

CMP430/431

Workgroup 6 Monday 15 April 2024

Online Meeting via Teams

WELCOME



Expectations of a Workgroup Member

Contribute to the discussion

Be respectful of each other's opinions

Language and Conduct to be consistent with the values of equality and diversity

Do not share commercially sensitive information

Be prepared - Review Papers and Reports ahead of meetings

Complete actions in a timely manner

Keep to agreed scope

Email communications to/cc'ing the .box email

Your Roles

Help refine/develop the solution(s)

Bring forward alternatives as early as possible

Vote on whether or not to proceed with requests for Alternatives

Vote on whether the solution(s) better facilitate the Code Objectives



Objectives and Timeline

Deborah Spencer – ESO Code Administrator



Objectives

- Introductions
- Action Review
- Legal Text Update
- Question for Workgroup Discussion
- Workgroup Consultation Review
- Next steps

Action Review

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
5	WG2	Proposer	Consider if there is any insight available into impact of Triads over winter 2023 and if this has changed following implementation of the Targeted Charging Review (TCR)		WG3	Open
6	WG3	Proposer	To speak with Ofgem about possible data available through previous RFI		WG4	Open
7	WG3	Proposer	To speak with the Revenue Team to work on information relating to impacted sites.		WG4	Open
9	WG3	Proposer	To meet with Ofgem and MHHS Programme about the interacting timescales and the certainty needed around the Legal Text		WG4	Open
10	WG4	Proposer/ HB	To meet with HB to consider the scenarios for contracts from October.		WG5	Open
12	WG5	Proposer/ Elexon Representatives	CUSC Section 14 changes 14.17.41. To consider if a further table is required to include export.		WG6	Open



Action Update

Deborah Spencer – ESO Code Administrator

Action Update (1)

Action 7 – Analysis on sites that may be subject to different charging arrangements

All analysis provided is based on a series of assumptions. We welcome Workgroup views on assumptions used and if the analysis is helpful for consideration of the proposed solution.

- a) Sites that are settled as Measurement Class C pre-MHHS migration that will have a Domestic Premises Indicator = True post-MHHS migration

Currently no data the Workgroup is aware of that could inform how many sites could be subject to this scenario. Sites are likely to be exceptions within Supplier systems.

If we assume that a domestic premises in MC C has a load profile similar to a Profile Class 1 domestic consumer, the annual consumption expected for it to be a 100kW site would be 380000kWh which is 93 times more than the Ofgem typical large house.

Based on this profile we would expect:

A TRIAD demand of 78kW

And consumption between 4 and 7 pm to be 64402kWh

Applying these assumptions to the 24/25 tariffs gives the following charges and impact:

example locational charge for domestic measurement class C site						
Zone	Zone Name	HH Demand Tariff (£/kW)	NHH Demand Tariff (p/kWh)	Triad (£)	4-7 (£)	Change if moved to 4-7
1	Northern Scotland	-	-	-	-	-
2	Southern Scotland	-	-	-	-	-
3	Northern	-	-	-	-	-
4	North West	-	-	-	-	-
5	Yorkshire	-	-	-	-	-
6	N Wales & Mersey	-	-	-	-	-
7	East Midlands	-	-	-	-	-
8	Midlands	2.373139	0.312657	184	201	17
9	Eastern	0.825367	0.113949	64	73	9
10	South Wales	4.503509	0.533793	349	344	- 6
11	South East	3.859199	0.538522	299	347	47
12	London	5.732674	0.644217	445	415	- 30
13	Southern	6.869732	0.903934	533	582	49
14	South Western	8.198917	1.129620	636	727	92

Action Update (2)

Action 7 – Analysis on sites that may be subject to different charging arrangements

All analysis provided is based on a series of assumptions. We welcome Workgroup views on assumptions used and if the analysis is helpful for consideration of the proposed solution.

- b) Sites that are settled as Measurement Class A pre-MHHS migration that will have a Connection Type Indicator = L or H (meaning they are CT Metered) and a Domestic Premises Indicator = False post-MHHS migration

Some data has been shared with the workgroup from P432 and DCP414

Using assumption that most of the remaining sites in this category are Profile Class (PC) 3 and 4 (P272 - PC5-8 sites migrated to HH settlement)

Taking the average PC3 profile and 10 year average temperature regression data from Elexon website applied to 24/25 tariffs and DCP414 site count estimations we get the following impact (numbers are almost identical using PC4 data):

32 and DCP414				example locational charge for NHH CT metered site in Profile Class 3				
Zone	Zone Name	HH Demand Tariff (£/kW)	NHH Demand Tariff (p/kWh)	Triad (£)	4-7 (£)	Change if moved to TRIAD	estimated number of sites	£ impact
1	Northern Scotland	-	-	-	-	-		
2	Southern Scotland	-	-	-	-	-		
3	Northern	-	-	-	-	-		
4	North West	-	-	-	-	-		
5	Yorkshire	-	-	-	-	-		
6	N Wales & Mersey	-	-	-	-	-		
7	East Midlands	-	-	-	-	-		
8	Midlands	2.373139	0.312657	13	16	- 3	5,000	- 13,012
9	Eastern	0.825367	0.113949	5	6	- 1	5,000	- 5,842
10	South Wales	4.503509	0.533793	25	27	- 2	5,000	- 9,639
11	South East	3.859199	0.538522	21	27	- 6	5,000	- 28,765
12	London	5.732674	0.644217	32	33	- 1	5,000	- 3,354
13	Southern	6.869732	0.903934	38	46	- 7	7,000	- 52,329
14	South Western	8.198917	1.129620	46	57	- 11	5,000	- 57,452
							Total	- 170,394



Question for Discussion

Deborah Spencer – ESO Code Administrator

Questions for members discussion

- **Unmetered Demand**

Feedback from an industry colleague has questioned the treatment of all unmetered sites, whether domestic or non-domestic

ESO have confirmed with Elexon that the CR32 solution would group all UMS demand under Measurement Class D (both domestic and non-domestic), but the expectation is there would not be any domestic UMS demand

ESO would welcome views from Workgroup members

- **Implementation Approach**

Feedback from an industry colleague has questioned the clarity on approach to implementation, so we would like the Workgroup to consider if this is sufficiently clear in the solution.

The solution is proposed to be implemented from the start of Charging Year 25/26. The query relates to whether a Domestic Measurement Class C site would be charged differently from 01/04/2025 OR the point at which it migrates.

The intent of the proposed solution is for the change to be applied when the site migrates to MHHS arrangements.



Legal Text Update

Proposer – ESO



Workgroup Consultation Review

All



AOB/Next Steps

Deborah Spencer – ESO Code Administrator

Timeline for CMP430 – Updated after CUSC Panel (23 February 2024)

Milestone	Date	Milestone	Date
Modification presented to Panel	23 February 2024	Code Administrator Consultation (6 working days)	10 June 2024 to 14 June 2024
Workgroup Nominations (4 Working Days)	23 February 2024 to 29 February 2024	Draft Final Modification Report (DFMR) issued to Panel (4 working days)	24 June 2024
Ofgem grant Urgency	29 February 2024 (5pm)	Panel undertake DFMR recommendation vote	28 June 2024
Workgroup 1 to 7 (assuming Ofgem have granted Urgency)	06 March 2024 11 March 2024 13 March 2024 – cancelled 19 March 2024 28 March 2024 05 April 2024 15 April 2024 17 April 2024 Next Workgroup if needed	Final Modification Report issued to Panel to check votes recorded correctly	28 June 2024
Workgroup Consultation (5 working days)	17 April 2024 – 24 April 2024	Final Modification Report issued to Ofgem	28 June 2024
Workgroup 8 to 14 - Assess Workgroup Consultation Responses and Workgroup Vote	29 April 2024 03 May 2024 08 May 2024 13 May 2024 20 May 2024 24 May 2024 30 May 2024	Ofgem decision	30 September 2024
Workgroup Report issued to CUSC dot box	03 June 2024	Implementation Date	01 April 2025
Workgroup Report presented to Special Panel (Panel agree Workgroup report has met its Terms of Reference)	07 June 2024		