

**Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma**

**CMP434: Implementing Connections Reform**

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>	Daryn Lucas	
<b>Company name:</b>	Green Generation Energy Networks Cymru Ltd	
<b>Email address:</b>	Daryn.Lucas@GreenGENCymru.com	
<b>Phone number:</b>	02922 944 618	
<b>Which best describes your organisation?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer body <input type="checkbox"/> Demand <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator <input 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:**

- a) The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence;
- b) 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;
- c) 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.

**Please express your views in the right-hand side of the table below, including your rationale.**

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 pages 59-61)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		Click or tap here to enter text.
3	Do you have any other comments?	<i>As a Transmission connected IDNO, Green GEN Cymru is concerned that many of the relevant aspects of the wider proposals for connections reform have been progressed in meetings convened by ENA to which IDNOs were not invited. This has resulted in certain decisions being made (such as excluding embedded demand from scope, what generation is included in the DFTC, and details pertaining to the DFTC) which has limited what can be discussed in CMP434 and more general uncertainty about how the proposal would work in practice for IDNOs especially those connecting directly to the Transmission System. That is not to say that these are the “wrong” decisions but not all Users of the Transmission System have been able to input. Whilst ENA have recently commenced a dialogue with all IDNOs via their representative body (Independent Networks Association), convened meetings and shared certain documents with them, there remains limited detailed discussion of the issues and the relevant working groups established by ENA remain closed to Transmission connected IDNOs who have not paid to join the ENA. We hope that the position for IDNOs will continue to improve as the proposals are finalised and that appropriate and inclusive governance arrangements are adopted.</i>
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? Element 7 has been de-scoped and 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 pages 9-10, 55)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
	<b>Element 2:</b> Introducing an annual application window and two formal gates, which are known as Gate 1 and Gate 2 (i.e. the Primary Process) (see pages 11, 35-36)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
	<b>Element 3:</b> Clarifying which projects go through the Primary Process (see pages 11-12, 35-36)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
	<b>Element 4:</b> Significant Modification Applications concept, including the proposed criteria and the proposed level of codification (see pages 12-13, 36-39)	<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 13-14, 35-36)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
	<b>Element 6:</b> Setting out the process and criteria in relation to Application Windows and Gate 1, including introducing an offshore Letter of Authority equivalent as a Gate 1 application window entry requirement for offshore projects (see pages 15-16, 39-40)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
	<b>Element 7:</b> Fast Track Disagreement Resolution Process (de scoped from this modification – see pages 16, 58)	<input checked="" 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 16, 40-41)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<p><i>Whilst it would be possible for a DNO or Transmission connected IDNO to introduce in new Distribution contracts the right to terminate after a period of time, we do not understand the rationale for such a longstop date. For so long as the customer requires the capacity it will be within the DFTC submission, so moving it from one Table in the DFTC (ie “contracted”) to another (“non-contracted”) would not change anything. If ESO required a view on how long individual customers had been within Gate 1, this could be provided as part of the submission.</i></p>	
<p><b>Element 9:</b> Project Designation (see pages 17-18, 48-49)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
<p><b>Element 10:</b> Connection Point and Capacity Reservation (proposed to not be codified within the CUSC, but is intended to be codified within the STC through modification <a href="#">CM095</a> – see pages 18-20 and the <a href="#">CM095 Workgroup Consultation</a>, pages 6-10)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
<p><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 20-24, 42-46)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
<p><b>Element 12:</b> Setting out the general arrangements in relation to Gate 2 (see pages 25-26, 47)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
<p><b>Element 13:</b> Gate 2 Criteria Evidence Assessment (see pages 26-27, 47-48)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
<p><b>Element 14:</b> Gate 2 Offer and Project Site Location Change (see pages 28, 46)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
<p><b>Element 15:</b> Changing the offer and acceptance timescales to align with the Primary Process timescales (e.g. a move away from three months for making licenced offers) (see pages 29, 42-46)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
<p><b>Element 16:</b> Introducing the proposed Connections Network Design Methodology (CNDM) (see pages 29, 53-55)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	

	<p><b>Element 17:</b> Introducing the concept of a Distribution Forecasted Transmission Capacity (DFTC) submission process for Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) and transmission connected Independent Distribution Network Operators (iDNOs) to forecast capacity on an anticipatory basis for Relevant Embedded Small Power Stations or Relevant Embedded Medium Power Stations aligned to the Gate 1 Application Window (see pages 30-33, 51-53)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p><i>To amplify our comment made under question 3, we are concerned by the proposal that obligations on a Transmission connected IDNO that relate to DFTC submissions are governed by an external body (ie ENA) to which most IDNOs are not members. We believe that any important processes should either be brought within CUSC or some other forum that is fully representative of all affected parties. See also our comment under question 11 below</i></p>		
	<p><b>Element 18:</b> Set out the process for how DNOs and transmission connected iDNOs notify the ESO of Relevant Embedded Small Power Stations or Relevant Embedded Medium Power Stations which meet Gate 2 criteria (see pages 33-34, 51-53)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p><i>See comment under question 11 below.</i></p>		
6	<p>Are there any elements of the proposal which you believe should not be included as part of this proposed solution, which the Proposer believes represents the 'Minimum Viable Product' reforms required to the connections process? If not, why not? (Please note the element number in each of your responses if applicable)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p><a href="#">Click or tap here to enter text.</a></p>		
7	<p>As per question 6, are there any additional features which you believe should be included as part of Minimum Viable Product reform to the connections process?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p><a href="#">Click or tap here to enter text.</a></p>		
8	<p>Do you agree that the Gate 1 process should be a mandatory process step, or do you think Gate 1 should be an optional process step with projects being able to apply straight into the Gate 2 process if the project meets both the relevant Gate 2 and Gate 1 criteria?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p><a href="#">Click or tap here to enter text.</a></p>		
9	<p>Do you believe that the proposed Gate 1 and Gate 2 process could duly or unduly discriminate against any types of projects? If so, do you believe this is justified?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p><a href="#">Click or tap here to enter text.</a></p>		
10	<p>Please provide your views on the proposed options ((a) to (e) on page 45) to mitigate the risk of requiring a developer to submit their application for planning consent earlier than they would in their development</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

	cycle (with the risk this consent could expire and any extension from the Planning Authority is not automatic).	
Click or tap here to enter text.		
11	Do you agree that DFTC should be included as part of CMP434? If not, do you believe that the reformed connections process can function without DFTC? Please justify your answer. (see pages 30-34, 51-53)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p><i>DFTC appears a useful process for inputting embedded customer requirements but we are unclear why this is not used to capture all embedded generation. A cleaner solution would be for DFTC to include all embedded Large, Medium and Small Generators who have an impact on the Transmission System. Then those generators who are required to have a BEGA or BELLA, or choose to have a BEGA, would identify this at the point of entering the Gate 2 process and apply for the applicable contract at the same time as the DNO/IDNO informs ESO that the projects have met the Gate 2 criteria. Such generators would also be separately identified within the applicable Table of subsequent annual DFTC submissions (ie generators who have passed Gate 2) so as to avoid any double-counting.</i></p>		
12	The Proposer intends to set out supporting arrangements for TMO4+ via a combination of guidance and methodologies (e.g. DFTC, CNDM, Project Designation, Gate 2 Criteria). Do you anticipate any issues with having these outside of Code Governance? (see Pages 9-10, 55)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		