

Public

CMP435 & CM096

Workgroup 22 Meeting

Summary

CM434 & CM095 Workgroup Meeting 22

Date: 10/10/2024 **Location:** Teams
Start: 10:00 AM **End:** 2:50 PM

Participants

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Catia Gomez	CG	Code Administrator, NESO	Chair
Elana Byrne	EB	NESO	Technical Secretary
Tammy Meek	TM	NESO	Technical Secretary
Alex Curtis	AC	NESO	Subject Matter Expert
Angela Quinn	AQ	NESO	NESO Lawyer (Legal Text)
Foolashade Popoola	FP	NESO	Subject Matter Expert
Michael Oxenham	MO	NESO	Subject Matter Expert
Richard Paterson	RP	NESO	Subject Matter Expert
Ruth Matthews	RM	NESO	Subject Matter Expert
Niall Coyle	NC	NESO	Proposer Alternate CMP435
Steve Baker	SB	NESO	Proposer CM096
Andy Dekany	AD	National Grid	Workgroup Member CMP435
Charles Yates	CY	Fred Olsen Seawind	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Ciaran Fitzgerald	CF	Scottish Power	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Gareth Williams	GW	Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Member CMP435 and CM096
Greg Stevenson	GS	SSE	Workgroup Member CMP435 and CM096
Helen Stack	HST	Centrica	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435

Public

Hooman Andami	HA	Elmya Energy	Workgroup Member CMP435
Hugh Morgan	HM	Energy Technical & Renewable Services Ltd	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Jack Purchase	JP	NGED	Workgroup Member CMP435
Joe Colebrook	JC	Innova Renewables	Workgroup Member CMP435
Jonathan Hoggarth	JH	EDF Renewables UK & Ireland	Workgroup Member CMP435
Jonathan Whitaker	JW	SSEN Transmission	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435 & CM096
Kyran Hanks	KyH	WWA Ltd	Workgroup Member CMP435
Mark Field	MF	Sembcorp Energy (UK) Limited	Workgroup Member CMP435
Niall Stuart	NS	Buchan Offshore Wind	Workgroup Member CMP435
Nina Sharma	NiS	Drax	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Paul Jones	PJ	Uniper	Workgroup Member CMP435
Paul Youngman	PY	Drax	Workgroup Member CMP435
Philip John	PJ	Epsilon Generation	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	SSE	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Salvatore Zingale	SZ	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Sam Aitchison	SA	Island Green Power	Workgroup Member CMP435
Steffan Jones	SJ	Electricity North West Limited (ENWL)	Workgroup Member CMP435
Tim Ellingham	TE	RWE Renewables	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Tony Cotton	TC	Energy Technical & Renewable Services Ltd	Workgroup Member CMP435
Wendy Mantle	WM	Scottish Power Energy Networks	Workgroup Member CMP435

Public

Agenda

#	Topics to be discussed	
1.	Timeline	Chair
2.	SME Updates – SCG and TMO4+	NESO
3.	Scene Setting – WG22	NESO
4.	Review of the Draft Legal Text – Workgroup Comments	NESO Legal
5.	Review of the Draft Workgroup Report	Workgroup
6.	TOR Review	Chair
7.	CMP435 Alternative Request – Verbal Update	Chair
8.	CM096 Solution Update – Verbal Update	NESO & CM096 Proposer
9.	Action Log	Chair
10.	Any Other Business	Chair
11.	Next Steps	Chair

Discussion and details

#	Key Areas of Discussions
1.	<p>Timeline</p> <p>There were no further updates to the proposed timeline.</p> <p>The Chair took the group through the plan for content of the remaining three Workgroups and encouraged any Alternative Requests to be raised as soon as possible to allow time for development and legal text creation.</p>
2.	<p>SME Updates – SCG and TMO4+</p> <p>The NESO representative notified the Workgroup of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Special TCMF meeting planned for 11 October where the upcoming Financial Instrument modification would be discussed. A follow-up webinar on 16 October with an update on Connections and Clean Power 2030 alignment (including methodologies) Working drafts of the methodologies to be shared with industry week commencing 21 October (views and questions to be provided via the industry consultations)

Public

- A Customer seminar on 05 November for Customer BAU topics as well as broader Reform topics. This seminar may feature a session on data and impact assessment for TMO4+ (dependent on the availability of materials by that date). A follow-up webinar was expected but possibly after the CMP434/435 Code Administrator Consultations (CACs) and methodologies' consultation.

3. Scene Setting – WG22

Objectives and parameters of discussion were outlined.

4. Review of the Draft Legal Text – Workgroup Comments

The NESO legal representative took the group through the changes applied to the draft documents since the last meeting. Key points of discussion were:

Timetabling

It was noted that certain timings, or timeframes, would be required for the Code Administrator Consultation (CAC) so stakeholders could assess when/how long there was for action to be taken and the impact assessment of the proposed changes. While the reason for timings not being confirmed was due to the mix of external factors playing into Connection Reform, NESO agreed to refer to indicate 'no less than X days/weeks' from key dates, e.g., implementation, and consider if it could indicate minimum window lengths.

Existing Agreement classification

It was confirmed that agreements with Appendix G and technical limits process included are classed as Existing Agreements (EA) for projects with a DNO/transmission connection iDNO. It was discussed that there was a need for one EA per developer from DNOs/transmission connection iDNOs (which could be multiple EA per agreement).

EA Request process

The NESO representative clarified that post-Workgroup Consultation the solution was adjusted to allow advancement and reduction of capacity with an EA Request (with a possible cancellation fee to reduce capacity if there are abortive works).

There was discussion about it not being permitted to change/add technologies via this request, however a technology could be removed (irreversibly) if not needed and the declared installed capacity and Gate 2 evidence aligned with the technology requirements. Installed capacity would be defined in the legal text for the purpose of the EA Request process.

Methodology and Clean Power 2030 (CP30) alignment

It was confirmed that the CP30 assessment of requests will be in addition to the Gate criteria assessment. The NESO representative agreed to consider with the CP30 team when Gate 1 or Gate 2 status would be assigned in relation to the CP30 assessment (so projects could understand before requesting advancement). The Workgroup expressed a need to

Public

understand the relevant links with the CP30 process and how CMP435-codified obligations and offer timings would be impacted by that.

It was discussed that if a party disagreed with the decision to permit/reject a project from entering the gated design process, the normal CUSC dispute process was available to them.

Continuation of works and release of securities/liabilities

It was discussed, and taken as an action, to confirm that NESO waving obligations to continue works was on allocation of a project into Gate 1 (and not Gate 2).

An action was taken to confirm that Gate 1 projects without an Agreement to Vary (AtV) will hold their security and liability levels (i.e., no increase).

NESO agreed to confirm the period by which released securities would be returned.

Reservation

The Workgroup expressed the need for industry to be informed when reservations had been made so parties were clear if they were/were not reserved.

Gate 1 offer

It was presented that appendices to a Gate 1 offer will be removed (as agreed in a previous Workgroup). While a Workgroup member suggested the legacy data would be of use, another Workgroup member noted it would be available in the original (pre-CMP435) agreement still.

Not signing an advancement offer

The NESO representative noted that the position for the solution was that in rejecting an advancement offer (that had been requested), a project would then be assigned as Gate 1. Otherwise, additional process and legal text would be required to deal with rejected offers. It was felt that this could also be subject to CP30 gaming if advancement was requested into spare capacity areas and then rejected. The NESO representative acknowledged the Workgroup's concerns that an offer could be subject to a different connection point, and projects would be penalised for not accepting that. In response, it's proposed that the self-declaration form include a preferred location if advancement is requested.

It was noted that a Grid Supply Point (GSP) may be moved if it no longer existed, and while it was unlikely that near-term projects would have a location change, unusual cases meant it couldn't be guaranteed 100%. If a change was required, it was expected that there would still be engagement with developers to discuss the best alternative locations for the situation.

DNO /transmission connected iDNOs and embedded generation obligations

Public

- Whether DNOs/transmission connected iDNOs become obligated to notify embedded generation if they need to act – to be taken up with DNO parties.
- The need for DNOs/transmission connected iDNOs to acknowledge to NESO when a large BEGA/BELLA has made an EA request themselves (a corresponding EA to NESO from the I/DNO).
- Reduction in capacity for Distribution to reflect reductions on the Transmission side.
- How reservation will be applied to Distribution if applied to Transmission.
- Return of securities and liabilities via the I/DNO

A Workgroup member noted that CUSC Section 6.6.2 could be used to allow rights for a third party, which the NESO legal representative agreed to look into but felt could be a complicated option.

Consag Schedule 2 Exhibit 3 Part One and 3A (Consags)

The Workgroup were encouraged to review, but the updates shared in the meeting included that there would be versions to cover reservation/no reservation and that the document would be checked against CMP434's version for consistency.

5. CMP435 Alternative Request and Alternative Request Vote

It was briefly discussed that two Alternative Requests were still pending confirmation to proceed based on the outcome of recent discussions.

A Workgroup member welcomed feedback on whether there was Workgroup support for proposed areas for Alternatives to be developed (slides to be shared with the group to consider).

Slides were to be circulated to the group by the Proposer of WACM1 for Workgroup consideration ahead of legal text development.

6. CM096 Solution Update

An update would be provided at the next meeting.

7. Action Log

Actions would be reviewed at the next meeting.

8. AOB

A Workgroup member thanked NESO for providing the additional information shared with Workgroup regarding the RFI (Request For Information). Queries regarding links for the extended RFI were taken by a NESO representative to be resolved.

9. Next Steps

Timings for the Draft Workgroup Report and updated legal text were shared (COP Monday 15 October).

Public

It was agreed that Workgroup would be asked for feedback on the Workgroup Report by midday 16 October ahead of discussing the Report in Workgroup 23 (17 October).

The Chair expressed the possible need for an additional Workgroup if more time was needed and would share more thoughts on this for discussion at Workgroup 23.

Public

Action Log

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
21	WG3	NESO Connections Team	When considering transitional arrangements, include guidance for staged projects	To be covered in more detail under Phase 2	WG6	Open
84	WG11	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
96	WG15	PM	CNDM team to be asked how existing projects not meeting Gate 2 will be factored into the CNDM (in case of any consequential issues for removing the Gate 1 longstop)	TBC	Ongoing	Open

Public

98	WG15	PM	To check if TEC reduction will still mean projects are open to liabilities	This is in 435 legal text confirming that would be liable for Cancellation Charge	Ongoing	Open
100	WG15	RM	Will timescales for submitting offers change with changes in programme timelines	Propose to close as related to transitional arrangements. Updates on transitional arrangements will be provided in the general update as and when available.	Ongoing	Open
101	WG15	RM	Workgroup require timings for the further updates on Element 19	The Proposal is being amended to remove specific timescales in respect of Element 19 and Implementation Approach (other than Implementation Date).	Ongoing	Open
102	WG15	MO	Swim lane document to be produced for CMP434 and 435	The Proposal is being amended to remove specific timescales in respect of Element 19 and Implementation Approach (other than Implementation Date).	Ongoing	Closed
107	WG17	AC	Clarify the process for transitional accepted offers in relation to 434 and/or 435 processes	Transitional offers will be managed by 435, as per Element 19 , the fourth group, talks about how transitional accepted offers will be managed.	TBC	Open
108	WG17	AQ	Come back with a clarificatory position on application routes where GSPs are involved	Addressed in Section 18 of the legal text to be clear for EG.	TBC	Open
111	WG18	MO	NESO and Ofgem to discuss expectations re: TOR i) and feedback to Workgroup.		TBC	Open



Public

112	WG18	RM	Underlying RFI data to be supplied in Excel format as per WG17	The further analysis that was requested has been shared as part of WG22	TBC	Open
114	WG19	MO	NESO to provide an update on the Swim lane diagram - ref dates and Ofgem letter	The proposal is being amended to remove specific timescales in respect of Element 19 and Implementation Approach (other than Implementation Date).		
115	WG20	RM/AC	NESO to provide an update on Phase 2 & Cutover Arrangements	Proposed this to become a standing agenda item instead on updates to Phase 2 and Cutover Arrangements		
116	WG21	MO/AQ	Diagram (e.g. flow chart) of the timeline for the earliest date an offer would be made if a mod app is submitted that falls into transitional arrangement, or a user wishes to mod app as part of CMP435 (and go through two separate windows)	Mod Apps (out of the scope of those within CMP435) will need to be submitted before any transitional arrangement restrictions are in place in relation to them (if and when in place), or else they will need to wait until the first CMP434 application window. We are therefore not intending on providing a diagram on this.	TBC	Open
117	WG21	MO	in the solution of the WG Report clearly outline the mod app process, the accepted criteria for requested changes for a mod app submitted for CMP435 Gate 2 and instances where fees are applicable (if	This forms part of Element 19 and intention is to have made this clear when looking at the WG Report in today's meeting.	TBC	Open



Public

not on the suggested timeline diagram)

118	WG21	MO/PM/AQ	Define installed capacity. Will it be possible to reduce installed capacity as part of 435 Gate 2, what is the relationship to developer capacity and TEC, it is user-defined and needs to match with value in EA?	<p>1) Installed capacity will be defined in CMP434 legal text and will refer to this definition in 435.</p> <p>2) There is no concept of reducing installed capacity as they just need to provide an installed capacity appropriate for their TEC/Developer Capacity when they self-declare they have met Gate 2.</p> <p>3) There is no relationship between Installed Capacity and TEC/Developer other than if installed capacity becomes a number lower than TEC/Developer Capacity then TEC/Developer Capacity reduces too.</p> <p>It is user defined as it is provided by as part of self-declaration. Whatever they state is their installed capacity defines the land acreage they need for each technology (calculation per technology is Installed Capacity in MW x Minimum acre per MW registered. Calculation is in 427 Guidance as we referred to on Friday.</p> <p>https://www.neso.energy/document/308911/download</p>	TBC	Open
-----	------	----------	--	--	-----	------



Public

119	WG21	MO/AQ	Confirm the consequences for not accepting an accelerated Gate 2 offer if date/GSP is not as requested (with a rationale for any changes on this position since the WG Consultation). CG to review WG consultation and post-consultation proposal slides.		TBC	Open
120	WG21	PM	Confirm where the need to meet minimum acreage requirements for each technology to reach Gate 2 was outlined in the solution for the WG consultation.	In our proposal section (Section 11.1, page 17 and note that the 427 guidance itself sets out the calculation where there is more than 1 technology. Going forward these details will be housed in Gate 2 Criteria Methodology.	TBC	Open
121	WG21	RP/MO	NESO to update the Workgroup on project timescales for the submission of data	The Proposal is being amended to remove specific timescales in respect of Element 19 and Implementation Approach (other than Implementation Date).	TBC	Open
122	WG21	RM/AC	ESO to provide an update on Phase 2 & Cutover Arrangements	This is a duplication - see action 115	TBC	Open
123	WG21	RM/AC	ESO to provide an update on Phase 2 & Cutover Arrangements	NESO are considering withdrawing CM096 if there is a way to use only a new STCP for G2TWQ, but too early to withdraw CM096 at this point until know if Legal text change required in there- SMEs and Legal are	TBC	Open



Public

aware of timelines and will keep workgroup updated.

124	WG21	SB	NESO to confirm the course of action for CM096/STCP progression ASAP to the Workgroup and whether a Special STC Panel meeting would be required.	TBC	Open
-----	------	----	--	-----	------

