

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Meeting name: CMP434 & CM095 Workgroup 13

Date: 04/07/2024

Contact Details

Chair: **Claire Goult** Claire.Goult@nationalgrideso.com

Proposer: **Joe Henry** joseph.henry2@nationalgrideso.com

Key areas of discussion

The key areas for discussion in Workgroup 13 were:

- End to End Solution
- CUSC/STC Areas of Code Change – Discussion

The Chair noted quoracy and began the Workgroup.

End to End Solution

The Proposer presented slides on what the ESO expects the End-to-End Solution to look like, starting with Element 1. The Proposer noted that they were looking for feedback on if the solution was clear enough for the layperson to understand, not for feedback on the content of the solution itself. A Workgroup member asked for clarity on when the non-codified methodologies will be published, the ESO stated that dates will be confirmed post consultation. A Workgroup member stated the ESO must have evidence that their proposal will deliver the outcome they are aiming for, and that this evidence should be in the consultation or methodology. A Workgroup member stated that the term “methodology” in this context should be replaced with “policy.” A Workgroup member noted that the ESO could change what goes in the methodologies after CMP434 is approved, as the workgroup discussions are not legally binding.

Element 3 A Workgroup member noted a suggestion for how to make this process clearer.

Element 5 A Workgroup member stated they believe this element is no longer required as the ESO are removing this from their initial proposal.

Element 6 A Workgroup member stated that LoA and Application Windows should be presented separately to avoid confusion.

Diagram of Indicative Process Timeline. A Workgroup member pointed out an “Offer Accepted” triangle is missing from the diagram. A Workgroup member asked for a diagram to be drawn explaining how Embedded applicants, expanding existing sites, and any other variants progress through the Process.

Element 9 A Workgroup member asked for the ESO to clarify what NESO designation will bring. A Workgroup member stated that the ESO should state that they do not intend to use NESO designation very often.

ESO

Element 11 A Workgroup member asked for the ESO to clarify if Gate 2 criteria is equal to M3. A ESO stated that Queue Management milestones would be in the code, but other aspects of gate 2 criteria would be put in a methodology document.

Element 12 A Workgroup member pointed out an error that states Gate 2 rather than Gate 1.

Element 18 A Workgroup member stated they believe the DNOs need an additional mechanism to help deal with applications.

CUSC/STC Areas of Code Change – Discussion

The CUSC Proposer went through the CMP434 Proposal form and made changes according to the Workgroup's views. The Proposer presented a list of sections within the CUSC they thought may potentially need to change, as follows: Sections 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 11, 15, 16, Exhibits B, C, D, E, I and O, Schedule 2 Exhibits, and the addition of new sections to cover the concepts of an Application Window, Gates, DFTC and Connections Network Design Methodology. The ESO stated that legal text will be confirmed and formulated following the Workgroup Consultation.

One Workgroup member queried whether CUSC amendments would be required for NESO Designation, and Connection Point and Capacity Reservation. The ESO agreed with the Workgroup member that Section 11 definitions would be required, followed by updates to relevant sections throughout the CUSC.

The STC Proposer went through the CM095 Proposal form and made changes according to the Workgroup's views. The Proposer presented a list of sections within the STC and STCPs they thought may potentially need to change, as follows: Sections D and J, and Schedules 5, 6, 7 and 13. The ESO stated that legal text will be confirmed and formulated following the Workgroup Consultation.

One Workgroup member highlighted the importance of only codifying obligations on Transmission Owners and not adding anything into the code that does not apply to them. Another Workgroup member queried the extent of the proposed legal text changes, to clarify if they were the only obligations being put on Transmission Owners. The ESO confirmed that obligations may be defined within the license and not within the STC. One Workgroup member believed that all obligations should be captured within the STC and not within the license.

The Proposer stated that TOCOs may no longer be considered in this modification, and that bay reservations will need to be added to the proposal form.

A Workgroup member asked for the ESO to provide an expected timeline/process of the fast dispute/resolution process, and to clarify if projects that are disputing their application are still considered in forecasts.

Actions and Query Log

Query 173 was disputed by a Workgroup member, who stated that the ESO should clarify if only developers can apply for offshore wind or if the CES/TCE can apply for capacity. The ESO agreed to alter the wording of their answer to query 173.

Actions 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 25, 27, and 28 were closed.

A Workgroup member asked for the technology change policy paper to be included as an annex to the consultation. The DFTC methodology document has been renamed to DFTC guidance document to provide clarity.

Any Other Business

A Workgroup member asked if the ESO intended to discuss the proposed content of the CNDM and Capacity Reallocation mechanisms in greater detail within future CMP434/435 Workgroups and noted their importance. The ESO stated that this is not their intention, as the proposal is to have the content in methodology rather than in code.

However, the ESO highlighted an outstanding Workgroup action to clarify the methodology drafting timetable and agreed to share a draft of the CNDM and Capacity Reallocation documentation with Workgroups when available, but noted this is not available at this point in time, and a timescale for it being available could not yet be shared with Workgroups (as per the Action).

The ESO then noted that even if it were shared in draft with the Workgroup there may not be time allocated to it (depending on when it is shared) and feedback on it would still be subject to it being further developed and approved separate to the code change process i.e., through the proposed methodology development and approval process.

Actions

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
11	WG2	All	Add agenda time to respond to papers provided by Workgroup members	Ongoing	WG4	Open
13	WG2	ALL	Workgroup to propose what they think could change in their application between Gate 1 and Gate 2			Closed
15	WG4	JH	Consider alignment of crown estate invitation to tender and auction timing	Out of Scope		Closed
16	WG5	RW/GL	Look into where STC changes for CNDM should be located within main body of STC and STCPs	Legal Text slides presented at WG13		Closed
17	WG5	FP	Are the duplication checks at Gate 2 against projects who are within the Gate 2 applicants pool of that period, Gate 2 applicants that are yet to accept their offer, or/and applicants who have accepted their Gate 2 offer	Presented at WG11		Closed
20	WG6	JN/AQ	Consider legal perspective on NESO designation		TBC	Open
21	WG6	MO	Update/develop slides presented based on Workgroup feedback		TBC	Closed
22	WG6	JH	Consider if an impact assessment by the ESO on the proposed solution is achievable within the current timescales		TBC	Open
23	WG7	LH	Clarify the ESO Position as to why the capacity reallocation		TBC	Open

			process is out of scope for CMP434		
24	WG7	MO	Consult ESO legal team to consider using existing legal definitions for clarification (substantial modification) and reconsider terminology being used (material/significant/allowable)	TBC	Open
25	WG7	LH/SG	Update on the Technology Change Policy Paper and consider request to share prior to consultation	Draft paper has been circulated.	Closed
26	WG7	SMEs	Provide a list of policy documents envisaged for TMO4+ and for which details are not within scope of CMP434 (e.g.CNDM). Also provide a list of their contents/principles the documents are using if not available for the WG consultation	TBC	Open
27	WG9	AP/KS	Take Workgroup feedback to ENA regarding the name of the DFTC methodology document – consider renaming to provide clarification	Draft ENA document shared, and title changed to guidance after WG feedback.	Closed
28	WG9	AP/KS	DFTC document – Provide answers to the following questions – Who approves the document, who can change it, who follows it and who can challenge it (the route to challenge specifically)	ENA members DNO's, TO's, ESO (iDNO's can join ENA)	Closed
29	WG9	MO/AQ	In terms of the 3 year long stop cancellation of sites/capacity provide detail to what element of the CUSC is being referenced and how this is envisaged to work?	TBC	Open
30	WG9	AQ	To explain how the dispute process will fit into the statutory approach (legal route)	TBC	Open
31	WG9	MO	More detail requested by Workgroup to make a judgement on Connection Point and Capacity Reservation (including offshore)	TBC	Open

32	WG10	MO	Clarify TO/ESO in terms of CNDM and what would get into the Gate 1 offer	TBC	Open
33	WG10	KS	To clarify, if the ESO decides not to have forward-looking milestones after M1, would DNO's change this or will they continue to be forward looking for all the others	If CMP434 is approved. EVA will look to amend their queue milestones.	Closed
34	WG10	PM	Review the four slides to address points from GG (clarity and colouring of text suggestions) and TC to review the dates are correct	TBC	Closed
35	WG10	AC/AQ	ESO to confirm whether additional uncertainty clauses (which have been appearing in offers recently) will remain	TBC	Open
36	WG10	AC/AQ	ESO to consider doing duplication checks on LoAs given info received today on G1 offers, to avoid buying LoAs off each other.	TBC	Open
37	WG10	AC/AQ	To confirm Gate 1 contracts are formal binding contracts and clarify terminology accordingly	TBC	Open
38	WG11	MO	To expand on licence change conditions/obligations	TBC	Open
39	WG11	MO	To share ESO suggested Licensed offer timescales changes from 3 months with the Workgroup	TBC	Open
40	WG11	RF	To share licence changes programme timescales with Workgroup	TBC	Open
41	WG12	PM	To share analysis/feedback which informs the Gate 2 period offer acceptance to submission of application for Planning Consent	TBC	Open
42	WG12	JH	To provide an update of the action log at Workgroup 13	WG13	Closed

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Claire Goult	CG	Code Administrator, ESO	Chair
Lizzie Timmins	LT	Code Administrator, ESO	Chair

Andrew Hemus	AH	Code Administrator, ESO	Tech Sec
Stuart McLarnon	SM	Code Administrator, ESO	Tech Sec
Graham Lear	GL	ESO	Proposer
Joe Henry	JH	ESO	Proposer
Alison Price	AP	ESO	ESO SME
Angela Quinn	AP	ESO	ESO SME
Dovydas Dyson	DD	ESO	ESO SME
Mike Oxenham	MO	ESO	ESO SME
Paul Mullen	PM	ESO	ESO SME
Lee Wilkinson	LW	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Alex Ikonic	AI	Orsted	Workgroup Member
Allan Love	AL	Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Member
Anthony Cotton	AC	Green Generation Energy Networks Cymru Ltd	Workgroup Member
Bill Scott	BS	Eclipse Power Networks	Workgroup Member
Callum Dell	CD	Invenergy	Workgroup Member
Claire Hynes	CH	RWE Renewables	Workgroup Member
Deborah MacPherson	DM	Scottish Power Renewables	Workgroup Member
Ed Birkett	EB	Low Carbon	Workgroup Member
Garth Graham	GG	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member
Grant Rogers	GR	Qualitas Energy	Workgroup Member
Greg Stevenson	GS	SSEN Transmisson (SHET)	Workgroup Member
Helen Stack	HS	Centrica	Workgroup Member
Hossein Khalilnezhad	HK	Fred Olsen Seawind	Workgroup Member
Joe Colebrook	JC	Innova Renewables	Workgroup Member
Kyran Hanks	KH	CUSC Panel member	Workgroup Member
Magdalena Paluch	MP	NGED	Workgroup Member
Mark Field	MF	Sembcorp Energy (UK) Limited	Workgroup Member
Michelle MacDonald Sandison	MS	SSEN	Workgroup Member
Mireia Barenys	MB	Lightsourcebp	Workgroup Member
Muhammad Madni	MM	NGV	Workgroup Member
Nirmalya Biswas	NB	Northern Powergrid	Workgroup Member

Paul Youngman	PY	Drax	Workgroup Member
Phillip Addison	PA	EDF Renewables	Workgroup Member
Ravinder Shan	RS	FRV TH Powertek Limited	Workgroup Member
Richard Woodward	RW	NGET	Workgroup Member
Rob Smith	RS	Enso Energy	Workgroup Member
Rohit Alexander	RA	Statkraft	Workgroup Member
Sam Aitchison	SA	Island Green Power	Workgroup Member
Sean Gauton	SG	Uniper	Workgroup Member
Simon Lord	SL	Engie	Workgroup Member
Steffan Jones	SJ	Electricity North West Limited (ENWL)	Workgroup Member
Zivanayi Musanhi	ZM	UK Power Networks	Workgroup Member