**Next Steps – 22 September 2021 – Last Updated 22 November 2021**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | What? | Who? | When? | Comments |
| STC | STC changes needed to be understood and developed ahead of Workgroup Report being finalised  *Determination of the transmission system capability (Planning Limit(s)) will be central to the required STC processes* | Grahame Neale, Terry Baldwin, and the Onshore Transmission Owners | STC proposal drafted and circulated by end October 2021 to the Onshore Transmission Owners (who would already have been consulted)  Grahame Neale presented findings to Workgroup 12 November 2021 and undertook to provide update w/c 15 November  Raise STC Modification to December 2021 Panel | Concern that discussions previously happened will be lost and Workgroup noted there were defined data requirements, guidance document produced pre-legal separation  Workgroup need to be comfortable that there are no showstoppers in the STC solutions that would unpick the CUSC solutions. The concept will be in the CUSC, the logic/detail will be in the STC. |
| Implementation | Break down the 24 months implementation plan into key components/deliverables | Zivanayi Musanhi, Brian Hoy, Grahame Neale, Matthew Paige-Stimson | Plan based on 8 tranches was presented at 12 November 2021 meeting – comments requested from Workgroup by 19 November 2021 (comments received from Brian Hoy) | *2 options:*   * *Update contracts as and when reviewed with a checkpoint 12 and maybe also 18 months in to identify those that haven’t been updated yet; or* * *Split into 8 tranches to spread out workload for DNOs although they can input as to which of their GSPs to prioritise e.g. if they were nearer the Materiality Trigger*   The Workgroup favoured the splitting of these into 8 tranches (publicised so clear what’s in which tranche) to avoid high peaks of workload and ensure the asks on DNOs are spread out. DNOs would also confirm their own priority Grid Supply Points so they can be picked up in the earlier tranches.  Workgroup also agreed that they would favour this implementation plan being managed by the ENA. Note that, even under CMP298, DNOs can choose whether or not GSPs are moved to the new arrangements – these need to be separately identified as part of this implementation plan.  **Need a list of GSPs where interdependency with more than 1 DNO?** |
| Planning Limit | What further clarity can we provide on Planning Limit – *i.e. make clear it is the capability of the network and only changes following reinforcement; and how the process works where the DNO /continues to make offers up to the Planning Limit but there is a Transmission connectee at the same time that the DNO are not aware of* | Grahame Neale (further updates to the Product Document)  Paul Mullen (Workgroup Report) | 5 November 2021 – discuss at 12 November 2021 meeting (added to Workgroup Report 9 November 2021) | More plain English wording in Product Document and Workgroup Report needed  *It will be for the Transmission Owners to determine how they calculate the Planning Limit and this would be part of the STC change. The CUSC change introduces the concept of a “Planning Limit”* |
| Re-Work Fee | Under what circumstances would the ESO charge a re-work fee /reject DNO submission and what is a ballpark cost for such a validation fee and indeed the application fee to set up the Transmission Impact Assessment | Grahame Neale (with Connections team) | Confirmed at 12 November 2021 meeting | Data missing/errors (Material Errors) that means e.g. the Planning Limit would be breached |
| Publication of Data | What data will be published and where and how frequently? | Paul Mullen (add to Workgroup Report) | At 12 November 2021 meeting (added to Workgroup Report 9 November 2021) | ESO will provide a monthly snapshot – not  necessarily updated monthly by DNOs though  ESO can only publish what is in the App G *– felt by some to be scope creep to publish other information and challenges previously identified to publish and keep up to date what is available.*  Concern that this may duplicate what is in the DNO Heat maps and there could well be crossover (although DNOs will make a conscious choice to provide such information to help their own customer interactions) but there will be centralised data hosted on ESO website and ESO are happy to point to latest DNO Heat maps  General comment from a Workgroup Member that some co-ordination of data would be welcome and asked if there was an ENA taskforce looking into this. Another Workgroup Member providing reassurance that as part of GC0139, the CMP298 data requirements are being fed and agreed to add the data requirements for CMP328 into this work. |
| Workgroup Alternatives | Alternative 1 - As per Original but DNO updates to Appendix G are deemed to be accepted unless ESO confirm otherwise rather than ESO Approve/Reject process | Brian Hoy to draft – **Complete but need to propose what would happen if the ESO and DNO can’t agree a resolution**  Grahame Neale (Legal text) | At 12 November 2021 meeting | This alternative proposes that a defined period (5 Working Days) is included for the ESO to dispute and then the ESO and DNO would agree a defined timescale to seek resolution. Further discussion needed on what would happen if the ESO and DNO can’t agree a resolution. |
| Workgroup Alternatives | Alternative 2 - As per Original but to remove the need for an application fee to set up the Transmission Impact Assessment or a validation fee to be charged by the ESO to DNOs to confirm requirements of Transmission Impact Assessment are met | Brian Hoy to draft – **Complete but may tweak**  Grahame Neale (Legal text) | At 12 November 2021 meeting |  |
| Workgroup Alternatives | Alternative 3 , 4 and 5 | TBC | To be written up after Alternative 1 and 2 – drafted 18 November 2021; to be presented 24 November 2021 |  |
| Workgroup Report | 1st draft to be sent to Workgroup | Paul Mullen | 5 November 2021 – issued 9 November 2021 (comments from Proposer 18 November 2021), 2nd draft issued 22 November 2021 |  |