

CMP456: Cost recovery for legacy plant in relation to GC0168

CMP466: CMP456 Consequential Charging Modification

Workgroup 2, 18 March 2026

Online Meeting via Teams

WELCOME

Agenda

Topics to be discussed	Lead
Introductions	Chair
Actions Review	Chair/ All
Discussion on cost-benefit analysis and impacted Generators	JR
Discussion on other costs to be added to the total model cost	TE
Alternative Request Presentation	IG
Workgroup Discussion	All
Alternative Request Vote	All
Discussion charging mechanism	TE
Timeline Review	Chair
Workgroup Consultation Discussion	All
Any Other Business	Chair
Next Steps	Chair




Modification Process

Kat Higby – NESO Code Administrator




Code Modification Process Overview



Workgroup Responsibilities and Membership

Kat Higby – NESO Code Administrator



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 – CMP456


Role	Name	Company
Proposer	Tim Ellingham	RWE
Workgroup Member	Caitlin Butchart	InterGen (Needs Schedule 1 confirmation)
Workgroup Member	Garth Garham	SSE Generation
Workgroup Member	Isaac Guitierrez	ScottishPower Renewables
Workgroup Member	Jack Purchase	NGED
Workgroup Member	Oliver Xing	Orsted
Workgroup Member	Paul Youngman	Drax
Workgroup Member	Ross Strachan	EDF-PS
Workgroup Member	Sean Gauton	Uniper
Workgroup Member	Utkarsh Agarwal	ESB Generation
Observer	Gopi Yericherla	NESO
Observer	Chris Smith	Natural Power Consultants Ltd
Authority Representative	Ghulam Haider	Ofgem

Workgroup Membership – CMP466

Role	Name	Company
Proposer	Tim Ellingham	RWE
Workgroup Member	Caitlin Butchart	InterGen (Needs Schedule 1 confirmation)
Workgroup Member	Garth Graham	SSE Generation
Workgroup Member	Isaac Guitierrez	ScottishPower Renewables
Workgroup Member	Jack Purchase	NGED
Workgroup Member	Oliver Xing	Orsted
Workgroup Member	Paul Youngman	Drax
Workgroup Member	Ross Strachan	EDF-PS
Workgroup Member	Sean Gauton	Uniper
Workgroup Member	Utkarsh Agarwal	ESB Generation
Observer	Gopi Yericherla	NESO
Observer	Chris Smith	Natural Power Consultants Ltd
Authority Representative	Ghulam Haider	Ofgem

Actions Review

Kat Higby– NESO Code Administrator



Actions

Action Number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comments	Due by	Status
1	WG 1	JR	NESO expects Users to produce retrospective EMT models only once that meets the electrical standards agreed in GC0168. Users are expected to provide model maintenance, same as the existing requirements.	Models would only need to be provided once but with maintenance for the lifetime of the plant and apparatus.	WG 2	Open
2	WG 1	JR	To provide information on how many Generators may be affected	Estimated and shared with Workgroup.	WG 2	Open
3	WG1	JR	To share material relating to PC.A.9.2.2 and how to address Licence Exemptible Embedded Medium Power Station (LEEMPS) within the Grid Code legal text	Shared with Workgroup	WG 2	Open
4	WG 1	TE	Review GC0168 to identify and classes of Users who are not CUSC parties and may therefore require an alternative cost-recovery route	LEEMPS affected as per action 3	WG 2	Open
5	WG 1	WG	To consider raising an Alternative Request to address retrospective EMT model cost recovery	Alternative raised and will be discussed and voted on during the meeting.	WG 2	Open
6	WG 1	JR	To confirm the status of the GC0168 cost-benefit analysis and whether it is published	Estimated and shared with Workgroup.	WG 2	Open


Discussion on cost-benefit analysis and impacted Generators

NESO SME




Discussion on other costs to be added to the total model cost

Proposer




Alternative Request Presentation

Isaac Gutierrez – ScottishPower Renewables



Workgroup Discussion

All



Alternative Request Vote

All



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 Original solution, 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.

Can I vote? And 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 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 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)** and submitted to the Panel and Authority alongside the Original solution for the Panel Recommendation vote and the Authority decision.


Discussion charging mechanism

Proposer



Timeline Review

Kat Higby– NESO Code Administrator



Timeline for CMP456 and CMP466 as at 25 February 2026


Pre-Workgroup		
Proposal raised	19/06/2025	
Proposal submitted to Panel	12/12/2025	
Workgroup Nominations	15/12/2025 to 08/01/2026	
Urgency Decision	16/01/2026 – Rejected	
Workgroups		
Workgroup 1	25/02/2026	Objectives and Timeline/Review and Agree Terms of Reference / Proposer presentation
Workgroup 2	18/03/2026	Solution Development / Workgroup Discussions / Legal Text review / Final Workgroup Consultation Review
Workgroup Consultation	23/03/2026 – 06/04/2026	
Workgroup 3	16/04/2026	Review of Workgroup Consultation Responses / Alternative Requests Discussion/Review Solution Position
Workgroup 4	04/05/2026	Alternative Requests Presentations and Vote (if required) / Final Workgroup Report Review / ToR Sign-off / Final Legal Text Review (WACMS legal text)

Timeline for CMP456 and CMP466 as at 25 February 2026

Post Workgroups		Key info
Workgroup Report submitted to Panel	14/05/2026	
Panel to agree whether ToR have been met	22/05/2026	
Code Administrator Consultation	27/05/2026 to 17/06/2026	
Draft Final Modification Report to Panel	20/07/2026	
Panel Recommendation Vote	31/07/2026	
Final Modification to Ofgem	12/08/2026	
Decision Date	TBC	
Implementation Date	TBC	

Workgroup Consultations Review

Kat Higby – NESO Code Administrator



Any Other Business

Kat Higby– NESO Code Administrator



Next Steps

Kat Higby– NESO Code Administrator

