

Meeting Summary

CISG Sub-Group - Connections strategic change & impact to CUSC (Meeting #8)

Date: 19/12/2023 **Location:** MS Teams
Start: 2:00pm **End:** 3:30pm

Participants

Attendee	Company	Attendee	Company
Camille Gilsean (CG)	ESO (Chair)	Alison Price (AP)	ESO (Tec Sec)
Joseph Henry (JH)	ESO (Tec Sec)	Will Kirk-Wilson (WKW)	ESO
Paul Mullen (PM)	ESO (Presenter)	Helen Stack (HS)	Centrica
Grace March (GM)	Sembcorp	Andrew Colley (AC)	SSE
Alex Ikonic (AI)	Orsted	Paul Jones (PJ)	Uniper
Lisa Waters (LW)	Waters Wye	Precious Nwokoma (PN)	Fred Olsen renewables
Dennis Gowland (DG)	Research Relay	Suzanne Law (SL)	SSE
Deborah MacPherson (DMP)	Scottish Power	Claire Hynes (CH)	RWE
Joe Colebrook (JC)	Innova	Alex Howison (AH)	Low Carbon
Ciaran Fitzgerald (CF)	Scottish Power	Liam Cullen (LC)	Ofgem

Please note: These notes are produced as an accompaniment to the slide pack, [link here](#):

Introduction and ways of working – CG

CG introduced the meeting. CG noted that the plan was to close connections subgroup in January. CG recapped the scope of the group with members. Focus to provide updates on 5PP, signpost to Connections Reform and to identify gaps within the CUSC.

Actions Log – AP

AP introduced the actions log. WKW, PM and CG here for support.

Updates on the actions were provided in the pack ahead of the meeting.

Action 25: Split out applications into new and mod apps.

ESO confirmed that they can and will do this, starting next year. **Action closed.**

Action 26: Data Quality.

CG has fed issue back into the business. AP advised that the ESO updates the TEC register twice a week and have a monthly audit. ESO are looking into how data can be improved in connections reform. Members advised to flag through dot boxes and account managers. LW asked if this would include the DNO holdings and application. CG said this is dealt with in a separate action. **Action closed.**

Action 32: BESS non-firm participation in Markets.

AP advised that for frequency, this is to be confirmed; stability midterm (Y-1) can participate (customers can refer to rules). Capacity Markets dialogue ongoing with DESNZ. **Action closed.**

Action 33: ESO frequency response team

Comments from group have been fed back to relevant FR teams, more info in action 38. **Action closed.**

Action 36: when will queue form part of TEC register and why ESO cannot share positions.

This is currently being explored with legal in regard to license and confidentiality conditions. CG suggested to close this as this will be picked up by the Agora route. LW asked whether the ESO has asked Ofgem for a license change. CG said this was with ESO legal before being raised with Ofgem. LW asked if legal advice would be shared. WKW said the concern was around data protection act. WKW said he was unsure as to whether we had spoken to Ofgem but there is a desire to share without risking contravention of DPA. DMC asked if parties are connecting on a non-firm basis where there is a queue, that the information would be provided to those parties. WKW said it was more akin to the TEC registers as it is the published data as per a connection date. WKW stated we are working with Ofgem to share this but compliance was a concern. **Action closed.** LW said CISG subgroup need to understand barriers to help ESO with their removal.

Action 37: Demand register

Work is ongoing to make a demand register but it will likely require a code change. This is being reviewed internally by ESO. A member stated that they had two calls this week with customers who want to increase exit capacity but unsure of their interaction with the current queue. Ofgem have said they want to prioritise demand connections but it is difficult to understand position from exit capacity and whether these customers would go to the back of the queue. Needs some explanation around interactions between Generation and Demand. Feedback taken on board and will be shared with connections teams who deal with the TEC register. LW asked had she missed comms on this. WKW advised that he was unsure. **Action to feedback comments received to relevant team in Connections – this action has now been completed with the comment fed back to the relevant Connections team**

Action 38: Confirm which services, firm and non-firm can participate in.

AP advised parties can participate in any reserve and response market but if you are part of an ANM then this would need to be assessed. HS mentioned that there are increasing ANM schemes across the country and wanted to know if there is any guidance on what level of ANM is acceptable and whether the ESO could cope on a case by case basis. Doesn't think this makes situation any clearer. CG advised that product teams engaged on the case by case basis point and this is our position as of today. This may change as get more of an understanding about impacts to the system. WKW advised that for accelerated storage there was an expectation that they are given guidance on availability level (circa 90-95% availability – WKW couldn't confirm exact figure in meeting). Accelerated storage cannot do frequency process but desire for this to happen in future. **Action closed.**

Action 39: Impact of TEC amnesty.

Connections will do a summary in Q4 2024 at the agora. Action Closed.

Action 40: Queue Management webinars

These have been set up and are being held in December and January. **Action closed.**

Action 41 – Transition plan for CISG

Slide in deck, action closed.

Action 42: CMP298 Expected Decision Date

Ofgem date of 12th December not met, expected early January. JC said it was mentioned at CUSC panel but cannot comment any further. Ofgem currently under seasonal moratorium so cannot issue anything further until January 2024. **Action Closed**

Action 43 – CMP298 Implementation Group

AP advised that due to extended decision date and inflight modification, and reconvening the group wasn't seen as a necessity. GSP technical limits developed by ENA 3PP and does not form part of CMP298. JC said this answered his question – was more around the scenario where CMP298 was not approved. GM asked if implementation group could be kept up to date **Action to reach out to Connections lead on CMP298 (19/12 – this action has been completed with the ask reiterated to Emily Watson).**

WKW pointed out Appendix G process has been in place for many years. Working with ENA working on TEC limits. CMP298 not contingent on this. LC from Ofgem mentioned that moratorium has delayed the publication as it wasn't deemed an urgent modification. Ofgem cannot comment further. **Action Closed.**

Action 44: Two Step Offer Process/CPAs

Group advised that aim was to update customer agreements. Every customer updated in England and Wales – work to mirror in Scotland ongoing. CPA is live process which will continue to evolve. JC suggested that something along these lines is highlighted in the next Agora. AP advised this was done at the last Agora. JC did not attend. LW stated that the Agora is somewhat chaotic. Questions are split between chat and other functions. This makes Agora a not optimal and sometimes repetitive forum. LW suggested that ESO should think about how to improve Agora internally as it is not currently user friendly. Sli.do was suggested as a better way to do this. Operational Transparency Forum (OTF) is a good example.. PM confirmed that we are looking at a better approach to handling Q&A as agreed it was difficult to follow the questions and answers in the chat and will take back the point to avoid repetitive content.. DG agrees Agora is not working and observes that the Q&As should be published to avoid repetition and improve efficiency. PM said Q&As from the Agora on 13 December 2023 would be published and would take on board the suggestion to publish on a rolling basis. HS said much of the Agora could mimic OTF in many ways. ESO could replicate as it would help users. LW said all ESO meetings should be in the ESO calendar. CG has raised this.

Additional questions submitted prior to meeting:

Should non-firm connections pay less TNUoS?

AP stated that this should go to TCMF as opposed to CISG connections subgroup as it is a Section 14 charging issue. JC to take to TCMF in January, potentially as AOB.

LIFO method and management of the LIFO stack by the Control Room

Non-firm will mimic LIFO. Details to be worked out by Project Team and will be communicated in due course.

Transition Plan - CG

CG shared slide showing where information can be found on connections topics when CISG subgroup concludes. Slides demonstrate this and should provide clarity. DG stated that the CISG subgroup came out of TCMF discussion where stakeholders felt TCMF was too short in length to deal with connections issues. DG also stated that CISG group has done its job and ESO have managed it well, and looks forward to seeing more connections discussions in TCMF. CG will be helping to chair TCMF moving forwards so will ensure connections updates will occur.

5PP - KP

AP directed members to agora recording for 5PP update. Slides in pack for awareness.

Connection Reform – PM

PM said that final recommendations have been published and events to share these were held on 12 (in-person) and 14 (webinar) December. Slides for the 12 December event are [here](#) and a link to the recording of the webinar is [here](#). The FAQs from the webinar will be published in January 2024.

PM summarised the final recommendations for the reformed connections process. He firstly noted that currently a developer can apply anytime to connect their project to the transmission system but under the reformed process, developers can only apply within a designated window, which means we can produce a more coordinated design solution to meet the connection request. Secondly, 2 formal gates will be introduced to track project progression and hold developers to account. PM added that currently we have a problem with speculative applications (as arguably quite a low hurdle to apply) so we are proposing the introduction of additional application requirements (e.g. Letter of Authority required for transmission applications) at a Gate 1 and then only when a project reaches a specific milestone or Gate 2, can a developer access an earlier connection date.

The reformed process will apply to all new generation, interconnector and demand connection applications, as well as relevant projects that modify their connections application after the go live date for the new process. LW asked how demand applications would be modelled in this and PM agreed to take this away and discuss further with LW and/or customers who have approached LW for clarification.

Go live for the reformed process is 1 January 2025 and to achieve this our ambition is to raise the suite of Code changes (and seek urgent treatment) in April 2024 for what we agree is our Minimum Viable Product. PM noted that there is plenty to do before we raise changes and there are still some areas where we need to finalise our position (e.g. what is Gate 2, frequency and duration of Application Window) before we can raise these changes and important that before we do raise these we are clear on scope, have considered changes cross-code, prioritised and have pre-engaged. With this in mind, there will be 2 governance forums – Ofgem's Connections Delivery Board that provides direction and hold us all to account to deliver and a Connections Process Advisory Group, which has representation across industry, to enable industry to steer the detailed design and code modifications. Outputs from both groups will be published. PM also encouraged stakeholders to feed in their views to Connections Reform team and/or their representatives on the Connections Process Advisory Group (CPAG). He added that there will be updates at TCMF and Agoras and potentially Code Panels (CUSC and STC) to provide pre-warning of upcoming code changes. Q1 2024 will be busy and industry help will be needed to deliver. DG asked if the CPAG members list can be circulated and AP asked if members email addresses can also be shared. PM noted that CPAG membership will be published and will provide link when available and will look to see whether email addresses can also be added to this publication

Action for link to CPAG membership list to be shared with email addresses included.

Close and AOB

LW raised that parties who expect they may get revised interruptible connections dates will need to understand what the info they will be given means so they can assess probability of interruption, and asked if ESO plan to do some training on this. WKW advised this was not the plan – expectation for accelerated non storage is to get consultants in to assist. ESO will have a meeting with Users after information has been issued out to see if they have any questions. No intention for a wider workshop.

LW asked how the rest of industry would understand this, and whether industry know who is interruptible and whether parties would be trading against each other blind. WKW said he does not see ANS as different from other trading scenarios. ESO are very much for transparency but process yet to be developed. There is a desire for assumed publishing unless a good reason not to.

JC stated he attended an event with Claire Dykta and had a discussion on transparent. ESO noted potential conflict with market competition rules by sharing information about interruptions. Curtailment percentages may be able to be shared but some companies would not wish for this. Some information can skew market and could not be shared. LW stated the biggest problem is that ESO do not publish to market info on state of transmission system. Insider information is a concern. Some members opined that if all TO outages were published this would be resolved for the whole market. CG advised this has been looked at outside of this workgroup – and this is ongoing internally within the ESO. Information linked to connections specifically will be where the ESO look at the connections reform action plan in terms of granularity of data. LW asked for this to be looked at more holistically than solely connections.

ESO

Next proposed date 23rd Jan – CG on AL leave. Subgroup asked if one more session is valuable before subgroup closure. DG said he believed things were sufficiently rounded off. JC tends to agree with Dennis on this. Nothing obvious comes to mind. JC said there were other avenues for discussion so happy for this subgroup to be concluded accordingly. CG asked if anybody disagreed. No members expressed any objections.

Group advised that slides and summary to be sent out following meeting. CG said if member's minds change regarding the conclusion of this subgroup then then to reach out directly, but the assumption is that subgroup has now closed.

Meeting closed.