

# **CMP432 Improve Locational Onshore Security Factor for TNUoS Wider Tariffs**

Workgroup 12 (07 April 2025)

Online Meeting via Teams

# WELCOME

# Agenda

Topics to be discussed	Lead
Introductions	Chair
Action Log Review	Chair
License Agreement document	Chair/NESO
Draft Workgroup Report Review	All
Terms of Reference Review	All
Any Other Business	Chair
Next Steps	Chair

Public  
**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

# Workgroup Membership

Role	Name	Company	Alternate
Chair	Sarah Williams	NESO	
Tech Sec	Prisca Evans	NESO	
Proposer	John Tindal	SSE	Damian Clough
Workgroup Member	Neil Dewar	NESO	
Workgroup Member	Tom Steward	RWE	Lauren Jauss
Workgroup Member	Ryan Ward	Scottish Power Renewables	Hector Eduardo Perez
Workgroup Member	Andrew Rimmer	Engie	Simon Lord
Workgroup Member	Paul Jones	Uniper	Sean Gauton
Workgroup Member	Alan Kelly	Corio Generation	Marc Smeed
Workgroup Member	Paul Youngman	Drax	Nina Sharma
Workgroup Member	Giulia Licocci	Ocean Winds	Nina Brundage
Workgroup Member	Binoy Dharsi	EDF	Hugh Boyle
Workgroup Member	Als Scrope	Northland Power	Emanuele Dentis / Grant Anderson
Workgroup Member	Chiamaka Nwajagu	Orsted	James Jackson
Observer	Kyle Murchie	Roadnight Taylor	Catherine Cleary
Observer	Sally Young	SSE	
Observer	Zahira Rafiq	NESO	
Observer	Loukas Papageorgiou	RWE	
Authority Representative	Sinan Kufeoglu	OFGEM	

# What is the Alternative Request?

**What is an Alternative Request?** The formal starting point for a Workgroup Alternative Modification to be developed which can be raised up until the Workgroup Vote.

**What do I need to include in my Alternative Request form?** The requirements are the same for a Modification Proposal you need to articulate in writing:

- a description (in reasonable but not excessive detail) of the issue or defect which the proposal seeks to address compared to the current proposed solution(s);
- the reasons why you believe that the proposed alternative request would better facilitate the Applicable Objectives compared with the current proposed solution(s) together with background information;
- where possible, an indication of those parts of the Code which would need amending in order to give effect to (and/or would otherwise be affected by) the proposed alternative request and an indication of the impacts of those amendments or effects; and
- where possible, an indication of the impact of the proposed alternative request on relevant computer systems and processes.

**How do Alternative Requests become formal Workgroup Alternative Modifications?** The Workgroup will carry out a Vote on Alternatives Requests. If the majority of the Workgroup members or the Workgroup Chair believe the Alternative Request will better facilitate the Applicable Objectives than the current proposed solution(s), the Workgroup will develop it as a Workgroup Alternative Modification.

**Who develops the legal text for Workgroup Alternative Modifications?** NESO will assist Proposers and Workgroups with the production of draft legal text once a clear solution has been developed to support discussion and understanding of the Workgroup Alternative Modifications.

# Timeline for CMP432 as of 3 April 2025

Pre-Workgroup	
Proposal raised	07/03/2024
Proposal submitted to Panel	22/03/2024
Workgroup Nominations	09/04/2024
Urgency Decision Granted	21/01/2025
Workgroups	
Workgroup 1	29/01/2025
Workgroup 2	05/02/2025
Workgroup 3	14/02/2025
Workgroup 4	21/02/2025
Workgroup 5	25/02/2025
Workgroup 6	27/02/2025
Workgroup Consultation	27/02/2025 – 07/03/2025
Workgroup 7	13/03/2025
Workgroup 8	20/03/2025
Workgroup 9	26/03/2025
Workgroup 10	01/04/2025
Workgroup 11	03/04/2025


# Timeline for CMP432 as of 3 April 2025

Workgroups		Key Info
Workgroup 12	07/04/2025	Review Workgroup Report
Workgroup 13	09/04/2025	Review Legal Text, Agree TOR
Workgroup 14	11/04/2025	Workgroup Vote and finalise WG report, Legal text and ToR

Post Workgroups		Key info
Workgroup Report submitted to Panel	23/04/2025	
Panel to agree whether ToR have been met	28/04/2025	Panel changed from 17th to 28th
Code Administrator Consultation	28/04/2025 – 06/05/2025	Changed instead 7 days not 5 days
Draft Final Modification Report to Panel	12/05/2025	
Panel Recommendation Vote	15/05/2025	
Final Modification to Ofgem	15/05/2025	
Decision Date	30/09/2025	
Implementation Date	01/04/2026	

# Action Log Review

Sarah Williams - NESO Code  
Administrator




# Action Log

Action	Description	Owner	Due	Status
34	Send a revised version of the Legal Text to the Workgroup. - Rebaseline	Proposer/NESO	WG13	Ongoing
39	Develop User Guide for SECULF model and present this at WG12	Revenue Team	WG12	Open


# License Agreement Document

Chair/NESO




# Draft Workgroup Report Review

All



# Terms of Reference Review

All



# CMP432 - Terms of Reference

Workgroup Term of Reference	Location in Workgroup Report (to be completed at Workgroup Report stage)
a) Consider EBR implications	
b) Consider the methodology for calculating the security factor (Locational Onshore Security Factor Section 14.15.88 – 14.15.90) and the further objectives of the Charging Methodology set out in Section 14.14.11	
c) Consider whether reinforcement with a larger capacity circuit, compared with the previous, increases the fault condition.	
d) Consider the impact of whether reinforcement is achieved by upgrading an existing circuit to a larger capacity, therefore increasing the fault condition	
e) Consider whether some types of technology require additional MITS redundancy, e.g. large inflexible conventional such as nuclear	
f) Consider and evaluate the evidence that the current Security Factor is reflective of how TOs make network reinforcement decisions	
g) Consider the scope of work identified and whether this is achievable within the timeframe outlined in the Ofgem Urgency decision letter	

# Any Other Business

Sarah Williams – NESO Code Administrator

# Next Steps

Sarah Williams – NESO Code Administrator

