

Response 24 – The Crown Estate Scotland

We agree with the proposals as they are set out in the consultation document and have the following specific comments to make:

- **Foundational Design Options**
 - Question 2: we agree that this is more aligned to the coordinated designs in the HND1 and HNDFUE.
- **Recommended TMO**
 - Question 15 - we agree that this aligns to Crown Estate Scotland leasing rounds and processes. The option for CES to 'reserve' grid capacity as part of leasing design will allow for smoother partnership working in offshore renewables leasing and provide certainty for prospective leasing applicants.
 - Question 17 – a key benefit of the proposal is that it aligns with our processes and means that applications would only be accepted based on our potential upcoming leasing rounds.
- **Key Customer and Technology Type Adjustments**
 - Question 23 – Yes. TMO 1-3 won't work for offshore so the best solution is TMO 4.
 - Question 24 – Yes. We agree that TMO4 works to align with future leasing processes. However, not clear whether domestic EGL interconnectors sit within this process. Please could you clarify this? It would be helpful to understand whether they either need to follow this process or are outwith this process. We can look at working closely with relevant stakeholders to develop new approaches to leasing that will achieve the intended objectives
- **Supplementary Target Model Add-ons**
 - Question 29 – for our interests in offshore renewables, we require commitment to and delivery of HND1 and HNDFUE and no new connection offers being made for offshore projects which do not hold a CES Option Agreement.