

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Meeting name: CMP434 & CM095 Workgroup 12

Date: 01/07/2024

Contact Details

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

Proposer: **Joe Henry** joseph.henry2@nationalgrideso.com

Key areas of discussion

The key areas for discussion in Workgroup 12 were:

- Gate 2 Criteria
- LoA Phase 2 – updates and implications
- DFTC Governance, Long Term Ambition and BEGAs
- Offshore Projects and LoA Equivalentents

The Chair noted quoracy and began the Workgroup.

Gate 2 Criteria

The ESO presented what is expected within Gate 2 criteria. The Workgroup debated the wording that had been selected, clarifying points around redline boundaries. A Workgroup member asked how the ESO has considered hybrid sites, like solar plus battery sites. Multiple Workgroup members asked why offshore sites are expected to take longer than onshore sites based on Workgroup provided indicative timescales, the ESO stated this is what their analysis indicates. Workgroup members asked for the ESO to share their analysis.

Offshore Projects and LoA Equivalentents

The ESO shared a slide on Offshore and Capacity Reservation, then a slide on Implications for Leasing Round Projects and OHAs. Workgroup members stated that more information on Offshore and Capacity Reservation must be presented by the ESO as these subjects have major consequences, and that safeguards must be given by the ESO to stop the CES and TCE abusing these powers. A Workgroup member stated that they believe that OHAs with generating assets in GB waters should be exempt from these powers.

A Workgroup member asked if this subject is similar to NESO Designation, the ESO answered that the subjects share similarities. Several Workgroup members stated that allowing queue reservation for 4 years is far too long. A Workgroup member stated that interconnectors need to go through this process twice, as they have to also plan the connection in the other jurisdiction/country.

LoA Phase 2 and Duplication checks

The ESO presented a slide on what their initial proposal was and how it has changed since then. A Workgroup member suggested to swap, in Gate 2, from the term LoA to Land Control to avoid

confusion with CMP427. A Workgroup member stated that the ESO should consider a method for applicants to reserve their redline boundaries while they are submitting their application. A Workgroup member stated that Network Owners should be able to share information with the ESO to assist the ESO with duplication checks, but other Workgroup members pointed out that this may cause issues with information confidentiality. A Workgroup member stated that self-certifying of redline boundaries is a poor idea, as it is quite easy for the ESO to check if any redline boundary overlaps.

Revisiting Application Window (Month 1 to Month 3)

The ESO shared a slide of how application windows have changed. Workgroup members stated that the ESO should be clearer about what the deadlines are for Gate applications. Multiple Workgroup members stated that “M1/2/3” should be renamed to “month 1/2/3”, to avoid confusion with other milestones. A Workgroup member asked if applicants could share more information after the deadline shuts, the ESO stated yes but only for clarification purposes. A Workgroup member asked for a clear list of what should be submitted in Gate 1 to be included in the Consultation.

DFTC – Considerations

The ESO shared a slide on considerations for the DFTC. Several Workgroup members asked for the DFTC to be removed from this modification as they do not feel it is necessary, whereas one Workgroup member stated DFTC needs to be in place in 2024; the ESO asked for these views to be stated in the Workgroup Consultation review. Workgroup members stated that Appendix G is a complicated process to work with. A Workgroup member asked if Action 28 would be answered by the draft of the consultation document.

Query Log

The Proposer went through the query log to address points that were added to the log previously. Queries were either marked complete or altered to better reflect what the question was asking.

Any Other Business

The ESO shared its plan for sharing the draft of the Workgroup Consultation and how the Workgroup can help shape it.

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 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	Later WG	Open
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	TBC	Open

			provide detail to what element of the CUSC is being referenced 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 this or will they continue to be forward looking for all the others	TBC	Open
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	Closed
35	WG10	AC/AQ	ESO to confirm whether additional uncertainty clauses (which have been appearing in offers recently) will remain	TBC	Open
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	Open
37	WG10	AC/AQ	To confirm Gate 1 contracts are formal binding contracts and clarify terminology accordingly	TBC	Open
38	WG11	MO	To expand on licence change conditions/obligations	TBC	Open
39	WG11	MO	To share ESO suggested Licensed offer timescales changes from 3 months with the Workgroup	TBC	Open
40	WG11	RF	To share licence changes programme timescales with Workgroup	TBC	Open
41	WG12	PM	To share analysis/feedback which informs the Gate 2 period offer	TBC	New

			acceptance to submission of application for Planning Consent		
42	WG12	JH	To provide an update of the action log at Workgroup 13	WG13	New

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Claire Goult	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
Alison Price	AP	ESO	ESO SME
Dovydas Dyson	DD	ESO	ESO SME
Paul Mullen	PM	ESO	ESO SME
Lee Wilkinson	LW	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Alex Ikonic	AI	Orsted	Workgroup Member
Anthony Cotton	AC	Green Generation Energy Networks Cymru Ltd	Workgroup Member
Barney Cowin	BC	Statkraft	Workgroup Member
Bill Scott	BS	Eclipse Power Networks	Workgroup Member
Callum Dell	CD	Invenergy	Workgroup Member
Ciaran Fitzgerald	CF	Scottish Power Renewables	Workgroup Member
Claire Hynes	CH	RWE Renewables	Workgroup Member
Claire Witty	CW	Scottish Power Energy Networks	Workgroup Member
Ed Birkett	EB	Low Carbon	Workgroup Member
Gareth Williams	GW	Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Member
Garth Graham	GG	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member
Grant Rogers	GR	Qualitas Energy	Workgroup Member
Helen Snodin	HS	Fred Olsen Seawind	Workgroup Member
Helen Stack	HS	Centrica	Workgroup Member
Jonathon Whitaker	JW	SSEN Transmisson (SHET)	Workgroup Member
Jonathon Wood	JOW	Tarchon Interconnector	Workgroup Member
Kyran Hanks	KH	CUSC Panel member	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
Muhammad Madni	MM	NGV	Workgroup Member
Paul Youngman	PY	Drax	Workgroup Member
Richard Woodward	RW	NGET	Workgroup Member
Rob Smith	RS	Enso Energy	Workgroup Member
Sam Aitchison	SA	Island Green Power	Workgroup Member
Simon Lord	SL	Engie	Workgroup Member
Steffan Jones	SJ	Electricity North West Limited (ENWL)	Workgroup Member
Zivanayi Musanhi	ZM	UK Power Networks	Workgroup Member