

# Code Administrator Meeting Summary

## Meeting name: CMP434 Workgroup 2

---

Date: 14/05/2024

---

### Contact Details

Chair: **Claire Goult** [Claire.Goult@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:Claire.Goult@nationalgrideso.com)

Proposer: **Joe Henry** [Joseph.Henry2@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:Joseph.Henry2@nationalgrideso.com)

---

## Key areas of discussion

The Workgroup meeting consisted of Workgroup Members, and observers for two urgent modifications - CMP434 and CM095.

### Introductions

The Chair welcomed everybody to the meeting and previewed the meeting agenda.

### Timelines and Topics

The Chair explained meeting topics and how they had changed since Workgroup 1. One Workgroup Member asked if the paper circulated within the meeting written by Simon Lord would be discussed in today's meeting. The ESO clarified that the treatment of existing plant already connected was outside of the scope of CMP434 and CM095 and that the ESO would be covering TEC that is pre-connection and not installed capacity at the end of its life.

The Workgroup discussed Workgroup Members providing papers when unable to attend a Workgroup meeting without reaching consensus on approach. One Workgroup Member felt that alternates should attend and be briefed while another highlighted the need for flexibility of approach when considering the timescales and importance of these changes.

### Workgroup Membership Check

The Chair shared a slide detailing Workgroup Membership. The Chair clarified that Workgroup Members will be eligible to vote if they have attended 50% of Workgroup meetings. Observers will not be eligible to vote.

### Overview of Primary Process

The Proposer explained the primary process at a high level.

The Proposer clarified that the capitalised words on the slide were not defined terms, in terms of CUSC and had just been capitalised.

The ESO SME clarified that the initial ESO view is that no change of either capacity or technology between Gate 1 or Gate 2 would be permitted, but this would be discussed at a future Workgroup. Also making the point that this is an application view and not applicable to DFTC which is a forecast at

Gate 1 The ESO SME also clarified that there is currently no time period defined between Gate 1 and Gate 2.

### **Clarifying which projects go through the primary process**

The ESO SME clarified that all projects go through the Primary Process including Crown Estates, Crown Estate Scotland, and developers.

### **New Relevant Embedded Small/Medium Power Station considerations in the primary process**

Alison discussed DFTC (Distribution Forecasted Transmission Capacity) at a high level.

A Workgroup Member highlighted interaction with [GC0117](#) in terms of its proposed changes to definitions of Large and Medium Power stations and the DFTC. DFTC will be discussed at a future Workgroup, where discussion will be had on whether the codes use [GC0117](#) defined terms or new terms. A Workgroup Member raised that this point may become a WACM.

The Workgroup discussed the term “Relevant” Small/Medium Power Station and what the term relevant meant. The ESO SME detailed that the threshold used are currently not hard coded in the CUSC but pointed to the Grid Code definition of Small/Medium Power stations using the thresholds for Embedded that will be used for a DFTC submission. A Workgroup Member suggested a potential WACM to disconnect the DFTC submission thresholds from the Grid Code definitions.

A Workgroup Member asked why a large Embedded power station would not be included in the DFTC process. The ESO SME explained that thresholds have been discussed with DNO's in the ENA DFTC Working Group and agreed that Large Embedded Power Stations are out of scope for DFTC. The ESO SME added that the DFTC submission is split by relationship, the ESO has a DNO relationship for Relevant Embedded Small and Medium Power stations but has a direct relationship with large projects.

The ESO SME shared a slide on how sizes of Power stations and BEGA's and non-BEGA's interacted.

A Workgroup Member raised that when a Relevant Embedded Small/Medium Power Station wants a BEGA, they will have to go through DNO's via DFTC and apply direct to the ESO. The ESO SME shared this would be discussed at future Workgroup.

A Workgroup Member asked for a slide detailing the large Embedded process.

A Workgroup Member raised that at pre-Gate 2 there is no queue positions, the Proposer confirmed this to be true.

A Workgroup Member raised that if an IDNO connected at Transmission level are required to provide a DFTC submission forecast and submit a Gate 2 application, should this be from a contracted position rather than a connected position The ESO SME took this away to consider whether this need to be amended.

### **Offshore considerations in the primary process**

The ESO SME presented a slide on offshore considerations.

One Workgroup Member thought that this was over prescribing for offshore to have its own special deviation from the primary process and did not see the need for this level of granularity. This Workgroup Member suggested it did not need to be covered in these Modifications if there is a route to connect.

One Workgroup Member stated a preference for CES and TCE reserving capacity. The ESO SME explained the hope that this would happen but stated the ESO does not want to mandate, so both options need to be available.

One Workgroup Member suggested raising a WACM on LoA exclusivity, if the ESO does not want to go down this route, as needed and quite useful.

A Workgroup Member raised that applying the exclusivity would remove the need to differentiate offshore from non-offshore. The ESO SME explained that if exclusive LoA route was taken, then the developers would.

The ESO SME stated the current LoA does not cover offshore, and the position has not changed, Gate 2 is where the duplication checks would be done and clarified that LoA offshore is scheduled to be discussed in WG3 and WG4.

### **Changes and the primary process**

A Workgroup Member asked if in the code changes, the Proposer will use minor changes or go into full detail and list the changes, the Workgroup Member said that the Workgroup should try to fully explain using defined terms, where possible.

A Workgroup Member suggested presenting what minor changes relate to Gate 1 and which to Gate 2 on separate slides for clarity.

The ESO SME confirmed that a TEC reduction would mean the application has to go back through Gate 2 with a reassessment and user costs.

A Workgroup Member asked for parties to have visibility of date changes and queue management changes.

A Workgroup Member asked if the definition of TEC will be changed, the ESO SME stated no, but acknowledged the fact that all parties should be using the same definition.

A Workgroup Member asked where the lines between finetuning and significant changes will be drawn, The ESO SME suggested this will likely come down to if system studies will be required.

A Workgroup Member asked how TEC reduction will interact with existing contracted but not yet connected and asked for clarity on the impacts for users doing this before or after a decided date.

A Workgroup Member raised a question on significant changes causing a drop in queue position, the Member wanted to see the relevant part of the CUSC where the major and minor are defined. Another Workgroup Member mentioned that queue position is only affected by breaches in contract while you are in the queue.

The Workgroup discussed a recent allowable change in Mod apps ESO paper drawing out the ban on adding technologies. The Workgroup asked what is forming policy and what will be codified. The ESO SME stated that this will not form part of these modifications. A Workgroup Member stated that parties' terms of conditions form the legal standpoint and not policy statements.

A Workgroup Member raised that Gate 2 should be where the restudying is done, rather than Gate 1. The ESO SME stated that there is no route to apply straight to Gate 2 and a Gate 1 and Gate 2 joint application would be required. Workgroup Members said that if changes can be made to your Gate 1 application, does this does not undo the point of this modification. Workgroup Members felt that unless the ESO is clear about when changes should be allowed to be made, then incentives for applicants will be perverse. Also stating that ad hoc changes at Gate 1 will make modelling difficult and make long term investment and system forecasting difficult.

### Any Other Business

A Workgroup Member raised if the ESO was going to try to create a government designation. An ESO Member said no.

### Next Steps

Send out revised slides for WG2 and the slides for WG3.

### Actions

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

| Action number | Workgroup Raised | Owner | Action  | Comment                        | Due by | Status |
|---------------|------------------|-------|---|--------------------------------|--------|--------|
| 1             | WG1              | PM    | To share further data is shared in relation to the transmission queue   |                                | WG2    | Open   |
| 2             | WG1              | JH/PM | To clarify if it is the modification is intending to cover a demand application at the distribution level which causes a transmission reinforcement.  |                                | WG2    | Open   |
| 3             | WG1              | JH    | Tighten up the language RE: User Commitment Methodology/ Final Sums   |                                | WG2    | Open   |
| 4             | WG1              | JH    | Changing the wording from 'change the Network Charging arrangements' to 'Network use of system Charging arrangements' are out of scope  |                                | WG2    | Open   |
| 5             | WG1              | JH/RW | Collaborate and finalise the Terms of Reference whilst cross checking against CM095.  |                                | WG2    | Open   |
| 6             | WG2              | JH    | Clarification slide on what is BAU regarding the GSP process  |                                | WG4    | New    |
| 7             | WG2              | JH    | Explain the interaction of CMP434 with GC0117, consider the potential impact if GC0117 approved such as a need for an additional code modification (Chair to put in consultation)   | Workgroup consultation 25/6/24 | WG3    | New    |
| 8             | WG2              | AP    | Consider the definition of Relevant Embedded Small/Medium Power Station and whether the codified definition needs to be changed or if the ESO is to provide guidance to DNO's outside of the energy codes on what is considered as relevant to the transmission network |                                | WG3    | New    |

|    |     |       |  |     |     |
|----|-----|-------|--|-----|-----|
| 9  | WG2 | AP    | Slide on Large Embedded for clarification  | WG4 | New |
| 10 | WG2 | DD    | Tabulate Minor and Major Changes at Gate 1 and 2 for a clearer distinction   | WG4 | New |
| 11 | WG2 | JH/DD | Response to the paper provided by Simon Lord   | WG4 | New |
| 12 | WG2 | JH/PM | ESO to speak to the policy team and consider how the 'Allowable Changes' policy being drafted would interact with CMP434, would all of the policy need to be codified or does the concept of the policy need to be codified? | WG4 | New |
| 13 | WG2 | ALL   | Workgroup to propose what they think could change in their application between Gate 1 and Gate 2   | TBC | New |

**Attendees**

| Name               | Initial | Company                               | Role             |
|--------------------|---------|---------------------------------------|------------------|
| Claire Goult       |         | Code Administrator, ESO               | Chair            |
| Stuart McLarnon    |         | Code Administrator, ESO               | Tech Sec         |
| Andrew Hemus       |         | Code Administrator, ESO               | Tech Sec         |
| Joe Henry          |         | Code Administrator, ESO               | Proposer         |
| Paul Mullen        |         | ESO                                   | ESO SME          |
| Alison Price       |         | ESO                                   | ESO SME          |
| Dovydas Dyson      |         | ESO                                   | ESO SME          |
| Alex Ikonic        |         | Orsted                                | Workgroup Member |
| Bill Scott         |         | Eclipse Power Networks                | Workgroup Member |
| Brian Hoy          |         | Electricity North West Limited (ENWL) | Workgroup Member |
| Callum Dell        |         | Invenergy                             | Workgroup Member |
| Claire Hynes       |         | RWE Renewables                        | Workgroup Member |
| Deborah MacPherson |         | Scottish Power Renewables             | Workgroup Member |
| Ed Birkett         |         | Low Carbon                            | Workgroup Member |
| Garth Graham       |         | SSE Generation                        | Workgroup Member |
| Grant Rogers       |         | Qualitas Energy                       | Workgroup Member |
| Greg Stevenson     |         | SSEN Transmission (SHET)              | Workgroup Member |
| Mpumelelo Hlophe   |         | Fred Olsen Seawind                    | Workgroup Member |

|                             |   |                  |
|-----------------------------|---|------------------|
| Helen Stack                 | Centrica                                  | Workgroup Member |
| Joe Colebrook               | Innova Renewables                         | Workgroup Member |
| Kyran Hanks                 | Waters Wye                                | Workgroup Member |
| Luke Scott                  | Northern Powergrid                        | Workgroup Member |
| Paul Jones                  | Uniper                                    | Workgroup Member |
| Paul Youngman               | Drax                                      | Workgroup Member |
| Mireia Barenys              | Lightsourcebp                             | Workgroup Member |
| Phillip Addison             | EDF Renewables                            | Workgroup Member |
| David Tuffery               | NGED                                      | Workgroup Member |
| Mark Field                  | Sembcorp Energy (UK) Limited              | Workgroup Member |
| Michelle MacDonald Sandison | SSEN                                      | Workgroup Member |
| Zygimantas Rimkus           | Buchan Offshore Wind                      | Workgroup Member |
| Ravinder Shan               | FRV TH Powertek Limited                   | Workgroup Member |
| Richard Woodward            | NGET                                      | Workgroup Member |
| Rob Smith                   | Enso Energy                               | Workgroup Member |
| Sam Aitchison               | Island Green Power                        | Workgroup Member |
| Wendy Mantle                | Scottish Power Energy Networks            | Workgroup Member |
| Zivanayi Musanhi            | UK Power Networks                         | Workgroup Member |
| Anthony Cotton              | Energy Technical & Renewable Services Ltd | Workgroup Member |
| Allan Love                  | Scottish Power Transmission               | Workgroup Member |