

Public

# Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Workgroup Meeting 2: CM093 - Extending the principles of the User Commitment Methodology to Final Sums Methodology

**Date:** 14 October 2025

## Contact Details

Chair: Rob Hughes; robert.hughes3@neso.energy

Proposer: Steve Baker; stephen.baker@neso.energy

## Key areas of discussion

The aim of Workgroup 2 was to provide an overview of the Code Governance modification process, including raising alternatives, voting, and Workgroup members' expectations and responsibilities. For the Proposer to go through their Proposal, and to discuss further Workgroup considerations. To discuss the timeline and objectives and review the Terms of Reference.

## Objectives and Timeline

The Chair took the Workgroup members through the timeline and objectives for future Workgroup meetings and various consultations and reports. It was noted that this timeline is aligned with the [CMP417](#) modification timeline to ensure the Final Modification Reports go to Ofgem around the same time. An action was taken to add the CMP417 timeline to future Workgroup meeting slides.

## CM093 Proposal

The Proposer provided an overview of the Proposal, including the background, context, and developments seen from CMP417. They discussed the legal text that requires review, what the defect is, and explained why a change is necessary. The Proposer presented the scope and potential areas that need addressing. The Chair suggested that these could be specific topics for future Workgroup discussions, along with potential future points brought up for consideration.

Detailed areas for discussion included defining attributable works for demand, shared works triggered by generation or demand, and the transition plan for existing users to move to the new regime.

## Public

A Workgroup member raised key points about being clear in distinguishing between security and liability, acknowledging market dynamics, and ensuring the process during TOCO and TOCA stages is manageable given the increasing demand volume. An action was taken to include these points in future discussions. The Workgroup member also discussed the importance of considering wider policies and factors related to demand volume and market dynamics. The Chair stated that they would be an important consideration for the Workgroup, however they should stay within the scope of the modification, with the potential for future modifications to be raised.

## Terms of Reference (ToR)

The Chair presented the STC Panel agreed Terms of Reference and stated that the proposed discussion points will address these. The Workgroup agreed the Terms of reference without any amendments.

## AOB

A Workgroup member suggested including examples with calculations to clarify the differences between the current system and the proposed changes. The Proposer for CMP417 mentioned that for CMP417, they had already developed a process flow and were working on creating generic examples. These examples would illustrate how the proposed changes would affect projects, showing:

- What a project would be liable for under the current final sums methodology.
- What it would be liable for under the proposed user commitment methodology.
- The calculations involved in determining these liabilities.

An action was taken to provide generic examples to avoid confidentiality issues and that they should be ready by November.

## Next Steps

- An action log will be created and maintained as a standing item in future meetings.
- Code governance to begin drafting the consultation report based on the discussions and key areas of consideration.

Public

## Action log

For the full action log, click [here](#).

Action Number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
1	WG1	RH/JR	Produce a slide showing the coordinated timeline for CMP417 and CM093	WG2	Open
2	WG1	RH/JR	Add points raised during the discussion to the list of key areas for consideration. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify differences between security and liability</li> <li>Acknowledging market dynamics and related policies</li> <li>Addressing the complexity of TOCO and TOCA processes, including lead times for implementation.</li> </ul>	WG2	Open
3	WG1	MC	Provide generic examples from CMP417 to illustrate the changes and calculations.	WG2	Open

## Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Rob Hughes	RH	NESO	Chair
Jess Rivalland	JR	NESO	Technical Secretary
Steve Baker	SB	NESO	Proposer
Ben Sayah	BS	NGET	Workgroup Member Alternate
Chris Patrick	CP	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Harriet Eckweiler	HE	SHET	Workgroup Member Alternate
Martin Cahill	MC	NESO	Observer
Neil Geddes	NG	SPT	Workgroup Member Alternate
Sean Nugent	SN	NESO	Observer