

Public

CMP435 & CM096

Workgroup 23 Meeting

Summary

CM434 & CM095 Workgroup Meeting 23

Date: 17/10/2024 **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)
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
Alan Love	AL	Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Alexander Rohit	AR	Statkraft	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Andrew Yates	AY	Statkraft	Workgroup Member CMP435
Andrew Colley	AC	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Ciaran Fitzgerald	CF	Scottish Power	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Clare Evans	CE	Scottish Power Energy Networks	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Claire Hynes	CH	RWE Renewables	Workgroup Member CMP435

Public

Darcy Kiernan	DK	National Grid Ventures	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Garth Graham	GG	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member CMP435
Greg Stevenson	GS	SSE	Workgroup Member CMP435 and CM096
Hooman Andami	HA	Elmya Energy	Workgroup Member CMP435
Jack Purchase	JP	NGED	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
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
Rory Fulton	RF	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Salvatore Zingale	SZ	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Steffan Jones	SJ	Electricity North West Limited (ENWL)	Workgroup Member CMP435
Tim Ellingham	TE	RWE Renewables	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435

Agenda

#	Topics to be discussed	
1.	Timeline	Chair
2.	SME Updates – SCG and TMO4+	NESO
3.	Scene Setting – WG23	NESO
4.	Review of the Draft Workgroup Report	Workgroup
5.	TOR Review	Chair
6.	Action Log	Chair

Public

7.	Any Other Business	Chair
8.	Next Steps	Chair

Discussion and details

Key Areas of Discussions

1. Timeline

In relation to the timeline, there are two Workgroups left in the diary for this modification. In the last meeting there was a discussion to add an extra meeting on 30 October. The aim would still be to vote on 29 October but to use the 30 October for minor adjustments which would not impact the vote in the previous meeting. The Chair clarified that they would go through the voting process and show the template to clarify any doubts or questions that the Workgroup may have.

2. SME Updates – SCG and TMO4+

A Workgroup member asked if NESO knew whether embedded connections that have a BEGA or BELLA would speak directly to transmission parties regarding their Gate 1 and Gate 2 applications/status, or if it would be handled through the DNO. NESO noted that they were waiting for clarification and took an action to feed back to the Workgroup.

The Workgroup member asked if the Proposer could confirm how the planning milestones are being dealt with for contracts that do not have milestones within them currently. And would planning need to be secured one year from the signing of the Gate 2 offer. NESO stated that it varies depending on the technology type, for example. It was noted that there is a table in CMP434 (which applies in the context of CMP435) around what would change in Section 16 about milestones for moving on to submit planning consent and subsequent milestones. When a Gate 2 offer is provided, they would also put in the updated queue management milestones where required into Gate 2 offers. That would include the forward facing, or in some cases backward facing milestones associated with planning consent submission.

There was then an update on CM096. Further to discussions that were had last time, there are internal discussions on this to see whether the Proposer wishes to withdraw the modification. It has been noted that a quick decision is needed on this.

3. Scene Setting – WG23

The main objectives for this meeting are to go through the Workgroup report and the Terms of Reference (ToR). The ask of the Workgroup was to ask any clarification questions, and to provide feedback on the report and ToR. It is also asked that Workgroup members come to an agreement on the status of the ToRs.

4. Review of the Draft Workgroup Report

Overall, throughout the report, there were comments to fix typographical changes, and outstanding updates, noting that some may be reliant on other reports (e.g. CMP434).

Public

In terms of the timeline, the Chair updated that NESO are still waiting for approval from Ofgem on the timeline extension.

It was advised that the draft Workgroup Report would be sent out to the Workgroup members following this meeting. Members would have until the 29 October to review the report. This meeting would be to agree as much content for the Report as possible, after which formatting would be completed to align it with CMP434. The Workgroup would then have the report to review for final checks and any comments ahead of a final review on 29 October. This final review will be ahead of the Workgroup Vote which is to take place in the latter half of that meeting on 29 October.

In relation to a comment from a Workgroup member in the draft report, it was decided to add in wording which explains that some changes cannot be made now, due to the ongoing Clean Power 2030 (CP30) discussions, but they may be adopted at a later date if the outcome from the CP30 discussions requires them to.

In relation to deadlines and dates, NESO stated that at the time of the Workgroup Consultation document, there was a concept of a defined calendar date for an Authority decision date, implementation date and Go-Live. It was decided after some discussion, that when these dates, Implementation, Go-Live, etc, are first mentioned in the report, they need to be clarified as to what they are. After that, they can be referred to just as 'Implementation', 'Go-Live', etc, but they need to be clarified when they are first used, to save any confusion after that.

There was discussion around inclusion of a reference to distribution customers getting/not getting an indicative connection date. The Proposer referenced that the DNO community may decide to provide such a date to customers so this would need later clarification.

There was some discussion in relation to DNOs, how batched project progressions sit within the Gate 2 methodology and the risk of queue position jumping when embedded generators move position. There needs to be clarification in relation to such projects.

A concern was raised by Workgroup members that a project meeting Gate 2 criteria, which includes CP30 criteria, could still have its connection date pushed backwards under CNDM. The Proposer noted that they do not think it will be the case that a project in that situation, if it has met Gate 2 criteria, should be bumped down the queue because someone has also gotten Gate 2 criteria. A Workgroup member argued that the proposal now said that a project may be able to keep a connection date, and NESO would have full discretion via the methodologies to decide whether or not dates change. NESO responded by explaining that your connection date may change, in certain circumstances, but it should not happen for the reason where someone else has been put in ahead of you. The Workgroup members felt that this is a fundamental change to what was originally in the proposal. Another Workgroup member added that this is a significant change, and there is a need for absolute clarity that a change has been made. They felt it needed to be understood that even if a project meets the Gate 2 criteria and CP30 criteria, there are circumstances where the date could still be changed.

The Workgroup was taken through the rest of the draft Report document to show where comments had been addressed or updates were still pending.

Public

As the meeting ran to a close, the remaining comments would be picked up and considered with the Workgroup in one of the final meetings.

5. TOR Review

The ToR was not reviewed in this meeting.

6. Action Log

The Action Log was not reviewed in this meeting.

7. AOB

There was no AOB in this meeting.

8. Next Steps

A clean document will be circulated to the Workgroup members for comments. In the next meeting the ToR will be reviewed. They will also look at the WACM legal text, Workgroup Report and the actions. The Chair asked for any legal text comments to be back by COB Tuesday. The extra meeting invites for 30 October will also be circulated as soon as possible.

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)	Question shared with CNDM team for consideration in relation to methodology drafting process.	Ongoing	Open
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

Public

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
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.	Discussions are ongoing	TBC	Open
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).		Open



Public

115	WG20	RM/AC	NESO to provide an update on Phase 2 & Cutover Arrangements	Updates on transitional arrangements will be provided in the general update as and when available		
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 not on the suggested timeline diagram)	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
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?	1) Installed capacity will be defined in CMP434 legal text and will refer to this definition in 435. 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	TBC	Open



Public

they have met Gate 2.
 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. 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. <https://www.neso.energy/document/308911/download>

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.	Explanation provided in WG22	TBC	Open
-----	------	-------	---	------------------------------	-----	------



Public

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	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.	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 aware of timelines and will keep workgroup updated.	TBC	Open
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.	Duplication of Action 123	TBC	Open



Public

125	WG23	RP	Consider the process timeline with 'no longer than' minimum periods after key milestones (and length of windows to allow WG to assess feasibility) – add to legal text where necessary.	Considered and now within updated WG Report Proposal.	25 October 2025	Open
126	WG22	MO/AQ	To provide confirmation that the securities and liabilities will be held at the same level as to when the Gate 2 application is submitted	Nothing added to proposal in this regard – ways to avoid it being an issue in practice without amends to the Proposal.	TBC	Open
127	WG22	MO/AQ	NESO to check that 18.12.2 (continuation of works) applies to Gate 1 projects only, not Gate 2 projects (adding clarity to the clause if needed)	Checked and waiver only refers to Gate 1 Projects.	TBC	Open
128	WG22	MO	Check with the CNDM team for the process of reassigning connection points if necessary (pre-engagement with developer for suitable relocation) and dealing with acceleration in areas where technology caps may be reached.	Question shared with CNDM team for consideration in relation to methodology drafting process.	TBC	Open
129	WG22	AQ/AC	To confirm the period for securities to be paid back		TBC	Open
130	WG22	ENWL	ENWL to check if an equivalent Alternative is required to their CMP434's Alternative.		TBC	Open



Public

131	WG23	MO	List of documents/event slides to be added to the WG Report for suggestions to industry for what to review along with the CMP435 CAC (methodologies, TMO4+ overview, CP30 updates)	Added to the WG Report	TBC	Open
132	WG23	RP	Share clarity on how an embedded connection with a BEGA/BELLA is put forward to Gate 1 or Gate 2, i.e. via the Distribution or Transmission routes.	Included in SME update and within this slide pack	24/10	Open
133	WG23	MO	Revisit wording in CMP434 and CMP435 proposal sections to be clear that the solution would provide the mechanism to update a connecting party's contract as a result of the CNDM.	This was already in there but it has been made clearer	TBC	Open



Public

