



CMP435 & CM096 Workgroup 20 Meeting Summary

CM434 & CM095 Workgroup Meeting 26

Date: 26/09/2024 **Location:** Teams

Start: 10:00 AM **End:** 2:50 PM

Participants

| Name | Initial | Company | Role |
|--------------------|---------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Catia Gomez | CG | Code Administrator, NESO | Chair |
| Alice Taylor | AT | ESO | Proposer CMP435 |
| Angela Quinn | AQ | ESO | Legal Text |
| Elana Byrne | EB | ESO | Technical Secretary |
| David Halford | DH | ESO | Proposer Alternate CM096 |
| Michael Oxenham | MO | ESO | Subject Matter Expert |
| Paul Mullen | PM | NESO | Subject Matter Expert |
| Richard Paterson | RP | NESO | Subject Matter Expert |
| Amy-Isabella Wells | AIW | NGET | Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435 and CM096 |
| Andrew Colley | AC | SSE Generation | Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435 |
| Andrew Yates | AY | Statkraft | Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435 |
| Andy Dekany | AD | National Grid | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Ben Adamson | BA | Low Carbon | Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435 |
| Charles Yates | CY | Fred Olsen Seawind | Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435 |
| Ciaran Fitzgerald | CF | Scottish Power | Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435 |
| Clare Evans | SE | Scottish Power Energy Networks | Workgroup Member CMP435 |



| GIOTIO | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----|--|--|
| Darcy Kiernan | DK | NGV | Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435 |
| Deborah MacPherson | DM | Scottish Power Renewables | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Garth Graham | GG | SSE Generation | Workgroup Member CMP435 & CM096 |
| Gareth Williams | SW | Scottish Power Transmission | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Grant Rogers | GR | Qualitas Energy | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Greg Stevenson | GS | SSEN Transmission | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Hannah Sharratt | HS | Electricity North West Limited (ENWL) | Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435 |
| Helen Snodin | HS | Fred Olsen Seawind | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Hooman Andami | HA | Elmya Energy | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Hugh Morgan | НМ | Energy Technical & Renewable Services Ltd | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Jack Purchase | JP | NGED | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Joe Colebrook | JC | Innova Renewables | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Jonathan Whitaker | JW | SSEN Transmission | Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435 & CM096 |
| Kimbrah Hiorns | KH | EDF Renewables UK & Ireland | Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435 |
| Luke Scott | LS | Northern Powergrid | Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435 |
| Mark Field | MF | Sembcorp Energy (UK) Limited | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Michelle Macdonald Sandison | MMS | SSEN | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Mpumelelo Hlophe | МН | Fred Olsen Seawind | Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435 |
| Niall Stuart | NS | Buchan Offshore Wind | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Paul Jones | PJ | Uniper | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Ravinder Shan | RS | FRV TH Powertek Limited | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Richard Woodward | RW | NGET | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Rob Smith | RS | Enso Energy | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Ross O'hare | RO | SSEN | Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435 |
| Ross Thompson | RT | UK Power Networks | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Salvatore Zingale | SZ | Ofgem | Authority Representative |
| Sam Aitchison | SA | Island Green Power | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Samuel Railton | SR | Centrica | Workgroup Member CMP435 |
| Carriaci i talitori | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |





Agenda

| # | Topics to be discussed | |
|----|--|------|
| 1. | CMP435 Draft Legal Text Discussion | NESO |
| 2. | CMP435 Alternative Requests and Alternative Vote | NESO |
| 3. | Action Log | NESO |

Discussion and details

| # | Key Areas of Discussions |
|----|--|
| 1. | Timeline |
| 2. | SME Update and Proposer update |
| 3. | Review of draft legal text |
| 4. | CMP435 Alternative Requests and Alternative Request Vote |
| 5. | Action log |
| 6. | AOB & next steps |

1. Timeline

The timeline for the upcoming meetings was shared with the Workgroups, noting recent changes for the coming week.

2. Proposer Update

The Proposer provided an update on an action from last week's Workgroup regarding the NESO considering impacts on the proposed Alternative Requests. There are likely to be varying levels of difficulty for implementing different Alternatives, but at this stage it felt to be too early to determine whether it would be more/less difficult than implementation of the Original solution. Once the list of Alternative Requests voted through to become Workgroup Alternative CUS Modifications (WACMs) is clearer it will be possible to explore the implementation further with the WACM Proposers and determine impacts on systems and timings for the NESO.

3. Review of Draft Legal Text

NESO stated that although the CMP435 legal text is less than for CMP434, it is important that the Workgroup members understand the text to understand its implications. Overall, there is still a need for clarity in relation to process timelines/timeframes in the legal text, with placeholder text being used until these are known. It was stated that these timings will be finalised as soon as possible, with them being influenced by other areas of Connections Reform.





An updated drafting note (previously shared in Workgroup 18) was shared for reference on the approach taken for creating the legal text. There was discussion on this, including on the clarity added for what the Gate 2 offers would include. It was also outlined that the legal text drafting aimed to adopt the same style that has been adopted for CMP434.

While discussing the legal text, there were some questions raised by the Workgroup members. One question related to release of securities if going from Gate 2 to Gate 1. NESO stated that this is in the proposed text already. NESO then explained that if you don't apply to Gate 2 or don't meet Gate 2 criteria, the agreement is made conditional with a Gate 1 offer. All rights and obligations under it are disapplied until a project gets to Gate 2, so although there are terms in that Gate 1 construction agreement regarding security, they aren't live and will not be applied until the point at which an agreement is updated to become a Gate 2 agreement.

Another question asked came from a budgeting perspective, and asked for confirmation that there is no application fee for Gate 2, but there is for a transitional application. NESO stated that if you are making a Gate 2 request (not transitional) without requesting advancement, then there would be no fee. Transitional agreement requests will incur a fee because at the point of applying for Gate 2 the fee paid would not be for a full contract (not fully studied, etc.) and a mod app would be needed, therefore incurring a fee. If a project is applying for something different (a full contract versus a transitional agreement or acceleration at Gate 2) a modification application and a modification application fee would be required, which has been reflected in the legal text.

One Workgroup member stated that it needs to be clear what the implications are for their project if they do not make an application and for the time period in which securities will be paid back.

Another question raised was in relation to an acceleration/advancement request for an application. It was outlined that the Connection Network Design Methodology (CNDM) will give offers based on acceleration requests. If you do not ask for an earlier date, you will not get an earlier date so projects should consider such requests if they wish for that.

NESO then stated that all existing agreements will eventually become Gate 2 projects with Gate 2 project obligations or become Gate 1 projects. There is no way an in scope project will remain as it is currently and cannot become either a Gate 1 project or a Gate 2 project.

There were concerns raised by Workgroup members about embedded generators, which needed to be considered again for clarity in the legal text. In some places of the legal text, it was asked if there was too much detail. For example, when discussing the checks on the declarations and the expectation that DNO's will be providing checks – it was asked if the level of detail in the legal text was helpful, to which it was agreed that it was.





4. CMP435 Alternative Requests and Alternative Request Vote

The Workgroup members voted on four of the five alternative requests:

- Alternative Request 1 will not be voted in as the majority vote was 'no' for this request.
- Alternative request 7 will not be voted in as the majority vote was 'no' for this request.
- Alternative request 8 was not voted on as the proposer was not present and will be voted on next week.
- Alternative request 9 will become WACAM 1 as it had a majority 'yes' vote.
- Alternative 10 will not be voted in as the majority vote was abstained, and the highest number of votes after abstaining were a no vote.

5. Action Log

The following actions were closed in this meeting: 36,42,57, 59, 79,80, 85, 93,94, 99, 105, 109, 113

AOB

There was no other business.

Next Steps

The legal text will be circulated as soon as possible to the Workgroup via email, and it will also be shared to the collaboration space. It was requested that comments are returned by the end of Wednesday 02 October.

The Workgroup report was confirmed to be shared as soon as possible.

It was noted that two additional Alternative Requests are going through critical friend checks and are planned to be ready to view at the next Workgroup.





Action Log

| Action number | Workgro up Raised | Owner | Action | Comment | Due by | Status |
|------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--------|--------|
| 21 | WG3 | NESO Connection s Team | When considering transitional arrangements, include guidance for staged projects | To be covered in more detail under Phase 2 | WG6 | Open |
| 36 | WG5 | Angie | Statement from NESO as to the CAP150 powers and how they are applied /can be applied re: ongoing compliance (include link to CAP150 info on NESO website) | This is part of the CMP434 legal text | | Closed |
| 42 | WG6 | AC/FP | Check with legal as to the clock start dates for new applications considering the point of implementation after an Authority decision (is 15th of November date is legally acceptable as the Gate 1 process only comes to existence 10 Working days after Authority decision?) | This question is no longer applicable now that Phase 1 is in place and the decision and implementation dates have changed. NESO have said that following Ofgem's decision on 21 August 2024, any new directly connected transmission application made from 2 September 2024, will receive a Transitional Offer. | | Closed |

| Public | | | | | | |
|--------|------|----|---|--|---------|--------|
| 56 | WG8 | МО | Clarification with legal regarding guidance and introduction of any new obligations. | Clarity on this should be provided by the legal text | Ongoing | Open |
| 57 | WG8 | МО | NESO set out the processes and timing for determining liability and security for April 2025 and October 2025. | April 2025 and October 2025 processes are currently expected to continue as normal in respect of existing agreements but this will be kept under review. | | Closed |
| 59 | WG8 | МО | Provide WG with the list of documents outside the mod, the principles for guidance docs and timelines for the development of methodology documents. | Awaiting methodology content and timescales before the NESO can update on this | | Closed |
| 60 | WG8 | RP | (Replacement for action 35) Provide relevant updates from SCG | Suggest that this is closed as an action and instead we have a standing agenda item moving forward | | Closed |
| 79 | WG10 | МО | Develop a diagram for consultation for alignment of methodologies' timings vs the modifications | No longer proposing to complete this action due to the recent Ofgem Open Letter and approach in respect of methodology discussion | | Closed |
| 80 | WG10 | МО | Provide further clarity on the nature of the projects designated in 2025, and separately those projects would have reserved capacity. | NESO are not providing any further information on this as part of the code process as until we have run the process we will not know which projects are subject to Capacity Reservation. | | Closed |



| Public | | | | | | |
|--------|------|------------------------------|--|---|---------|--------|
| 84 | WGII | PM/HS | To discuss how to make Offshore projects holding offers in scope of the modification | Ongoing discussions between Connections and Offshore Coordination team and have spoken to HS | Ongoing | Open |
| 85 | WG11 | AC/DD | Comeback to WG with Justification on proposals on exempting mod apps from implementation date | This is related to the Phase 1 transitional arrangement scope which has now been set and is in place | | Closed |
| 89 | WG14 | МО | STC solution to expand on intended process and contract changes (particular importance for TOs) | NESO Legal are working on CM095 and CM096 legal text solutions. Ongoing weekly conversations with TOs is taking place | Ongoing | Open |
| 93 | WG14 | NESO Connection s Team | Update on the pathway of modifications in relation to the wider Reform package | Propose that this becomes a standing agenda item instead to provide general updates on other aspects of TMO4+ | | Closed |
| 94 | WG15 | NESO Connection s Team | Clarification sought on whether the change to assess whether projects are needed introduces any risk to projects before the new arrangements go live (in context of an investment hiatus). | NESO session arranged for 16th September "Potential to apply a technology lens to Connections Reform event" | | Closed |
| 96 | WG15 | РМ | CNDM team to be asked how existing projects not meeting Gate 2 will be factored into the CNDM (in case of any | | Ongoing | Open |



| | тп | h | и. | $\overline{}$ |
|------------------|----|--------|----|---------------|
| $\boldsymbol{-}$ | | ומ | ш | |
| | ч | \sim | ш | v |

| ublic | | | | | | |
|-------|------|----|---|--|---------|--------|
| | | | consequential issues for removing the Gate 1 longstop) | | | |
| 98 | WG15 | PM | To check if TEC reduction will still mean projects are open to liabilities | To be covered as part of CMP435 legal text | Ongoing | Open |
| 99 | WG15 | РМ | NESO to consider the new proposed reforms to National Planning Framework for nationally significant solar projects and any impacts for the Planning Regime timescales for Town & Country Planning (TCP) | We would either use the Exceptions process (if e.g, a developer can't meet M1 timings because planning authority have made it longer) and/or later raise a Modification to change the timescales set out in the forward looking M1 timetable (as set out in Section 16 Legal Text, which equally applies to CMP434 and CMP435) | | Closed |
| 100 | WG15 | RM | Will timescales for submitting offers change with changes in programme timelines | Cannot be provided until revised programme available, including revised implementation and go-live dates. | Ongoing | Open |
| 101 | WG15 | RM | Workgroup require timings for the further updates on Element 19 | | Ongoing | Open |
| 102 | WG15 | МО | Swim lane document to be produced for CMP434 and 435 | | Ongoing | Open |



| Public | | | | | | |
|--------|------|-------|---|---|-----|--------|
| 105 | WG16 | AT/SB | Request for NESO to provide comment on how options will be created for Govt decisions on capacity mix (and the legal basis for decisions) | NESO session arranged for 16th September "Potential to apply a technology lens to Connections Reform event" | | Closed |
| 107 | WG17 | AC | Clarify the process for transitional accepted offers in relation to 434 and/or 435 processes | Ongoing discussions | TBC | Open |
| 108 | WG17 | AQ | Come back with a clarificatory position on application routes where GSPs are involved | TBC | TBC | Open |
| 110 | WG17 | AQ | Provide the document outlining the CMP435 legal text approach for sharing with the Workgroup | Provided ahead of WG20 | TBC | Open |
| 111 | WG18 | МО | NESO and Ofgem to discuss expectations re: TOR i) and feedback to Workgroup. | | TBC | Open |
| 112 | WG18 | RM | Underlying RFI data to be supplied in Excel format as per WG17 | | TBC | Open |

| 113 | WG19 | АТ | NESO to consider the technical impacts of the proposed Alternative Requests for CMP435 | As per Proposer's update in WG20 | Closed |
|-----|------|----|--|----------------------------------|--------|
| 114 | WG19 | МО | NESO to provide an update on the Swim lane diagram - ref dates and Ofgem letter | | |