

Public

CMP445: Pro-rating first year TNUoS for Generators

Workgroup 10, 09 March 2026

Online Meeting via Teams

WELCOME

Agenda

Topics to be discussed	Lead
Introduction/ Recap	Chair
Timeline Update (Extension Request to Panel)	Chair
Alternative Request 3 Presentation	SSE
Legal Text Review (Alternative Request 3)	SSE
Alternative Request 3 Vote	
Next Steps	Chair
AOB	Chair

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
Proposer	Angus Armstrong	Ocean Winds
Workgroup Member	Sean Nugent	NESO
Workgroup Member	Graham Pannell	BayWa r.e.
Workgroup Member	Thibaut Cheret	Offshore Energy UK
Workgroup Member	Ryan Ward	ScottishPower Renewables
Workgroup Member	Garth Graham	SSE Generation
Workgroup Member	Archie Campbell	Zenobe Energy Limited
Workgroup Member	Marc Smeed	Corio Generation
Workgroup Member	Richard Buckland	Brockwell Energy
Workgroup Member	Mark McCabe	Boralex
NESO SME	Daniel Hickman	NESO SME
Observer	Eugenia Pascual Rodr�guez	Abei Energy
Observer	Chiamaka Nwajagu	Orsted
Observer	Kyran Hanks / Graz Macdonald	Waters Wye Associates
Authority Representative	Louis Sandiford	Ofgem

Introduction/Recap

1. New alternative received from SSE – this will be discussed and voted upon at today's meeting.
2. Legal Text for WACMs 1 and 2 have now been reviewed by NESO legal and workgroup
3. Alternative 3 Legal Text will need to be formulated and WG Report updated with outcomes of today's meeting, pending vote.
4. Extra month needed for report to go to panel. New timeline to go to CUSC Panel 27th March with Report in April.
5. WG to be held 30th March to finalise outstanding tasks and vote.
6. No delay to Ofgem decision date

Proposed New Timeline for CMP445 as of 09 March 2026


Milestone	Date	Milestone	Date
Modification presented to Panel	29 November 2024	Code Administrator Consultation	5 th May – 27 th May
Workgroup Nominations (15 business days)	1 April 2025 to 17 April 2025	Draft Final Modification Report (DFMR) issued to Panel (5 business days)	18 th June
Workgroups 1 to 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29 April 2025 – Initial discussion 20 May 2025 – Consider Legal Text and action updates 18 June 2025 – Discuss Workgroup Consultation and Draft Legal Text 15 July 2025 – Consider alternative 1, Finalise Workgroup Consultation and Draft Legal Text ready to send to industry 	Panel undertake DFMR recommendation vote	26 June 2026
Workgroup Consultation (21 business days)	25 July 2025 to 22 August 2025	Final Modification Report issued to Panel to check votes recorded correctly	29 June – 1 July 2026
Workgroups 5-11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17 September 2025 – Review Workgroup Consultation feedback 9 October 2025 – Vote on Alternative 2, Review Workgroup Report and Legal Text 3 November 2025 – Review Workgroup Report and Legal Text 1 December 2025 – Finalise Workgroup Report and Legal Text 14 January 2026 – Close off any outstanding actions and Provisional Workgroup vote 09 March – Review Alternative Request 3 30 March – Workgroup Vote 	Final Modification Report issued to Ofgem	4 July 2026
Workgroup report issued to Panel	16 th April	Ofgem decision needed by	30 September 2026
Panel sign off that Workgroup Report has met its Terms of Reference	24 th April	Implementation Date	01 April 2027

Alternative Request 3 Presentation

SSE

Initial Legal Text Review (Alternative Request 3)

SSE



Workgroup Vote on Accepting Alternative Request 3

Prisca Evans – NESO Code
Administrator

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 as outlined in the Original Proposal which the alternative seeks to address compared to the current proposed solution(s);
- the reasons why the 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.

What is the Alternative Vote?

To participate in any votes, Workgroup members need to have attended at least 50% of meetings. 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)

Stage 1 – Alternative Vote

- Vote on whether Workgroup Alternative Requests should become Workgroup Alternative CUSC/ STC Modifications.
- The Alternative vote is carried out to identify the level of Workgroup support there is for any potential alternative options that have been brought forward by either any member of the Workgroup OR an Industry Participant as part of the Workgroup Consultation.
- **Should the majority of the Workgroup OR the Chair believe that the potential alternative solution may better facilitate the CUSC/ STC objectives than the Original then the potential alternative will be fully developed by the Workgroup with legal text to form a Workgroup Alternative CUSC modification (WACM)/ STC modification (ASM)** and submitted to the Panel and Authority alongside the Original solution for the Panel Recommendation vote and the Authority decision.

What is the Workgroup Vote?

To participate in any votes, Workgroup members need to have attended at least 50% of meetings. 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)


Stage 2 – Workgroup Vote

- 2a) Assess the original and Workgroup Alternative (if there are any) against the relevant Applicable Objectives compared to the baseline (the current code)
- 2b) Vote on which of the options is best.

Alternate Requests cannot be raised after the Stage 2 – Workgroup Vote

Next Steps

Prisca Evans– NESO Code
Administrator



Next Steps

Step	Date
Workgroup Report review	Wednesday 11 th March – Wednesday 18 th March
Timeline request to CUSC Panel	27 th March
WG 11 – Sign off Report and Vote	30 th March
WG Report sent to CUSC Panel	16 th April
CUSC Panel	24 th April

Any Other Business

Prisca Evans– NESO Code
Administrator

