

CMP331

17 April 2023

Online Meeting via Teams



Objectives and Timeline

Paul Mullen - National Grid ESO Code Administrator

Timeline for CMP331 V5 as at 27 March 2023

| Milestone | Date | Milestone | Date |
|--|--|--|---------------------------|
| Workgroup Nominations (15 working days) | 4 July 2022 to 25 July 2022 | Panel sign off that Workgroup Report has met its Terms of Reference | 28 April 2023 |
| Workgroup 1 - Understand proposal and solution, note the scope and identify any possible alternative solutions, agree timeline, agree and review terms of reference, agree next steps including any analysis | 22 September 2022 | Code Administrator Consultation | 9 May 2023 to 31 May 2023 |
| Workgroup 2 and 3 - Review analysis, solution(s) and Legal Text, finalise Workgroup consultation (including agreeing Workgroup Consultation questions) | 18 October 2022 and 28 November 2022 (Showstopper Meeting 7 December 2022) | Draft Final Modification Report (DFMR) issued to Panel (5 working days) | 22 June 2023 |
| Workgroup Consultation | 12 December 2022 to 11 January 2023 | Panel undertake DFMR recommendation vote | 30 June 2023 |
| Workgroup 4 - Assess Workgroup Consultation Responses, further review of Original and agree alternatives to be taken forward | 20 January 2023 | Final Modification Report issued to Panel to check votes recorded correctly (5 working days) | 4 July 2023 |
| Workgroup 5 - Finalise solution(s) and legal text, carry out Alternative Vote, agree that Terms of Reference have been met, Review Workgroup Report and hold Workgroup Vote | 17 April 2023 (non quorate meeting 27 March 2023 and the key discussions will be replayed) | Final Modification Report issued to Ofgem | 12 July 2023 |
| Workgroup report issued to Panel (5 working days) | 20 April 2023 | Ofgem decision | TBC |
| | | Implementation Date | 1 April 2024 |



Summary of 27 March 2023 meeting

Paul Mullen - National Grid ESO Code Administrator



Review of outstanding actions

Paul Mullen - National Grid ESO Code Administrator

Review of outstanding actions

| Action number | Owner | Action | Due by | Status |
|---------------|-----------|---|---------|--|
| 1 | ESO | Consider if references to site specific ALF should be changed to user provided ALF to avoid confusion on terminology | 6/4/23 | Closed – “user-provided ALF” |
| 2 | ESO | Update legal text to reflect outcome of action 1 and add in obligation for Users to update the ESO if their User provided ALF is no longer accurate | 6/4/23 | Closed – circulated 14 April 2023 |
| 3 | ESO | Confirm when the User must make their choice by (to elect to have a user provided ALF) and when the user provided ALF needs to be agreed by | 6/4/23 | Open |
| 4 | ESO | Confirm that where User provided ALFs are rejected by the ESO, the ESO will not publically share why rejected but will share learnings at industry forums | 6/4/23 | Open |
| 5 | Chair | Issue V2 of Workgroup Report | 28/3/23 | Closed – shared 28 March 2023 |
| 6 | Workgroup | Provide showstopper Comments on V2 of Workgroup Report and Legal Text | 13/4/23 | Closed – only received from Andy Pace |
| 7 | Chair | Bring absent Workgroup Members up to speed with key updates from meeting | 6/4/23 | Open – need to do at start of 17 April 2023 meeting instead given holidays |



Review showstopper comments on Legal Text

All



Review showstopper comments on Workgroup Report

All



Terms of Reference

- Have we addressed them all?

All

CMP331 Terms of Reference

| Workgroup Term of Reference | Location in Workgroup Report |
|--|---|
| a) Consider EBR implications | “Interactions” section |
| b) Consider if any annual reconciliation process might be appropriate for cost reflectivity purposes if the outturn is more than the forecast (and if so should this be capped by the generic load factor?). | “Using a site-specific ALF, but then reconciling it to the actual ALF” section |
| c) Consider who should commission (and at whose expense) the independent third-party review of the forecast to be used. | “3 This forecast value must be determined by an independent third party and the evidence submitted to the ESO for agreement/verification” section |
| d) Consider if there should be any obligations on the User to be fully open and transparent with the independent third party and the ESO where a suitable site-specific ALF is available. | “5 Should there be any obligations on Users to be fully open and transparent with the independent third party and the ESO where a suitable site-specific ALF is available” section |
| e) Consider what needs to be contained in the report produced by the independent third party (recognising that it needs to be of sufficient status for the ESO to act upon). | “3 This forecast value must be determined by an independent third party and the evidence submitted to the ESO for agreement/verification” section |
| f) Consider the history associated with Annual Load Factors discussed within CMP213. | “Interactions” section |
| g) Consider whether or not this proposed process only applies to new generators or could existing generators retrofitting new plant be eligible. | “1 A new transmission connected generator (including “retrofit” plant?) will have a choice to submit a site-specific ALF, which will be a forecast instead of the default to use the generic ALF to determine the TNUoS charges that apply to the site” section |
| h) Consider distributional impact analysis | “4 Analysis to show the benefits and impacts on existing TNUoS parties” section |



Workgroup Vote

Paul Mullen - National Grid ESO Code Administrator

Can I vote? and What is the Workgroup Vote?

To participate in any votes, Workgroup members need to have attended at least 50% of meetings

Stage 2 – Workgroup Vote

- 2a) Assess the original and WACMs (if there are any) against the CUSC objectives compared to the baseline (the current CUSC)
- 2b) Vote on which of the options is best.



Any Other Business

Paul Mullen - National Grid ESO Code Administrator



Next Steps

Paul Mullen – National Grid ESO Code Administrator