

Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma

CMP435: Application of Gate 2 Criteria to existing contracted background

Industry parties are invited to respond to this consultation expressing their views and supplying the rationale for those views, particularly in respect of any specific questions detailed below.

Please send your responses to cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com by **5pm** on **06 August 2024**. Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration.

If you have any queries on the content of this consultation, please contact cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
Respondent name:	Craig Duffy	
Company name:	Buchan Offshore Wind	
Email address:	craig.duffy@buchanoffshorewind.com	
Phone number:	07983 642091	
Which best describes your organisation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer body <input type="checkbox"/> Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network <input type="checkbox"/> Operator <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Generator <input type="checkbox"/> Industry body <input type="checkbox"/> Interconnector	<input type="checkbox"/> Storage <input type="checkbox"/> Supplier <input type="checkbox"/> System Operator <input type="checkbox"/> Transmission Owner <input type="checkbox"/> Virtual Lead Party <input type="checkbox"/> Other

I wish my response to be:

(Please mark the relevant box)

☒ **Non-Confidential** (*this will be shared with industry and the Panel for further consideration*)

☐ **Confidential** (*this will be disclosed to the Authority in full but, unless specified, will not be shared with the Workgroup, Panel or the industry for further consideration*)

For reference the Applicable CUSC (non-charging) Objectives are:

- The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence;*
- Facilitating effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity, and (so far as consistent therewith) facilitating such competition in the sale, distribution and purchase of electricity;*
- Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency *; and*

- d) *Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements.*

*The Electricity Regulation referred to in objective (c) is Regulation (EU) 2019/943 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 June 2019 on the internal market for electricity (recast) as it has effect immediately before IP completion day as read with the modifications set out in the SI 2020/1006.

Standard Workgroup Consultation questions

1	Do you believe that the Original Proposal better facilitates the Applicable Objectives?	Mark the Objectives which you believe the Original solution better facilitates: Original <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D Click or tap here to enter text.
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach? (See page- 57-58)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Yes, subject to our statement on Element 11 below.
3	Do you have any other comments? Click or tap here to enter text.	
4	Do you wish to raise a Workgroup Consultation Alternative Request for the Workgroup to consider?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (the request form can be found in the Workgroup Consultation Section) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.

Specific Workgroup Consultation questions

5	<p>Do you agree with the elements of the proposed solution for CMP435? <i>Please note that the application of these elements may be different to CMP434, therefore please answer the questions in respect to CMP435.</i></p> <p>Elements 2,4,6,7,12,15,17 and 18 are not part of the CMP435 Proposal and is only part of the CMP434 Proposal. Element 10 is proposed to be codified within the STC through modification CM095.</p> <p>Please provide rationale for your answer and any suggestions for improvement to each element?</p>
---	---

Element 1: Proposed Authority approved methodologies and ESO guidance (see Page 8-10,29)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		
Element 3: Clarifying which projects go through the Primary Process (See pages 10-11,29-31)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		
Element 5: Clarifying any Primary Process differences for customer groups (See pages 11-12,32)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		
Element 8: Longstop Date for Gate 1 Agreements (See pages 12-13, 32-33)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		
Element 9: Project Designation (See pages 14-15, 33-34)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		
Element 11: Setting out the criteria for demonstrating Gate 2 has been achieved and setting out the obligations imposed once Gate 2 has been achieved (See pages 16-21, 34-39)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>We note that the consultation does not specify a definitive timescale for offshore wind for the proposed new forward-looking milestone to move from acceptance of the Gate 2 offer to M1 (submission of application for planning consent) and invites views on an appropriate timescale.</p> <p>We believe that two years is an appropriate period for this new milestone for existing projects, and that this strikes the correct balance between ensuring projects are progressing without creating disproportionate risks to shareholders, given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the scale and complexity of offshore wind projects and the potential for delays in submitting consent due to unexpected factors encountered during detailed site survey work or unanticipated requests from consultees; the relative immaturity of floating offshore wind and the degree of due diligence required by developers before submitting consent the potential for sites to be subject to significant revisions to layout and design due to developments in turbine technology and capacity; <p>We would also add that the degree of sunk costs, in terms of both option fees and development expenditure, for ScotWind projects means there is significant incentive for shareholders to progress projects as quickly as possible, which should provide reassurance to the ESO that these projects are progressing and seeking to follow reasonable time frames.</p>		

	Element 13: Gate 2 Criteria Evidence Assessment (See pages 22-23, 39-40)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
	Element 14: Gate 2 Offer and Project Site Location Change (See pages 23-24, 40-41)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
	Element 16: Introducing the proposed Connections Network Design Methodology (CNDM) (See pages 24-25, 41-42)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
	Element 19: Contractual changes (See pages 26-28, 43-46)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
	Element 20: Cut Over arrangements (See page 28, 47)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
6	Are there any elements of the proposed CMP435 solution - as per Q5 - which you believe are not appropriate to include when you consider how to most effectively implement TMO4+ to projects in the existing contracted background (as opposed to the process for new applicants via CMP434)? If yes, please provide supporting justification.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
7	In relation to Q6, are there any features which you believe are missing in the proposed CMP435 solution that would more effectively facilitate implementation of TMO4+ to the existing contracted background. If yes, please provide details and justification.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
8	Do you believe any groups of projects should be exempt from the scope of CMP435 or from some elements of the proposed solution? If so, please advise on which groups and elements and provide rationale to why.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
9	Do you believe that the proposed solution could duly or unduly discriminate against any particular types of projects? If so, do you believe this is justified?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	