

Embedded Capacity Request DCUSA Subgroup Meeting 03

08 December 2025 at 13:00

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Frasier Gascoigne (FG)	NPg
Paul Bennet (PB)	Centrica
Julie Richmond (JR)	SPEN
Christopher Ibeh (CI)	NESO
Conner Reid (CR)	SPEN
Peter Douglass (PD)	Ethical Power
Pat Brown (PT)	CIMple Data
Chavdar Ivanov (CI)	griddigit
Code Administrator	
Andy Green	Chair
Apologies	
None	N/A

1. Administration

Recording

- 1.1 The Chair advised members that this meeting will be recorded. The purpose of this recording is purely to aid the Technical Secretariat in producing an accurate report of the meeting. The recording will be deleted once these minutes have been approved.

Competition Law Guidance and Terms of Reference

- 1.2 The Working Group reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance” and “Terms of Reference”. All subgroup members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair set out that the purpose of the meeting was to review the ECR change requests that have been raised by NESO and The LTDS CIM project and then agree on next steps.

3. Review of LTDS/CIM ECR Change request.

- 3.1 The Subgroup started to review the Ethical Power ECR change request; this can be found within **Attachment 1 Embedded Capacity Register (ECR)-Change-Request-Notice_ LTDS CIM.**
- 3.2 The Chair invited PB to walk the Subgroup through the ECR change request. PB advised that the LTDS licence obligations request that Distributors share their grid models 5 years into the future, largely from the standpoint of providing an infrastructure on which load data, or load forecast data can be supplied.
- 3.3 PB advised that the desire however will be to get a picture of 2, 3 or 4 years from now, including generation.
- 3.4 PB noted that industry parties raised concerns on the forward view due to their planning models not really including this kind of information so far out for accepted to connect connection requests.
- 3.5 PB advised that a suggestion had been made to use the accepted to connect information that the Distributors are already publishing in the embedded capacity register as the information that would provide the 2, 3, 4 etc future view of generation.
- 3.6 It was noted that this could be accomplished by simply adding another column to the ECR that captures the grid location at which this reference generation is anticipated to connect.
- 3.7 The assumption then was that there would be a connectivity node defined in the LTDS future model, and it would be that connectivity node that the ECR would draw attention to.
- 3.8 FG stated that he agreed that the connectivity node would be the identifier but did go on to state that there could be concerns for the ID and data elements to this approach, particularly around how the IDs are assigned as some IDs are fixed, others can be interchangeable.
- 3.9 PB acknowledged this concern and advised there are already conversations on this within the LTDS/CIM working group, and that the goal is persistence, meaning then that the ECR users wouldn't

be continually modifying MRID identifiers of the connectivity node to which the generation was going to connect.

- 3.10 FG said the issue he had wasn't really the model changing in itself, but how the software would interact with the data, especially if the data was changing/updated over time.
- 3.11 FG went on to suggest that as long as there was a valid link that enabled users to link between the CIM model and the ECR, e.g. a foreign ID, but within a users own CIM model, as long as it was linked internally and was consistent within that Distributor, that could be a solution.
- 3.12 JR advise that they agreed with the ECR change request broadly but went on to say that it would be better to wait until the output from the LTDS/.CIM project was better understood and known to avoid Distributors working towards one approach which could potentially change significantly if the project needed to change course.
- 3.13 JR also noted that the LTDS CIM files will only be updated once or twice a year however the ECR is monthly and so that's another area that would need to be considered.
- 3.14 PB went on to say that the DNO representatives that are on the LTDS SIM working group are already focused on stage two and there is there is a work stream that's set up to deal with the question of future models and the ECR connections to them.
- 3.15 PB suggested that maybe bringing this request back to the DCUSA ECR subgroup in 2026 around February, once full clarity can be given, would be the best step to take.
- 3.16 The DCUSA ECR subgroup agreed with this approach but noted that they were appreciative that this had been raised for review now, so they have some idea and visibility of what the LTDS/CIM project seeking to deliver.
- 3.17 That concluded the review of the LTDS/CIM ECR change request.

4. Review of NESO ECR Change Request

- 4.1 The Chair noted that this ECR change request had been reviewed previously and this was the final opportunity to review before issuing the request to contract managers. This ECR Change Request can be found within **Attachment 2 Embedded Capacity Register (ECR)-Change-Request-Notice_NESO**
- 4.2 JR noted that the request didn't necessarily follow the format that they were expecting, and that they were of the opinion to keep it as it is, unless there is a general consensus that actually every DNO is going to change to a standard format.
- 4.3 They went on to note that there may not be much value in a Distributor following this approach, if the others didn't.
- 4.4 JR went on to state that they believed some Distributors already use the unique ID that they provide as a reference point and that they wouldn't want to create an unnecessarily impacts unless there's a standard format agreed by all DNOS which would to be implemented.

- 4.5 CI and FG stated that they agreed with these comments and the ECR change request would consider them.
- 4.6 CI then raised the second element of this ECR change request which was in relation to the GSP lookup table. It was noted that this element of the NESO ECR change request had been reviewed and was ready to be issued.
- 4.7 JR noted that their organisation would be publishing a GSP reference table probably early next year, so the only issue was where there are multiple GSP names, they are not historically for Scottish Power separated by a comma.
- 4.8 JR proposed that maybe change that to just capture a standard delimiter, because they believed that if there's a standard delimiter, then NESO should be able to take that and do what they needed with it.
- 4.9 JR said that the delimiter hadn't been landed on yet, but a hyphen, forward slash or back slash would work rather than a comma.
- 4.10 CI agreed this would be helpful and included in the ECR change request.
- 4.11 That concluded the review the for the NESO ECR change request.

5. Next Meeting

- 5.1 It was agreed to reconvene meetings ad-hoc when new ECR change requests are raised.
- 5.2 It was noted that the February SIG meeting may be used to review how the CIM has progressed.

6. Any Other Business

- 6.1 CI raised that they'd had some challenges with the November ECR publication from NGED as it hadn't been updated on the website and they'd not been able to communicate with any at NGED on when this would be remedied.
- 6.2 The chair advised he would send CI the contract managers contact details for NGED in order for this to be raised with them.

DCUSA