflected zonal LMP but provided an aggregated view of the half hour signals over a year, based on an optimised system. The intention of the model is set to offer stability from using the optimised system, predictability from not being purely a half hourly signal and removing the need for creating new backgrounds (as the model adapts to the demand/generation at the time). It was also noted that the model could be used to charge demand, generation and storage as it would charge as per expected operations in an optimised system with standard system conditions.

Included in this section of the meeting slides is also an overview of the GB zones used to create the model using PLEXOS, a summary of impacts from transmission delay and list of positive implications and other considerations of the model.

The proposing Task Force member was open to bilateral discussions with members outside of the Task Force meetings, and a request for support from other Task Force members was shared to support development of the model towards the modification process.

The Authority representative asked whether the ESO had considered what degree of incremental risk from forecast error OpTIC would present compared to the current approach.

Agenda Point 4: Break

Agenda Point 5: OpTIC Model: Feedback & Further Discussion

In response to the question from the Authority representative before the break, the ESO took an action:

ACTION 2 (CP): Set up a working session between the OpTIC proposers and ESO NOA experts (including exploration of risk).

Specific questions from the Task Force to be discussed (e.g., in a bilateral discussion):

- In a constrained network, how to avoid double counting the value of a constraint within a constrained network (GMa)
- RE: Batteries – a Task Force member questioned how changes between arbitrage and long-term storage would be handled by the model. How would storage be assigned in the model, how would usage be assumed, or changes handled? (GMa)
- Assumptions re: costs of constraints versus network build costs (PJ)
- 'Direct' access through the expansion constant and transmission build vs constraints (Amo)
- Does OpTIC account for non-network build options when dealing with constraints? (NE). The proposer confirmed that the assumptions can include that some of the constraints are resolved by Demand Side Response.

ACTION 3 (GMa, Amo, PJ): set up bilateral conversations with OpTIC proposer to pick up specific questions.

Re: NOA an ESO representative added that future Centralised Strategic Network Plans would be considering environmental, community and deliverability aspects too, over and above NOA's economic optimisation, in case that effects future NOA discussions.

A Task Force member questioned whether OpTIC was in scope for the Task Force, which was supported by another member who did agree that even if not directly tackled by the Task Force, this project was looking to achieve similar objectives of improving investment signals and predictability. The Authority representative believes that this package of work does fall in scope as it's tackling the locational TNUoS signal based on load flow modelling (and would be ultimately developed separately as a modification). Task Force members were invited to contact the Authority representative directly with any views on that and an update to the Task Force can be shared in due course.

ACTION 4 (Task Force): Share thoughts with the Authority representative as to the OpTIC model falling within scope for the Task Force.

The proposing Task Force member expressed their intention to progress the OpTIC project to a modification but wanted to test the concept with the members of Task Force based on their experience. Help was welcomed for progressing the modification.

Agenda Point 6: Consultancy Support: Further Considerations & Analysis

The consultants in attendance shared updates on queries from previous Task Force meetings which they had been looking into further, some of which possibly support work by different workstream teams.

<u>Backgrounds</u>

The consultants have a piece of work in progress to check for consistency when considering different FES scenarios against previous analysis.

In looking at the impact of alternative backgrounds on tariffs for different charging years, the results for 2023/24 mirrored those of 2021/22. The trend of tariff changes from North-South remained the same as the earlier modelling, with alternative backgrounds having a limited impact compared to existing background when it comes to *relative* tariff changes.

<u>Sharing factors</u> (and to what extent sharing factors are driving volatility)

The consultants modelled tariff changes for 2021/22 and 2023/24 while setting sharing factors to 0% (no sharing) and also 100% (all shared). The results found that very similar *trends* of changes were generated for 'no sharing' and 'all shared' scenarios, suggesting that sharing factors are not themselves driving volatility. However, this analysis indicates that sharing is more impactful in some areas than others, and that with less sharing there would likely be greater volatility.

The conclusion was that sharing factors are not changing results on a large-scale year-on-year so they are note seen to have a significant effect on volatility *relatively*, but they do in absolute terms.

The consultants addressed the influence a lot of short-run inputs into sharing factor methodology would have on the long-run marginal cost signal. It was found that the impact of changes in short-run operational data (used as a proxy for real impacts) is likely to be limited on the long-run signal.

While sharing should not be ignored, an alternative and implementable approach hasn't currently been identified. Elements such as a 5-year rolling ALF (mitigating sensitivity to market conditions) and the cumulative ratio of sharing across all zones north of a particular point will dampen the impact of the short-run impacts (more so in the South for sharing ratios).

It was concluded by the consultants that large shifts in the short-run inputs would be needed to have material impacts on the methodology. Therefore, conceptually (although not stress-tested through analysis), this was not seen as a primary cause for concern. Alternative views were welcomed but none shared in the meeting.

Annual Load Factors (ALFs)

The consultants had looked at the correlation between the actual load factor in a year versus the T-1- or 5-year average ALF, with results showing a much higher correlation with the 5-year ALF. When looking at 2,3,4-year periods a 2+ year option was better than one year. However, shorter-term options raised the possibility of more volatility and plant factoring in dispatch distortion so there was not a strong enough benefit case for moving from the 5-year option.

Considering plant with rapidly declining load factors, the consultants did some analysis illustrating a 20% per year decline. This found some material impact possible with the impact of a shorter trailing average being greater in the Scottish zones. This was highlighted as an area for consideration for future relevant work.

A Task Force member who had been part of discussions on this topic in previous meetings thanked the consultants for their work. They noted that in certain instances a dramatic change in load factor would convert a CCGT (Combined Cycle Gas Turbine) plant to an OCGT (Open Cycle Gas Turbine) plant, resulting in a different ALF anyway, but in other instances a relevant modification could be raised if there were specific issues to address.

General volatility in historic charges

The consultants included some analysis in the meeting slides for changing charges by zone, levels of deviation across zones (factoring in all charges) and the effect on zone ranking based on changes in relative charges.

The consultants put it to the Task Force to consider this information for further areas of discussion.

Regarding the year-on-year changes shown, a Task Force member requested whether absolute values were available for year-on-year changes.

ACTION 5 (Frontier/LCP): Provide absolute values for the Y-o-Y tariff changes across regions (re: historic volatility)

A note further developing the implications of negative load factors on current peak/year-round backgrounds, treatment of PV in the transport model and single vs multiple reference nodes has been sent to the ESO to review/input into and will be shared with the Task Force in due course.

Agenda Point 7: Lunch

Agenda Point 8 & 9: Backgrounds Case for Change: Overview, Feedback & Further Discussion

The Chair opened this section of the day with the objective for the Task Force to answer whether a clear defect and case for change had been formed, and if there was any additional evidence required to support its progression into a modification.

The Task Force member presenting to the group covered the current SQSS scaling factors and the different scaling factor scenarios for the three rounds of modelling undertaken by the consultants in their previous analysis.

Different possible defect areas debated by the workstream group were shared along with cases for/against change and initial recommendations:

1) Improve the Year-Round generation background

   The suggestion is to improve the scaling factors which could introduce inconsistency with the SQSS (if not aligned) and would require better transparency from the NOA and network planning.

2) Improve the Peak Security generation background

   The suggestion being to improve scaling factors for Peak Security to better reflect usage (and to work with and without renewables being included as they often use the network in peak demand periods). There is a strong case for Peak Security reflecting the SQSS as a strong driver of network investment for network security. A Task Force member voiced support for consideration of changing Peak Security as sensible to assess it being fit-for-purpose long-term. It was mentioned by the proposing Task Force member that there are different views held on whether a change to Peak Security is required in addition to a change to the Year-Round background, which would be a point for the workstream to explore.

   A consideration was raised by the workstream group as to whether SQSS Demand Security criteria should align with the Capacity Mechanism de-rating factors (especially for interconnectors and renewables), or whether it should reflect the SQSS. A Task Force member suggested that alignment between SQSS Demand Security criteria and the Capacity Mechanism was addressing a different issue and is something of a 'red herring' in this context. This was agreed with personally by the proposing Task Force member who believes the SQSS is more important for Peak Security to align with.

   The proposing Task Force member noted that Peak Security should align with the SQSS if its scaling factors are the drivers of network investment. However, if there are other drivers for that investment it would make sense to consider other steps to take.

   A Task Force member asked whether it was fair that Peak Security does not consider renewables, to which the proposing Task Force member suggested that the SQSS would lead this (i.e. if SQSS determines build with assumption of no wind, charges would reflect that, but if the SQSS changed there would be a case for changing Peak Security accordingly).

   ACTION 6 (JW): Check with ESO SQSS experts as to a review of sharing factors to play back to the Task Force (and the Backgrounds workstream).

3) Different treatment of demand between backgrounds

   The case for change here was that Peak Security demand should reflect peak conditions, and Year-Round should reflect the bulk energy loads around those peak times. Points raised against the change covered the importance of relative generation and demand for load flows and the possibility of changes in demand being negated by scaling against a CBA.

   It was raised that there are significant overlaps or interactions with the Signals and Technology Type workstreams, so it was agreed that this defect will need to be addressed following updates from these other projects.

4) Change the number of backgrounds

The cases for and against change were outlined, citing the simplicity of fewer backgrounds and a potential for a small improvement in cost reflectivity from more backgrounds.

When questioned, the proposing Task Force member felt that two backgrounds reflected an acceptable level of cost reflectivity without adding unwarranted complexity (Peak Security and Year-Round covering key scenarios).

An ESO representative noted that there would be a significant impact on settlements by moving from two backgrounds to one as another consideration to be aware of.

A suggestion was that rather than change the number of backgrounds, improving the two existing backgrounds (e.g. a more cost reflective Year-Round) would be more beneficial.

In conclusion it was agreed that defects 1 and 2 have a case for change but require a review of the SQSS for how to proceed (and if an SQSS review is not feasible, the decision can be taken to start a modification). Defect 3 requires updates from Signals and Technology Type workstreams in a few months' time before being decided upon. Defect 4 is not seen as having a sufficient case for change. Therefore, until the SQSS review has taken place and other related workstreams have been completed, a proposal cannot progress.

ACTION 7 (GM, AMo): Signals and Tech Type workstreams to feed back to Task Force their views on the treatment of demand raised in the Backgrounds workstream.

Agenda Point 10: Break

Agenda Point 11: Signals Workstream: Initial Thinking

A Task Force member presented slides from the Signals workstream who are looking at five different issues around the ability of TNUoS charges to send appropriate signals to participants. The group expect to need 2-3 months to document the principles and outcomes in more detail and make recommendations for modification proposals.

Issues being explored:

1) Task Force Issue 20 – Locational investment signals for offshore

   The defect and an initial view of general principles for tackling the issue were shared with the group.

   As some future offshore connections are likely to be meshed rather than point to point/radial the question was posed as how these are appropriately reflected in TNUoS charging (if classified as local circuits to offshore generators but shared by offshore and onshore Users).

   One associated point the workstream had highlighted was to assess which charges should be included, or not included, in the Adjustment Tariff as this should not be dependent on how assets are classified for charging purposes.

   One principle noted by the workstream representative was to define offshore MITS (Main Interconnected Transmission System) in relation to the use of that network. An ESO representative noted that MITS definitions have been discussed and concluded at OTNR (Offshore Transmission Network Review) sub-group, i.e., the current definition is not exclusive to onshore assets and will be carried forward to the HND by default. A Task Force member involved with the OTNR sub-group as well noted that there was considerable industry feeling that MITS requires further consideration due to its impact on volatility and it not just being an offshore issue.

   The Authority representative recognised the ESO's statements and referred to an open question being looked at by the ESO currently regarding treatment of assets in HND serving the purpose of a 'bootstrap' for onshore reinforcement. The Authority representative noted that a very clear case for change would be needed to propose changes to the current MITS definition, for the onshore element for example, when the offshore element is intended to be addressed as part of the ESO's 'bootstrap' work.

The workstream representative noted that offshore would still need to be referenced in their work as onshore/offshore voltages need consideration as part of the defect but acknowledged the Authority's viewpoint. It was considered by the Authority representative that while industry is free to raise modifications in this area, the Task Force's time was not best spent exploring those offshore arrangements when significant work has already been conducted on it by the OTNR sub-group.

2) Task Force Issue 21 – Long-term fixing of TNUoS

The defect and general principles were shared with the group for exploring whether fixing TNUoS long-term would mitigate unpredictability as a signal, as well as implications for investment, plant closure and incentives.

Some of the suggestions to explore were different fixing periods for different Users, the concept of fixing as an obligation as well as a right and the flexibility to fix to align with investment decisions. Considerations would be taken for the Adjustment Tariff and a continued need for that to 'float'.

The Authority representative thanked the group for their work to date and asked whether the workstream were considering their suggestions in contractual terms. The workstream representative agreed that this was the initial view.

When asked whether the 'fixing' approach would apply to demand and who would bear the risk for volatility, the workstream representative referenced the work that would be needed to explore how fixing and the adjustment tariff etc. would work in more detail.

When asked about the possibility of setting a 'strike price' the workstream representative didn't expect there to be a proposal for Users to set pricing themselves. Instead, it was suggested that using an agreed fixed price would provide security for charge levels for a premium (analogous with mortgages/currency).

A Task Force member raised a consideration for the workstream around what information is public for the fixing process which the sub-group will take away to consider relating to predictability. When asked by another Task Force member about the level of complexity that should be considered to improve predictability, the workstream representative outlined that they expect to come back with a better set of principles and limitations rather than a formal proposal (from which modifications can then be taken up separately).

3) Task Force Issue 22, 23, 24 – Appropriateness of negative locational charges

The workstream representative outlined the defects in question relating to negative charges for generation and demand, the signals that demand TNUoS should send (considering co-location and generation-demand interactions now) and the need to consider these together.

Initial views of the principles to be addressed and 'next steps' questions were shared on the slides, covering what charges should be reflective of (SQSS, NOA etc.), representation of complex sites and any need for new backgrounds to include demand.

Agenda Point 12: Absolute vs Relative Workstream: Initial Thinking

The workstream representative took the group through the key question being addressed for this topic, which is whether TNUoS should represent spare capacity.

The group was taken through the step change model demonstrating the periodic investment and build on the network and the relationship between spare capacity and constraints. The workstream representative covered relevant assumptions of the current methodology (what happens, where and why) and initial consequences of pricing TNUoS to reflect the capacity required (indicating a case against a change). The workstream representative noted that a clear case for change hadn't emerged as yet, so asked the Task Force to make contact if there were other thoughts to contribute.

The Authority representative will contact the workstream with any further thoughts and questions.

ACTION 8 (Task Force): Contact the Abs v Rel workstream if there are other views for a case for change.

ACTION 9 (HH): Contact the Abs v Rel workstream with any further thoughts/questions.

Agenda Point 13: Next Steps & Meeting Close

The Chair summarised key achievements from the day:

- An informative and productive session on the OpTIC model
- Backgrounds workstream will be subject to a SQSS review and development of the Signals and Technology Type workstreams (with defect 4 being discounted as having no case for change)
- Updates on the progress of the Signals and Absolute vs Relative workstreams respectively

ACTION 10 (Task Force): All workstream leads to create a high-level timeline and action plan for each workstream which will be collated by CP to create a longer-term Task Force road map.

Action Item Log

Action items: In progress and completed since the last meeting

ID/ date	Agenda Item	Description	Owner	Notes	Target Date	Status
1 15/09	3	Check whether OpTIC would smoothen step changes in network development, check whether the model could cope with half a circuit. Consider timing and frequency of phasing data with ESO outputs.	JD		Ongoing	Open
2 15/09	5	Set up a working session between the OpTIC proposers and ESO NOA experts (including exploration of risk)	CP	HH agreed to be part of this conversation	TBC	Open
3 15/09	5	Set up bilateral conversations with OpTIC proposer to pick up specific questions	GMa, Amo, PJ		Ongoing	Open
4 15/09	5	Share thoughts with the Authority representative as to the OpTIC model falling within scope for the Task Force	Task Force		October	Open
5 15/09	6	Provide absolute values for the Y-o-Y tariff changes across regions (re: historic volatility)	Frontier/LCP		TBD with Frontier/LCP	Open
6 15/09	8/9	Check with ESO SQSS experts as to a review of sharing factors to play back to the Task Force	JW		TBC	Open

		(and the Backgrounds workstream)				
7 15/09	8/9	Signals and Tech Type workstreams to feed back to Task Force their views on the treatment of demand raised in the Backgrounds workstream	GM, Amo		Nov/Jan meeting	Open
8 15/09	12	Contact the Abs v Rel workstream if there are other views for a case for change	Task Force		Oct/Nov meetings	Open
9 15/09	12	Contact the Abs v Rel workstream with any further thoughts/questions	HH		Oct meetings	Open
10 15/09	13	All workstream leads to create a high-level timeline and action plan for each workstream	Workstream leads	Timings to be collated by CP to create a longer-term Task Force road map	Meeting 9 (11 Oct) if possible	Open

Action items: Open actions from previous meetings

ID/ date	Agenda Item	Description	Owner	Notes	Target Date	Status
2 18/08	2	Consider using initial workstream proposals as alternative format for information to stimulate stakeholder feedback.	Task Force	To be reviewed once workstreams have shared their initial thoughts	Mtg 8-10	Open
3 18/08	4	Ownership and timings defined for the OTNR Sub-Group closure report	JS	Closure Report to be shared with TF once complete (NP @ESO)	October	Open
5 18/08	7	A one-page report for the Charging Futures website to summarise the reference node modification plans and individuals involved.	JS	To also reflect any further views not captured at TF meeting 7.5 and provided as part of action 4 above.	October	Open
6 18/08	7	Draft modification proposal to be raised.	JT		Mid-Oct (JT to advise)	Open
7 18/08	7	BAU update to TCMF with ESO/Propose to agree who will present the Reference Node proposal to relevant TCMF.	JT, JS/CP	Topic to be added to TCMF Oct agenda – 1 pager in development with JT update	Oct TCMF	Open
9	8	Share draft ‘negative scaling’ modification proposal with the	JS/MC	JT and Backgrounds	Q4 2023	Open

18/08		Task Force to review prior to submission		workstream to link with this project for updates		
10 18/08	9	Review the current modification tracker for a version to feature in future Task Force meetings or shared for visibility.	JS, CP, DS, EB	Version to be shared in Oct Mtg 9	Mtg 9	Open
1 27/07	3	Consider whether updating the 'pseudo-CBA approach' to scaling factors is currently feasible with the data available and whether case for change should include the analysis from the consultants	JT	Consider as part of Backgrounds case for change - ongoing	Mtg 8	Open
3 27/07	3	Consider whether backgrounds are complicating understanding of how charges work or a necessary element of the cost reflectivity of the model.	Task Force		Mtg 8	Open
6 27/07	5	Review past calculations for sharing to provide a recommendation for what work would be feasible now	Frontier/LCP	Information shared by SL 28 Jul	TBC	Open
7 27/07	5	Consideration of renewables in sharing (wind vs wind, treatment of solar).	Frontier/LCP	JS to assess information needed	TBC	Open
8 27/07	5	Exploration of turning off sharing to see impacts on final charges and volatility	Frontier/LCP		Mtg 8	Closed
9 27/07	8	Consider calculating using a 5 year average rather than current 5 year method	Frontier/LCP		Mtg 8	Closed
11 27/07	8	Consider the information available to share with consultants & TF re: potential new ESO products and impacts on FPN, and possible new data input modification	JS		TBC: updates can follow after final internal reviews of proposed products	Open
12 27/07	8	Absolute values to be shared for the impact of using FPN only on Year Round components of the tariff.	Frontier/LCP	Material impacts possible for different scales of plant. Ongoing to form part of AFL analysis	Ongoing	Open
14 27/07	8	Consider aligning Week 24 data with the SQSS change and move to gross demand.	JZ		Ongoing	Open

15 27/07	8	Contact TOs for a view on what data inputs could be more regularly updated (re: locational tariff calculations) with a material impact and their view on revenue being deferred for a year	JS, NW	Will form part of wider Data Inputs workstream and discussion	Ongoing	Open
5 26/06	3-7	Can indicative monetary values be provided for the impacts of the different backgrounds on differently-sized projects.	Frontier/LCP		Up to Mtg 10	Open
7 26/06	3-7	Additional analysis shared on metrics used to compare volatility between actual and estimated charges.	Frontier/LCP		Ongoing – Frontier need a steer on what is required	Open
10 26/06	3-7	Bring together the Task Force representatives and the ESO SQSS Review team (when in a position to do so) to discuss potentially parallel/overlapping interests.	JS, SS to explore with BD	To feed into case for change if required	Ongoing	Open
12 26/06	8-10	Revisit ESO work on embedded generation in relation to the transport model and share with the Task Force if relevant.	JS & NW	To consider as part of distributed generation element work package	Ongoing	Open
17 26/06		Update from OTNR sub-group	JT		Mtg 7.5/8	Closed
1 26/04	1	Provide update on recruiting Non-Domestic user reps to Task Force	JS & NW	Discussions ongoing for a named rep. Non-Domestic Supplier forums updated by JS	Ongoing	Open
10 26/04	7	Investigate more granular data sources for DNO embedded distribution to support the methodology & analytics	JS	Need TF to identify the data needs before exploring sources (part of Distributed Generation work). Update to be shared by CP ahead of Mtg 9	Ongoing	Open