

CMP331

27 March 2023

Online Meeting via Teams



Objectives and Timeline

Paul Mullen - National Grid ESO Code Administrator

Timeline for CMP331 V4 as at 9 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	27 March 2023	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



Review of outstanding actions

Paul Mullen - National Grid ESO Code Administrator

Review of outstanding actions

Action number	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
1	ESO	Are retrofit (fundamentally changing characteristics of plant) sites already be included in the current methodology?	10/02/2023	Closed - generic ALF would apply under the current TNUoS methodology to this plant and therefore, under the CMP331 Original, they are eligible to opt for site-specific ALF (i.e. a site-specific can always be used when a generic ALF would be applied according to the CUSC process).
2	ESO	Confirm when ESO can provide further analysis to show how TNUoS charges for existing generators would be impacted by this change.	10/02/2023	Open – planned for 17 March 2023 but to be provided 20 March 2023
3	ESO	Consider whether a step in the compliance process could be added for the User to confirm if they are seeking a site specific ALF	10/02/2023	Open – still being considered by ESO
4	ESO	Consider publishing a generic ALF calculator	10/02/2023	Closed - site specific ALF would be more complex given the number of variables and arguably is not cost or time effective at this time given how many sites are expected to seek a site specific ALF
5	Chair	Confirm revised timeline	10/02/2023	Closed – provided 17 March 2023
6	Workgroup	Review draft template for Users to complete when submitting evidence to support having a site specific ALF	24/02/2023	Open- No comments received



Review of ESO analysis to show how TNUoS charges for existing generators would be impacted by this change.

Rein de Loor - National Grid ESO



Review Workgroup Report (including clarifications sought from Workgroup)

All



Review Final Legal Text

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