

CUSC Amendments Panel

Actions Arising from Meeting No. 104 Held on 27 November 2009

Present

Alison Kay	AK	Panel Chair
Bali Virk	BV	Secretary
David Smith	DS	Panel Member (National Grid Electricity Transmission)
Hêdd Roberts	HR	Panel Member (National Grid Electricity Transmission)
Jonathan Dixon (via teleconference)	JD	Ofgem Representative
Paul Mott (via teleconference)	PM	Panel Member (Users' Member)
Garth Graham	GG	Panel Member (Users' Member)
Barbara Vest	BVe	Panel Member (Users' Member)
Bob Brown	BB	Panel Member (Users' Member)
Paul Jones	PJ	Panel Member (Users' Member)
Fiona Navesey	FN	Panel Member (Users' Member)
Simon Lord	SL	Panel Member (Users' Member)

Apologies

Abigail Hall	AH	National Consumer Council
--------------	----	---------------------------

In Attendance

Alex Thomason	AT	National Grid Electricity Transmission
Sally Nicholson	SN	National Grid Electricity Transmission
Kathryn Coffin	KC	ELEXON

All presentations given at this CUSC Amendments Panel meeting can be found in the CUSC Panel area on the National Grid website: <http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Electricity/Codes/systemcode/Panel/>

1 Introductions/Apologies for Absence

2242. Apologies were received from Abigail Hall.
2243. BB confirmed that he would act on behalf of Abigail Hall as her alternate for CAPs 175/176/177/178 Panel vote.
2244. The Chair welcomed Fiona Navesey and Sally Nicholson to the CUSC Amendments Panel meeting.

2 Minutes of the Meeting held on 30 October 2009

2245. The draft minutes of the CUSC Amendments Panel meeting held on 30 October 2009, incorporating comments from GG and KC, were AGREED subject to a minor amendment and will be published on the National Grid website shortly.

Action: BV to publish on the National Grid website

3 Review of Actions

2246. Minute 2196: Major Policy Review and Self Governance – Ofgem to circulate MPR flow diagram

JD circulated to the Amendments Panel a high level diagram detailing the MPR process. JD acknowledged that the Amendments Panel would appreciate something more detailed, JD confirmed that discussions are still taking place internally at Ofgem and will continue to add detail to the process and will be looking to include a flow diagram within the Code Governance Review Final Proposals.

Action: JD to update the Amendments Panel with any changes to the MPR flow diagram - Ongoing

2247. Minute 2202: NGET to look at the provisions within the CUSC to determine if a mid term election could be held to recruit Alternate members

AT confirmed that there are currently no provisions within the CUSC to allow Alternate Members to be elected to the Panel outside of the Election process of Users' Panel Members. This includes the process for filling vacancies if a Panel Member stands down. The provisions only cover elections taking place in an election year, or upon Users' Panel Members and/or alternate Members ceasing to hold office before the expiry of the term of office. Therefore a mid-term election to elect a pool of Alternate Members is not possible under the current provisions within the CUSC.

2248. GG informed the Amendments Panel that the Governance Standing Group (GSG) had discussions on the 26 November regarding alternates and that the BSC route was discussed whereby if a BSC Panel member is unable to attend a BSC meeting they can appoint any individual to be their alternate. This individual does not need to be BSC Panel member or an elected Alternate.

2249. The GSG debated the way forward and agreed to proceed as they are and if the Amendments Panel was to need this information in the future the GSG could provide this in due course.

2250. Minute 2203, 2205 & 2207 – GSG to develop an Amendment Proposal to cover best practice for alternates' voting rights; who should be able to invite a Working Group observer to speak; and Working Group attendees

Action: Covered under Agenda item 7- Complete

2251. Minute 2213: NGET to produce Key Performance Indicators for November CUSC Amendments Panel

Action: Covered under Agenda item 4 - Complete

2252. Minute 2217 – NGET and Ofgem to consider the use of “consent to modify” for future housekeeping CUSC Amendment Proposals

AT and JD confirmed that there was some interaction between the consent to modify process and the proposed route of self-governance and this will be included in the Code Governance Review Final Proposals. No further review

is proposed at this stage, pending the outcome of the Code Governance Review.

JD confirmed that the Code Governance Review Final Proposals will be published for consultation at the end of January 2010, accompanied by revised licence drafting, followed by statutory licence consultation. Implementation would therefore be more likely to be in May 2010 rather than April 2010. JD agreed to give a presentation to the Amendments Panel at the January 2010 Panel meeting on the Final Proposals consultation with the intention of the Amendments Panel discussing a potential Panel response to the Final Proposals consultation at the Amendments Panel meeting in February 2010.

Action: JD to present the Code Governance Review Final Proposals at the Amendments Panel meeting on 29 January 2010

Action: BV to add as an agenda item for February 2010 meeting - Amendments Panel response to the Code Governance Review Final Proposals

2253. Minute 2221 – All to send items to Kathryn Coffin for a Cross-code Electricity Forum

KC confirmed that discussions were held at the GSG meeting on 26 November 2009 with regards to a cross code electricity forum. KC stated that the initial thoughts were that the cross code forum would be aimed at a high level for CUSC, BSC and Grid Code. The idea was for an educational session on current changes to be held in the morning, with an opportunity for industry participants to ask any questions and discuss any issues in the afternoon. Currently, the BSC has an issues process but within the CUSC there is no formal process. The idea would be that the cross code forum would be held every other month at Elexon's premises in London, with the first meeting to be held in Spring 2010.

2254. BVe suggested that CUSC issues could be highlighted at the existing Operational Forum or Users' Seminars run by NGET. BVe also requested that the cross code electricity forum be kept informal and members of the Amendments Panel agreed. JD also agreed with this and reinforced that the cross code forum be used on an educational basis. KC agreed that the intention was for an informal education session along the lines of that recently hosted for transmission losses.

2255. PJ also asked the Amendments Panel to be mindful that a lot of this work is currently being done by the Trade Associations and that we would need to be careful that we are not duplicating what is already happening.

2256. The Amendments Panel agreed that the cross code electricity forum should be somewhere to raise informal modification proposals, and somewhere to find out what is going on, and also somewhere individuals can discuss issues.

CUSC Amendments Panel

2257. It was agreed that KC and AT would write a note, setting out thoughts for the cross code electricity forum and detailing the format of the forum, which would be circulated to the Trade Associations to invite informal feedback.¹

Action: KC and AT to produce a note to circulate to the Trade Associations for comment by 9 December 2009

2258. **2229 – NGET to consider possible Reactive Power Review**

DS updated the Amendments Panel on National Grid's view on the need for a Reactive Power Review, highlighting that CAP169 showed the potential need to review pricing structures, the need to consider the impact of a changing generation mix on reactive power provision and the way in which reactive power is provided by offshore generators. The Panel agreed a review is required and agreed to the proposal to consider this review once the Frequency Response Working Group has concluded, with the exception of any changes required to address any issues with the offshore regime. These changes should be brought forward once identified.

Action: Closed

2259. **2238 – BV to publish 2010 meeting dates for CUSC Amendments Panel on National Grid website**

BV confirmed that the dates would be published during December 2009.

2260. All other outstanding actions were completed or to be covered as an agenda item.

4 October Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

2261. AT presented to the Amendments Panel the CUSC Amendments Panel KPIs for October 2009. The KPIs were based on the discussions held at the last Amendment Panel meeting. GG asked AT to clarify the period covered by the KPI report as being up to the end of October and that the KPIs would therefore always be a month behind the Panel meeting reviewing them. AT confirmed that the proposal was to provide KPIs to cover the immediately preceding month which the Amendments Panel Members agreed to.

2262. AT went through the CUSC Amendments Panel Issues Status Report, explaining that it had been created with a view to supporting and providing some transparency to the "Issues" fields on the KPI slide. PJ stated that he felt that the Issues were a subset of the actions from the previous Panel minutes, apart from issue AP006 which refers to "Frequency Response provisions from future Interconnectors". The Amendments Panel agreed with this and that the Issues report should only list issues that are raised externally to the Panel.

Action: AT to remove AP001 to AP005 from the CUSC Amendments Panel Issue Status Report

2263. AT asked the Amendments Panel to note that BB had raised some concerns regarding the KPIs in relation to deadlines for publication of the Headline

¹ Post-meeting note: this has now been published and highlighted to Parties and trade associations (via ELEXON's Newscast, the GSG chair and the BSC Panel). A copy of the note is available from ELEXON's website [here](#).

Report and Final Minutes and had suggested that these should be reduced to 1 working day from 5 working days. BV confirmed that this was an achievable target and the KPI will be changed to reflect this.

Action: AT to change the KPIs from 5 days to 1 day for Headline Report and Final Minutes being issued

2264. FN questioned the purpose of the KPIs presented with a view to understanding whether they were designed to drive the behaviour of the code administrator, the Panel or both. A discussion ensued which concluded that certain elements of the KPIs may not be very useful and could be removed, for example, "Draft minutes issued on time". One suggestion was that the KPIs could record the total time taken for an Amendment Proposal to progress through the amendment process, split into three distinct stages; 1) from date raised to completion of the Panel Recommendation Vote; 2) from date Amendment Report sent to Ofgem for decision to date Authority decision is provided; and 3) from date Authority decision is provided to implementation date. BVe also suggested that the KPIs could detail the number of responses received to consultations.

2265. JD stated that he felt that the KPIs presented were a good step forward and that each of the industry codes should be working to KPIs, which Ofgem had highlighted through the Code Governance Review.

2266. It was agreed that a set of revised KPIs would be produced for the next Amendments Panel meeting.

Action: NGET to review the KPIs in light of the Panel discussions and present a revised set of KPIs at the next Panel meeting

5 Applicable CUSC Objectives for Panel Recommendation Vote: A recap

2267. In recognition of a new Panel Member joining the Amendments Panel and that this meeting includes a Panel Recommendation Vote, AT gave a presentation recapping on the Applicable CUSC Objectives. PJ noted that the presentation had been useful in providing some clarity over how certain Amendment Proposals of a governance nature could be seen to better meet the Applicable CUSC Objectives. Details of the presentation can be found at the link on the first page of these minutes.

6 New Amendment Proposals

2268. There were no new amendment proposals.

7 Working Groups/Standing Groups Reports

2269. Governance Standing Group

GG, chair of the GSG, confirmed that a meeting had taken place on 26 November 2009. GG confirmed that NGET had revised its report templates to include implementation dates and transitional arrangements. Also the cross code forum for electricity was debated and is detailed under minute 2253. GG informed the Amendments Panel that NGET has drawn up a new

Amendment Proposal which covers five governance elements which were raised by either the GSG or the Amendments Panel. NGET has some updates to make to this which will then be circulated to GSG members for comment. As part of this process, NGET has also drafted a trial Initial Written Assessment.

2270. GG also asked the Amendments Panel for approval of the GSG Terms of Reference to be updated to remove David Jones and replace with Kathryn Coffin, representing ELEXON, and to remove Carole Hook and replace with Alex Thomason, as the National Grid representative. No objections were raised in response to these changes.

Action: BV to update National Grid website with the updated Terms of Reference for GSG

2271. **Gas Insulated Switchgear/Balancing Services Standing Group/ Interconnector Frequency Response Working Group**

DS confirmed that the above Working Groups had not met since the last Amendments Panel meeting and were due to meet next in December, therefore an update will be given at the January Amendments Panel meeting.

8 CUSC Amendments Panel Vote

2272. **CAP175: Urgent Amendment proposals revisions to the process**

An issue was raised by GG regarding an element of EDF Energy's response to CAP175, dated 3 November 2009, which might have resulted from a misinterpretation of the intention of CAP175. The paragraph in question from EDF Energy's response is reproduced below:

"We note that one aspect of this new proposal makes clear that requests for urgency in respect of a new CUSC amendment proposal can come from any CUSC party or Consumer Focus, not just from the Party who raised the amendment proposal. We consider this to be an improvement against baseline as the existing restriction does not have any obvious justification; if others wish to make a case that a new modification proposal fits the criteria for Urgency, and the actual proposer for whatever reason has not made the case, then others (any CUSC party or Consumer Focus) should indeed be permitted to make the case for Urgency for consideration in the usual manner."

The Panel discussed concerns over the potential for a third party to request urgency for an Amendment Proposal for which they are not the Proposer, on the grounds that this undermines the principle that the Proposer should retain ownership of their Amendment Proposal. National Grid, as Proposer of CAP175, confirmed that the intention of the proposal was **not** that any CUSC Party or Consumer Focus could make a request for urgency for an Amendment Proposal raised by a third party. PM from EDF Energy (but not representing them at the Panel) also agreed that EDF Energy's response was due to a misinterpretation.

Subsequent to this clarification, the Panel voted unanimously that CAP175 better facilitates the achievement of Applicable CUSC Objective (a). None of the Panel voted that it better facilitates achievement of Applicable CUSC Objective (b).

CUSC Amendments Panel

The table below shows a breakdown of Panel Members' voting against the CUSC Applicable Objectives and the rationale for such votes. For ease of reference, the Objectives are reproduced here:

(a) the efficient discharge by the licensee of the obligations imposed upon it under the Act and by this licence; and

(b) 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.

Panel Member (Representation in brackets)	Better meets Applicable CUSC Objective (a)
Barbara Vest (User)	Yes. CAP175 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Bob Brown (User)	Yes. CAP175 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Bob Brown acting as alternate for Abigail Hall (Consumer)	Yes. CAP175 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Fiona Navesey (User)	Yes. CAP175 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Garth Graham (User)	Yes. Mindful, in particular, of the comments in paragraphs 1.6, 3.2 and 8.1 of the report together with consultation responses and the discussions at GSG, CAP175 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Paul Jones (User)	Yes. CAP175 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Paul Mott (User)	Yes. CAP175 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Simon Lord (User)	Yes. CAP175 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.

CUSC Amendments Panel

Panel Member (Representation in brackets)	Better meets Applicable CUSC Objective (a)
David Smith (National Grid)	Yes. CAP175 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.

2273. CAP176: Correction of errors contained in the CUSC provisions for post-implementation review for Urgent Amendment Proposals

No issues were raised with regard to CAP176. The Panel voted unanimously that CAP176 better facilitates achievement of Applicable CUSC Objective (a). None of the Panel Members voted that it better facilitates achievement of Applicable CUSC Objective (b)

The table below shows a breakdown of Panel Members' voting against the CUSC Applicable Objectives and the rationale for such votes.

Panel Member (Representation in brackets)	Better meets Applicable CUSC Objective (a)
Barbara Vest (User)	Yes. CAP176 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Bob Brown (User)	Yes. CAP176 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Fiona Navesey (User)	Yes. CAP176 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Garth Graham (User)	Yes. Mindful, in particular, of the comments in paragraphs 1.6, 3.2 and 8.1 of the report together with consultation responses, CAP176 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Paul Jones (User)	Yes. CAP176 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Paul Mott (User)	Yes. CAP176 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Simon Lord (User)	Yes. CAP176 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.

CUSC Amendments Panel

Panel Member (Representation in brackets)	Better meets Applicable CUSC Objective (a)
Bob Brown acting as alternate for Abigail Hall (Consumer)	Yes. CAP176 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
David Smith (National Grid)	Yes. CAP176 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.

2274. CAP177: Removal of CUSC Amendments Panel's ability to raise Amendment Proposals

No issues were raised with regard to CAP177. The Panel voted unanimously that CAP177 better facilitates achievement of Applicable CUSC Objective (a). None of the Panel Members voted that it better facilitates achievement of Applicable CUSC Objective (b).

The table below shows a breakdown of Panel Members' voting against the CUSC Applicable Objectives and the rationale for such votes.

Panel Member (Representation in brackets)	Better meets Applicable CUSC Objective (a)
Barbara Vest (User)	Yes. CAP177 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Bob Brown (User)	Yes. CAP177 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Fiona Navesey (User)	Yes. CAP177 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Garth Graham (User)	Yes. Mindful, in particular, of the comments in paragraphs 1.6, 3.3 and 8.1 of the report together with consultation responses and the discussions at GSG, CAP177 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Paul Jones (User)	Yes. CAP177 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Paul Mott (User)	Yes. CAP177 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.

CUSC Amendments Panel

Panel Member (Representation in brackets)	Better meets Applicable CUSC Objective (a)
Simon Lord (User)	Yes. CAP177 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Bob Brown acting as alternate for Abigail Hall (Consumer)	Yes. CAP177 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
David Smith (National Grid)	Yes. CAP177 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.

2275. CAP178: Amendment to the process for the approval of CUSC Amendments Panel meeting minutes when a Amendments Panel meeting has been cancelled

No issues were raised with regard to CAP178. The Panel voted unanimously that CAP178 better facilitates achievement of Applicable CUSC Objective (a). None of the Panel Members voted that it better facilitates achievement of Applicable CUSC Objective (b).

The table below shows a breakdown of Panel Members' voting against the CUSC Applicable Objectives and the rationale for such votes.

Panel Member (Representation in brackets)	Better meets Applicable CUSC Objective (a)
Barbara Vest (User)	Yes. CAP178 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Bob Brown (User)	Yes. CAP178 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Fiona Navesey (User)	Yes. CAP178 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Garth Graham (User)	Yes. Mindful, in particular, of the comments in paragraphs 1.3, 3.2 and 8.1 of the report together with consultation responses, CAP178 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Paul Jones (User)	Yes. CAP178 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.

CUSC Amendments Panel

Panel Member (Representation in brackets)	Better meets Applicable CUSC Objective (a)
Paul Mott (User)	Yes. CAP178 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Simon Lord (User)	Yes. CAP178 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
Bob Brown acting as alternate for Abigail Hall (Consumer)	Yes. CAP178 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.
David Smith (National Grid)	Yes. CAP178 would better facilitate Applicable CUSC Objective (a) by improving the efficiency of the procedures in place for modification of the CUSC.

2276. The CUSC Amendments Panel agreed for the draft Amendment Reports for CAPs 175, 176, 177 and 178 to be updated to reflect the voting and circulated to the CUSC Amendments Panel for review prior to submission to Ofgem.

Action: NGET to update Amendment Reports with the voting and circulate to Amendments Panel and then final submission to the Authority

9 Authority Decisions

2277. The Amendments Panel noted that the Authority had approved the following CUSC Amendment Proposals on 19 November 2009.

2278. **CAP173 – Reactive Power Market Tender Process**

This Amendment Proposal looks to amend a section of the CUSC following a review of the reactive power market tender process as set out in Schedule 3. More specifically the proposal seeks to condense the timescales associated with various elements of the reactive power market tender process as prescribed in Clause 3 of Schedule 3 so as to reduce the overall tender process from 26 weeks to 14 weeks. **Implementation date: 1 April 2010**

CAP174 – Amendment to Exhibit B to require provision of location of proposed Offshore Connection Site

Following “Go-Active” of the Offshore regime on 24 June 2009, it was noted that the application form contained within Exhibit B to the CUSC (for a directly connected Power Station, Non-Embedded Customer or Distribution System directly connected to the National Electricity Transmission System) does not require an Applicant to provide the specific location of the Offshore Connection Site. It is proposed to amend Exhibit B to require an Applicant to provide the longitude and latitude of the proposed Connection Site.

GG asked when this Amendment Proposal would be implemented, given that the Authority's implementation notice had not included a specific date. AT confirmed that it had been implemented on **24 November 2009**.

10 Update on Industry Codes

2279. **Elexon.** KC gave the Amendments Panel an update on the Transmission Losses modification P229, which is currently out for consultation. ELEXON had identified an issue with the Transmission Losses Multipliers (TLMs) which was delaying publication of these TLMs. ELEXON sent a note to the industry on Wednesday 25 November detailing this and in the meantime ELEXON have worked out where the error is, so will endeavour to put things back into order. Consultation is due to close on 3 December 2009 and an update will be given to the BSC Panel at the December meeting.²
2280. BSC Offshore modifications have been approved (P237 and P238). There are still two further BSC Offshore modifications currently still out to consultation.
2281. **Grid Code update.** DS informed the Amendments Panel that Nick Morris from NGET gave a presentation to the Grid Code Review Panel on the European National Transmission System Operator Electricity (ENTSO-E) and asked Panel Members if they would like Nick Morris to present this at the Amendments Panel meeting in January which the Amendments Panel agreed to.

Action: DS to arrange for ENTSO – E presentation the CUSC Panel on 29 January 2010

2282. **SO Incentives update.** DS informed Panel Members that an industry workshop was held on 10 November at National Grid's offices in Wokingham to discuss the SO Incentives initial proposals with the industry. The presentations were videoed and have been posted on the internet. To see the presentations, please go to:
<http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Electricity/soincentives/IndustryWork/>
2283. **Ofgem.** JD informed the Amendments Panel that the Code Administrators Working Group (CAWG) are due to meet on 4 December 2009 to review the draft Code of Practice.

12 AOB

2284. There was no AOB discussed.

13 Date of Next Meeting

2285. The next meeting is scheduled for 18th December 2009, at National Grid House, Warwick Technology Park, Gallows Hill, Warwick, CV34 6DA.

² Post-meeting note: the issue has been resolved, and the TLMs are now published on ELEXON's website [here](#). Due to the delay in publication, the consultation period has been extended to 11 January 2010.