

## 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](mailto: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](mailto:cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com)

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
<b>Respondent name:</b>	James Potter	
<b>Company name:</b>	Apatura Energy Ltd	
<b>Email address:</b>	grid@apatura.energy	
<b>Phone number:</b>	07788251329	
<b>Which best describes your organisation?</b>	<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 checked="" 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?	<div>Mark the Objectives which you believe the Original solution better facilitates:</div> <div>Original <input type="checkbox"/>A <input type="checkbox"/>B <input type="checkbox"/>C <input type="checkbox"/>D</div> <div>Click or tap here to enter text.</div>
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach? (See page- 57-58)	<div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/>No</div> <div>Click or tap here to enter text.</div>
3	<div>Do you have any other comments?</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For projects post gate 2, robust and transparent parameters (available for public scrutiny) should be provided detailing allowable modification application changes. The basis for allowable changes could mirror those contained within the Energy Networks Association “Fair and Effective Management of DNO Connection Queues: Treatment of Requests to Change Connection Applications Good Practice Guide (November 2018).</li> <li>Regarding Strategically Important projects that may be advanced in the connection queue at the expense of other connections: A robust and transparent methodology (available for public scrutiny) should be presented to define what constitutes a Strategically Important project. This process should be codified and auditable to ensure fair and consistent application.</li> <li>Parties should acknowledge that multiple projects can be deliverable on the same registered parcel of land. Where the same land parcel is associated with multiple projects (transmission and distribution), enquiries should be made with developers to ensure that minimum land area requirements and other viability criteria can be met to deliver all projects.</li> <li>Existing connection offers that include a nodal substation at an unconfirmed location should be afforded a single modification application post gate 2 to relocate the developer’s site once the nodal connection location has been finalised.</li> <li>Embedded projects that pass gate 2 should not be disadvantaged by other less advanced projects within the same Project Progression, or if that Project Progression has not been signed by the host DNO.</li> </ul>	

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 <a href="#">Workgroup Consultation Section</a> ) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		

### Specific Workgroup Consultation questions

5	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 <a href="#">CMP434</a>, therefore please answer the questions in respect to CMP435.</i>  Elements 2,4,6,7,12,15,17 and 18 are not part of the CMP435 Proposal and is only part of the <a href="#">CMP434</a> Proposal. Element 10 is proposed to be codified within the STC through modification <a href="#">CM095</a> .  Please provide rationale for your answer and any suggestions for improvement to each element?	
<b>Element 1:</b> Proposed Authority approved methodologies and ESO guidance (see Page 8-10,29)		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
All procedural changes should be codified and transparent		
<b>Element 3:</b> 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.		
<b>Element 5:</b> Clarifying any Primary Process differences for customer groups (See pages 11-12,32)		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		
<b>Element 8:</b> 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.		
<b>Element 9:</b> Project Designation (See pages 14-15, 33-34)		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
A robust and transparent methodology (available for public scrutiny) should be presented to define what constitutes a Strategically Important project. This process should be codified and auditable to ensure fair and consistent application.		
<b>Element 11:</b> 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

	Apatura are supportive of 'Proposal, assuming some land and planning work are done in parallel' timescales.	
	<b>Element 13:</b> Gate 2 Criteria Evidence Assessment (See pages 22-23, 39-40)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Parties should acknowledge that multiple projects can be deliverable on the same registered parcel of land. Where the same land parcel is associated with multiple projects (transmission and distribution), enquiries should be made with developers to ensure that minimum land area requirements and other viability criteria can be met to deliver all projects.	
	<b>Element 14:</b> Gate 2 Offer and Project Site Location Change (See pages 23-24, 40-41)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Existing connection offers that include a nodal substation at an unconfirmed location should be afforded a single modification application post gate 2 to relocate the developer's site once the nodal connection location has been finalised.	
	<b>Element 16:</b> Introducing the proposed Connections Network Design Methodology (CNDM) (See pages 24-25, 41-42)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Changes should be codified and transparent to customers.	
	<b>Element 19:</b> Contractual changes (See pages 26-28, 43-46)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
	<b>Element 20:</b> 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 <a href="#">CMP434</a> )? If yes, please provide supporting justification.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Neither agree nor disagree	
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 type="checkbox"/> No
	Neither agree nor disagree	
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 type="checkbox"/> No
	Neither agree nor disagree	

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Expediting projects via a process that is not codified/is outside of CUSC will inevitably discriminate against other projects in the queue, may impact project viability and resultant loss of substantial investment.		