

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Meeting name: CMP434 & CM095 Workgroup 10

Date: 20/06/2024

Contact Details

Chair: **Claire Goult** Claire.Goult@nationalgrideso.com

Proposer: **Graham Lear** graham.lear@nationalgrideso.com

Key areas of discussion

The key areas for discussion in Workgroup 10 were:

- Gate 2 Criteria - Forward Looking QM Milestones
- Gate 1 and Gate 2 Offer Content
- DFTC Gate 1 outcome and Gate 2 offer

The Chair noted quoracy and began the workgroup.

Gate 2 Criteria - Forward Looking QM Milestones Part 1

The ESO shared some slides containing worked examples of how projects will pass Queue Management Milestones. A Workgroup member noted that it is highly unlikely for a DNO to reject an application that is actively progressing through the planning process, to which the ESO agreed. A Workgroup member asked to look at exemptions again as they may be too lax. A Workgroup member stated that they feel only M1 should be forward looking, not M2 and M3+. Multiple Workgroup members stated that forward looking M2 would be better, due to easier ESO cancellation of projects. A Workgroup member stated that further milestones, i.e. M4-M8, should remain backwards looking.

A Workgroup member stated that if the queue were to half to 350 GW, then GB planning departments would struggle to process 350 GW of forward planned projects. A Workgroup member asked how Distribution projects work with these timelines, a DNO SME stated that Distribution projects will aim to mirror Transmission connected projects. Multiple Workgroup members stated that forward looking milestones would struggle to cater for projects with longer connection dates.

One Workgroup member noted that planning and land milestones should be done sequentially, rather than in parallel, to minimise the risk of a project being removed from the queue. A Workgroup member asked if any milestones would guarantee that TOs would start working on consenting a planned project. A Workgroup member asked for a clause to say that the ESO has the right to remove a project that has exhausted its appeals, based on technology types.

Multiple Workgroup members stated that planning dates 10+ years in the future are always speculative, and that it is queue position being secured in this scenario. Another Workgroup member stated that further out dates should be more solid, as TOs have more time to prepare for consenting. A Workgroup member stated that this process is at risk of setting up projects with longer connection

dates for failure, due to these projects losing town and county planning after 3 years, then being removed from the queue due to having no planning permission.

Gate 1 and Gate 2 Offer Content

The ESO presented their solution on Gate 1 offer content. Several Workgroup members noted that as Gate 1 is not a firm offer, they would be unable to make financial decisions based on the offer. The purpose of Gate 1 was also queried; it was confirmed that Gate 1 is designed to provide an indicative connection date and location based on meeting Gate 2 in a timely manner, and that Gate 1 is beneficial for TO network planning as they can use the projects who have a Gate 1 offer to plan their networks. Workgroup members stated that they believe Gate 1 will cause the ESO a lot of issues with resourcing, without much benefit.

The ESO shared what is contained within a Gate 2 offer. A Workgroup member stated that the ESO should confirm whether additional uncertainty clauses, which have been appearing in offers recently, will remain in NGET offers. This Workgroup member also asked for the ESO to consider doing duplication checks on LoAs to avoid developers buying LoAs off each other. Workgroup members noted that it would be useful to have visibility of the connections queue, specifically relating to other projects which have been given contracts to connect to the same points of the network.

DFTC Gate 1 outcome and Gate 2 offer

The ESO shared slides on Gate 1 and 2 DNO offers and Indicative dates. A Workgroup member asked if the numbers shown in table 4 are contracted or non-contracted, the ESO answered that these numbers are non-contracted. A Workgroup member asked for the contracted numbers to be published alongside the non-contracted, and for names of projects to be attached to submissions. A Workgroup member asked for a Transmission version of the DFTC to be published, so that developers can see what the ESO expects to join the Transmission network.

Actions and Query Log

The Chair shared the action log, noting that no actions have been closed. The Chair then showed the new actions that are to be added to the action log.

Actions

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
11	WG2	All	Add agenda time to respond to papers provided by Workgroup members	Ongoing	WG4	Open
13	WG2	ALL	Workgroup to propose what they think could change in their application between Gate 1 and Gate 2		TBC	Open
15	WG4	JH	Consider alignment of crown estate invitation to tender and auction timing		TBC	Open
16	WG5	RW/GL	Look into where STC changes for CNDM should be located within main body of STC and STCPs	Later WG		Open
17	WG5	FP	Are the duplication checks at Gate 2 against projects who are	Later WG		Open

			within the Gate 2 applicants pool of that period, Gate 2 applicants that are yet to accept their offer, or/and applicants who have accepted their Gate 2 offer		
20	WG6	JN/AQ	Consider legal perspective on NESO designation	TBC	Open
21	WG6	MO	Update/develop slides presented based on Workgroup feedback	TBC	Open
22	WG6	JH	Consider if an impact assessment by the ESO on the proposed solution is achievable within the current timescales	TBC	Open
23	WG7	LH	Clarify the ESO Position as to why the capacity reallocation process is out of scope for CMP434	TBC	Open
24	WG7	MO	Consult ESO legal team to consider using existing legal definitions for clarification (substantial modification) and reconsider terminology being used (material/significant/allowable)	TBC	Open
25	WG7	LH/SG	Update on the Technology Change Policy Paper and consider request to share prior to consultation	TBC	Open
26	WG7	SMEs	Provide a list of policy documents envisaged for TMO4+ and for which details are not within scope of CMP434 (e.g.CNDM). Also provide a list of their contents/principles the documents are using if not available for the WG consultation	TBC	Open
27	WG9	AP/KS	Take Workgroup feedback to ENA regarding the name of the DFTC methodology document – consider renaming to provide clarification	TBC	Open
28	WG9	AP/KS	DFTC document – Provide answers to the following questions – Who approves the document, who can change it, who follows it and who can challenge it (the route to challenge specifically)	TBC	Open
29	WG9	MO/AQ	In terms of the 3 year long stop cancellation of sites/capacity provide detail to what element of the CUSC is being referenced	TBC	Open

			and how this is envisaged to work?		
30	WG9	AQ	To explain how the dispute process will fit into the statutory approach (legal route)	TBC	Open
31	WG9	MO	More detail requested by Workgroup to make a judgement on Connection Point and Capacity Reservation (including offshore)	TBC	New
32	WG10	MO	Clarify TO/ESO in terms of CNDM and what would get into the Gate 1 offer	TBC	Open
33	WG10	KS	To clarify, if the ESO decides not to have forward-looking milestones after M1, would DNO's change there's or will they continue to be forward looking for all the others	TBC	New
34	WG10	PM	Review the four slides to address points from GG (clarity and colouring of text suggestions) and TC to review the dates are correct	TBC	New
35	WG10	AC/AQ	ESO to confirm whether additional uncertainty clauses (which have been appearing in offers recently) will remain	TBC	New
36	WG10	AC/AQ	ESO to consider doing duplication checks on LoAs given info received today on G1 offers, to avoid buying LoAs off each other.	TBC	New
37	WG10	AC/AQ	To confirm Gate 1 contracts are formal binding contracts and clarify terminology accordingly	TBC	New

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Claire Gault	CG	Code Administrator, ESO	Chair
Lizzie Timmins	LT	Code Administrator, ESO	Chair
Andrew Hemus	AH	Code Administrator, ESO	Tech Sec
Stuart McLarnon	SM	Code Administrator, ESO	Tech Sec
Graham Lear	GL	ESO	Proposer
Joe Henry	JH	ESO	Proposer
Alex Curtis	AC	ESO	ESO SME

Alison Price	AP	ESO	ESO SME
Angela Quinn	AQ	ESO	ESO SME
Paul Mullen	PM	ESO	ESO SME
Lee Wilkinson	LW	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Alex Ikonic	AI	Orsted	Workgroup Member
Allan Love	AL	Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Member
Andrew Yates	AY	Statkraft	Workgroup Member
Andy Dekany	AD	NGV	Workgroup Member
Anthony Cotton	AC	Green Generation Energy Networks Cymru Ltd	Workgroup Member
Bill Scott	BS	Eclipse Power Networks	Workgroup Member
Brian Hoy	BH	Electricity North West Limited (ENWL)	Workgroup Member
Callum Dell	CD	Invenergy	Workgroup Member
Claire Hynes	CH	RWE Renewables	Workgroup Member
Claire Witty	CW	Scottish Power Energy Networks	Workgroup Member
Deborah MacPherson	DM	Scottish Power Renewables	Workgroup Member
Ed Birkett	EB	Low Carbon	Workgroup Member
Garth Graham	GG	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member
Grant Rogers	GR	Qualitas Energy	Workgroup Member
Greg Stevenson	GS	SSEN Transmisson (SHET)	Workgroup Member
Helen Snodin	HS	Fred Olsen Seawind	Workgroup Member
Helen Stack	HES	Centrica	Workgroup Member
Hooman Andami	HA	Elmya Energy	Workgroup Member
Joe Colebrook	JC	Innova Renewables	Workgroup Member
Kyran Hanks	KH	CUSC Panel member	Workgroup Member
Luke Scott	LS	Northern Powergrid	Workgroup Member
Magdalena Paluch	MP	NGED	Workgroup Member
Mark Field	MF	Sembcorp Energy (UK) Limited	Workgroup Member
Michelle MacDonald Sandison	MS	SSEN	Workgroup Member
Mireia Barenys	MB	Lightsourcebp	Workgroup Member
Mpumelelo Hlophe	MH	Fred Olsen Seawind	Workgroup Member

Nina Sharma	NS	Drax	Workgroup Member
Paul Jones	PJ	Uniper	Workgroup Member
Phillip Addison	PA	EDF Renewables	Workgroup Member
Ravinder Shan	RS	FRV TH Powertek Limited	Workgroup Member
Richard Woodward	RW	NGET	Workgroup Member
Rob Smith	RS	Enso Energy	Workgroup Member
Sam Aitchison	SA	Island Green Power	Workgroup Member
Zivanayi Musanhi	ZM	UK Power Networks	Workgroup Member