

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: | Paul Munday | |
| Company name: | Ethical Power | |
| Email address: | Paul.munday@ethical-power.com | |
| Phone number: | 07729 073916 | |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> A <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Many of these documents may only be drafted and not finalised, with only some going through a robust review and approval process. The rest are being issued by the ESO without any consultation. This will be late codification of some elements and mean reliance on guidance or methodologies yet to be written. | |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| The retention of the Statement of Works, Project Progression and Modification Application processes for Gate 2 notification from DNO to NGESO does not improve, and possibly worsens, the connection process for Distribution Network Companies and their customers - DNO users be disadvantaged due to the time taken to go through the Statement of Works process to reach Gate 2 while Transmission customers 'self certify'. | |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| The details and rules regarding this element are not clear enough and risks undermining the reforms until made clear, we do not believe this should be a part of this particular code modification. | |
| 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 |
| Click or tap here to enter text. | |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| This proposal does not seem workable and is in contradiction to the principal of the purpose of Gate 2, i.e. a project secures land rights to reach Gate 2 but then begins a search for a new site due to change in POC, meaning the project is much further away from being ready to connect. A different solution is required and expect this will involve NGESO publishing data about the queue and POC | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | availability as well as hold 'pre Gate 2 application meetings' so that projects can get a view on likely Gate 2 offer before applying or securing land rights. | |
| | 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. | |