**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Workgroup Terms of Reference and Membership **TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR CMP320WORKGROUP** | |
| CMP320: Island MITS Radial Link Security Factor |
| **Responsibilities** | |

1. The Workgroup is responsible for assisting the CUSC Modifications Panel in the evaluation of CUSC Modification Proposal CMP320: Island MITS Radial Link Security Factor
2. The proposal must be evaluated to consider whether it better facilitates achievement of the Applicable CUSC Objectives. These can be summarised as follows:
   1. The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence;
   2. Facilitating effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity, and (so far as consistent therewith) facilitating such competition in the sale, distribution and purchase of electricity;
   3. Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency \*; and
   4. Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements.
3. It should be noted that additional provisions apply where it is proposed to modify the CUSC Modification provisions, and generally reference should be made to the Transmission Licence for the full definition of the term.

|  |
| --- |
| **Scope of work** |

1. The Workgroup must consider the issues raised by the Modification Proposal and consider if the proposal identified better facilitates achievement of the Applicable CUSC Objectives.
2. In addition to the overriding requirement of paragraph 4, the Workgroup shall consider and report on the following specific issues:
3. The extent to which the MITS connection is financially firm;
4. Consider the origin of the local circuit security factor and whether those principles need to be considered within the Modification;
5. Consider impacts on and interactions with SQSS;
6. Objective criteria for pulling specific circuits out of the treatment of 1.8 security factor and whether or not it impacts on the calculation of the 1.8 security factor;
7. Ensuring proposed solution doesn’t introduce undue discrimination; and
8. Confirming Panel decision that a Workgroup Consultation is not required.
9. The Workgroup is responsible for the formulation and evaluation of any Workgroup Alternative CUSC Modifications (WACMs) arising from Group discussions which would, as compared with the Modification Proposal or the current version of the CUSC, better facilitate achieving the Applicable CUSC Objectives in relation to the issue or defect identified.
10. The Workgroup should become conversant with the definition of Workgroup Alternative CUSC Modification which appears in Section 11 (Interpretation and Definitions) of the CUSC. The definition entitles the Group and/or an individual member of the Workgroup to put forward a WACM if the member(s) genuinely believes the WACM would better facilitate the achievement of the Applicable CUSC Objectives, as compared with the Modification Proposal or the current version of the CUSC. The extent of the support for the Modification Proposal or any WACM arising from the Workgroup’s discussions should be clearly described in the final Workgroup Report to the CUSC Modifications Panel.

1. Workgroup members should be mindful of efficiency and propose the fewest number of WACMs possible.
2. All proposed WACMs should include the Proposer(s)'s details within the final Workgroup report, for the avoidance of doubt this includes WACMs which are proposed by the entire Workgroup or subset of members.
3. Following the Consultation period the Workgroup is required to consider all responses including any WG Consultation Alternative Requests. In undertaking an assessment of any WG Consultation Alternative Request, the Workgroup should consider whether it better facilitates the Applicable CUSC Objectives than the current version of the CUSC.

As appropriate, the Workgroup will be required to undertake any further analysis and update the original Modification Proposal and/or WACMs. All responses including any WG Consultation Alternative Requests shall be included within the final report including a summary of the Workgroup's deliberations and conclusions. The report should make it clear where and why the Workgroup chairman has exercised his right under the CUSC to progress a WG Consultation Alternative Request or a WACM against the majority views of Workgroup members. It should also be explicitly stated where, under these circumstances, the Workgroup chairman is employed by the same organisation who submitted the WG Consultation Alternative Request.

1. The Workgroup is to submit its final report to the Modifications Panel Secretary on **28 August 2019** for circulation to Panel Members. The final report conclusions will be presented to the CUSC Modifications Panel meeting on **20 September 2019.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Membership** |

1. It is recommended that the Workgroup has the following members:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Role** | **Name** | **Representing** |
| Chairman | TBC | National Grid ESO |
| National Grid ESO Representative | Grahame Neale | National Grid ESO |
| Industry Representatives | Jennifer Geraghty  John Tindal  Paul Mott  Guy Nicholson (Alex Savvides is Alternate)  Robert Longden  Paul Jones  Simon Swiatek | SSE Generation Ltd. (Proposer)  SSE Renewables Developments (UK) Ltd  EDF Energy Limited  Statkraft UK Ltd.  Cornwall Insight Ltd  Uniper Energy  BayWa RE |
| Authority Representatives | TBC (Tim Aldridge?) | OFGEM |
| Technical secretary | TBC | National Grid ESO |
| Observers |  |  |

NB: A Workgroup must comprise at least 5 members (who may be Panel Members). The roles identified with an asterisk in the table above contribute toward the required quorum, determined in accordance with paragraph 14 below.

1. The chairman of the Workgroup and the Modifications Panel Chairman must agree a number that will be quorum for each Workgroup meeting. The agreed figure for CMP320 is that at least 5 Workgroup members must participate in a meeting for quorum to be met.
2. A vote is to take place by all eligible Workgroup members on the Modification Proposal and each WACM. The vote shall be decided by simple majority of those present at the meeting at which the vote takes place (whether in person or by teleconference). The Workgroup chairman shall not have a vote, casting or otherwise]. There may be up to three rounds of voting, as follows:

* Vote 1: whether each proposal better facilitates the Applicable CUSC Objectives;
* Vote 2: where one or more WACMs exist, whether each WACM better facilitates the Applicable CUSC Objectives than the original Modification Proposal*;*
* Vote 3: which option is considered to BEST facilitate achievement of the Applicable CUSC Objectives. For the avoidance of doubt, this vote should include the existing CUSC baseline as an option.

The results from the vote and the reasons for such voting shall be recorded in the Workgroup report in as much detail as practicable.

1. It is expected that Workgroup members would only abstain from voting under limited circumstances, for example where a member feels that a proposal has been insufficiently developed. Where a member has such concerns, they should raise these with the Workgroup chairman at the earliest possible opportunity and certainly before the Workgroup vote takes place. Where abstention occurs, the reason should be recorded in the Workgroup report.
2. Workgroup members or their appointed alternate are required to attend a minimum of 50% of the Workgroup meetings to be eligible to participate in the Workgroup vote.
3. The Technical Secretary shall keep an Attendance Record for the Workgroup meetings and circulate the Attendance Record with the Action Notes after each meeting. This will be attached to the final Workgroup report.
4. The Workgroup membership can be amended from time to time by the CUSC Modifications Panel.

|  |
| --- |
| **Appendix 1** |

Proposed CMP320 Timetable (subject to Panel agreement on Prioritisation and timescales)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **The Code Administrator recommends the following timetable:** | |
| Initial consideration by Workgroup | 23 August 2019 |
| Workgroup Consultation issued to the Industry | n/a |
| Modification concluded by Workgroup | 28 August 2019 |
| Workgroup Report issued to Panel | 28 August 2019 |
| Workgroup Report presented to Panel | 5 September 2019 |
| Code Administration Consultation issued to the Industry | 5 September 2019 |
| Code Administration Consultation closes | 12 September 2019 |
| Draft Final Modification Report issued to Panel (for 5 working days) | 13 September 2019 |
| Draft Final Modification Report presented to Panel | 20 September 2019 |
| Modification Panel decision | 20 September 2019 |
| Final Modification Report issued to the Panel (for 5 working days) | 20 September 2019 |
| Final Modification Report issued to the Authority | 27 September 2019 |
| Decision implemented in CUSC | TBC by Ofgem |