

Public

CMP435 & CM096

Workgroup 24 Meeting

Summary

CM434 & CM095 Workgroup Meeting 24

Date: 24/10/2024 **Location:** Teams
Start: 10:00 AM **End:** 2:50 PM

Participants

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Catia Gomez	CG	Code Administrator, NESO	Chair
Jess Rivalland	JR	NESO	Technical Secretary
Tammy Meek	TM	NESO	Technical Secretary
Alice Taylor	AT	NESO	Proposer CMP435
Alex Curtis	AC	NESO	Subject Matter Expert
Angela Quinn	AQ	NESO	NESO Lawyer (Legal Text)
Michael Oxenham	MO	NESO	Subject Matter Expert
Paul Mullen	PM	NESO	Subject Matter Expert
Richard Paterson	RP	NESO	Subject Matter Expert
Steve Baker	SB	NESO	Proposer CM096
Akshai Palakkalvijayan	AP	NGET	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Amy-Isabella Wells	AIW	NGET	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Andrew Colley	AC	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Arif Bilal	AB	Statkraft	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Charles Yates	CY	Fred Olsen Seawind	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Ciaran Fitzgerald	CF	Scottish Power	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435

Public

Clare Evans	CE	Scottish Power Energy Networks	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Claire Hynes	CH	RWE Renewables	Workgroup Member CMP435
Gareth Williams	GW	Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Member CMP435
Garth Graham	GG	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member CMP435
Jack Purchase	JP	NGED	Workgroup Member CMP435
Jonathan Hoggarth	JH	EDF Renewables UK & Ireland	Workgroup Member CMP435
Kyran Hanks	KyH	WWA Ltd	Workgroup Member CMP435
Liam Cullen	LC	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Luke Scott	LS	Northern Powergrid	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Mark Field	MF	Sembcorp Energy (UK) Limited	Workgroup Member CMP435
Muhammad Madni	MM	NGV	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Mpumelelo Hlophe	MH	Fred Olsen Seawind	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Niall Stuart	NS	Buchan Offshore Wind	Workgroup Member CMP435
Nirmalya Biswas	NB	Northern Power Grid	Workgroup Member Alternate
Paul Jones	PJ	Uniper	Workgroup Member CMP435
Ravinder Shan	RS	FRV TH Powertek Limited	Workgroup Member CMP435
Rob Smith	RS	Enso Energy	Workgroup Member CMP435
Robin Prince	RP	Island Green Power	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Ross O'Hare	RO	SSEN	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Ross Thompson	RT	UK Power Networks	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Salvatore Zingale	SZ	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Sam Aitchison	SA	Island Green Power	Workgroup Member CMP435
Samuel Railton	SR	Centrica	Workgroup Member CMP435
Steve Halsey	SH	UK Power Networks	Workgroup Member CMP435
Tim Ellingham	TE	RWE Renewables	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435
Tony Cotton	TC	Energy Technical & Renewable Services Ltd	Workgroup Member Alternate CMP435

Public

Agenda

#	Topics to be discussed	
1.	Timeline	Chair
2.	SME Updates – SCG and TMO4+ / CM096	NESO
3.	Scene Setting – WG24	NESO
4.	Legal Text review	Workgroup
5.	WACMI Legal Text	Workgroup
6.	Voting run through	Chair
7.	Action log	Chair
8.	Any Other Business	Chair
9.	Next Steps	Chair

Discussion and details

#	Key Areas of Discussions
1.	<p>Timeline</p> <p>The discussion highlighted the importance of understanding the dependencies between CMP434 and CMP435, particularly in terms of voting order.</p> <p>The timeline for future Workgroups and voting stage to be updated and shared with members after 28 October 2025 Workgroup meeting.</p>
2.	<p>SME Updates – SCG and TMO4+ / CM096</p> <p>Updates were provided on the status of the financial instruments modification, including feedback reflection and upcoming seminars.</p> <p>The discussion focused on clarifying the application route for BEGA/BELLAs, highlighting the need for coordination between different entities involved in the process, which involves understanding the roles of DNOs and NESO in the Gate assessment and ensuring that contracts are aligned and information is consistent.</p> <p>The need for harmonised rules across all DNO areas was discussed to facilitate trade, ensure system security, and integrate renewable sources. Harmonisation is legally required to increase competition and efficiently use the network for consumer benefit.</p> <p>The possibility of acceleration requests by embedded generators, including the need for an initial agreement with DNOs before proceeding was addressed. The process requires careful coordination to ensure that acceleration is feasible and aligns with the DNO's capabilities.</p>

Public

NESO covered the potential withdrawal of CM096 in favour of developing new STCPs to capture the Gate 2 queue solution. This approach provides more time for developing effective connection reforms and legal text. Concerns were raised about the lack of industry consultation in the withdrawal process.

The timeline for the Authority's decision on a package of work is currently uncertain, with discussions ongoing to expedite the process. The decision date is crucial as it impacts the scheduling of subsequent actions and decisions.

3. Scene Setting – WG24

The meeting aimed to review legal text updates for CMP435 and gather feedback. As well as consideration of the WACMI draft legal text. The Connections Network Design Methodology (CNDM) slide pack was shared for information, not for further discussion.

4. Legal Text review

The Chair went through the individual legal text comments and tracked changes, and resolved as agreed upon with the Workgroup. The following discussion points were raised.

There were concerns about how the process affects projects close to energisation, particularly regarding potential suspension periods. The discussion highlighted the need for clarity on whether such projects would go through a gated process and regarding the status of projects during the transition to Gate 2 offers. It was noted that existing agreements remain in place until a Gate 2 modification offer is signed.

The Workgroup talked around the implications of the legal text and the Gate 2 process on existing agreements, particularly for projects in the commissioning phase. The legal text outlines that existing agreements remain in force until updated by a Gate 2 modification offer, which projects can choose to accept or not.

The methodologies, including CNDM, cannot change existing contracts unless a modification offer is accepted. However, the application of these methodologies could lead to changes in existing agreements, especially if projects do not meet the Gate 2 criteria.

The differentiation between processes triggered at an embedded level for demand versus generation was highlighted, with the importance of understanding these distinctions for project progression and agreements. It was suggested that these processes have been previously explained in meetings, indicating a need for clarity in legal texts.

The Workgroup discussed the approach to competence and application processes and the need for clear delineation of steps involved in checking applications and declarations. The conversation suggested adopting a consistent approach across different sections.

There was a consensus on the need for a flow diagram to illustrate the process, which would aid in understanding and ensure consistency across documents. The diagram would not be part of the legal text but would be included in the Workgroup report. This has been taken as an action in relation to clause 18.8.4

There was a debate centred on the level of commitment to checking evidence, focusing on whether to commit to checking 100% of declarations or use reasonable endeavours. The concern is about the practicality and resource implications of such commitments. The difference between aspiring to check 100% of evidence and being obligated to do so, with

Public

concerns about the text not reflecting the aspiration. The discussion included the potential for future modifications if full checks are deemed unnecessary with a Workgroup member potentially raising a WACM.

The timing for issuing Gate 1 notifications was talked about, with a preference for completing the process by the end of the gated design process. This ensures that the process is manageable and aligns with project timelines.

The discussion revolved around refining the legal text and charging regime related to EA requests and mod applications. The current language is seen as too specific and potentially misleading, suggesting a need for more generic language to accommodate different processes.

The distinction between simple EA requests and those requiring advancement, which necessitate a mod application and fee was highlighted. The process for embedded generators and DNOs was discussed, with a focus on ensuring clarity and consistency in the requirements.

Security obligations continue until a Gate 1 agreement is accepted, after which the obligation is removed. This is a critical point in the legal text to ensure that parties understand their security commitments.

Existing agreements remain in effect until a Gate 2 agreement is accepted, at which point changes occur as specified in the Gate 2 agreement. This ensures continuity and clarity in contractual obligations.

The timing for issuing Gate 1 notifications was discussed, with a preference for completing the process by the end of the gated design process. This ensures that the process is manageable and aligns with project timelines.

The reservation process involves notifying users about their reservation status, which is crucial for managing project timelines and expectations. The discussion included ensuring that the process is clear and aligns with user expectations.

The discussion highlighted the complexities involved in managing contracts with multiple technologies, and the need for clarity in agreements to accommodate different project components. The conversation revealed the challenges of transitioning between stages and the implications of not meeting criteria for all technologies within a project. It delved into the criteria for Gate 1 and Gate 2, particularly how projects with multiple technologies are assessed and the implications of not meeting the criteria for all components. The need for a flexible approach that allows projects to proceed with compliant technologies while addressing non-compliant components was discussed.

It was discussed how to address existing agreements should be treated in the context of new processes, particularly concerning letters of authority or acknowledgement. The aim is to clarify that those who have already provided such documents do not need to resubmit them.

The Workgroup explored the process of handling requests for advancement in agreements, including how such requests are managed and the implications for

Public

connection dates and locations. The discussion highlighted the need for a clear process and form to specify advancement preferences.

A discussion focused on the queue management process and how milestone dates are handled, particularly in cases of project advancement. This includes whether section 16 needs amendments to reflect these changes.

The importance of providing clear guidance on forms to ensure they are filled out correctly was emphasised, and the responsibility should not fall on legal technicians. It was suggested that the portal used for form submissions should be flexible enough to accommodate special requests without losing them.

The complexities of handling disputes involving embedded generators, particularly when they do not have direct agreements with the NESO was talked about. The process requires disputes to be raised through the DNO, as they hold the contractual relationship.

The Workgroup addressed the potential termination of projects that do not progress to Gate 2, particularly for small and medium projects. There is a need to amend agreements to reflect changes in status, as termination is a significant action.

The need for clear guidance and amendments to reflect the status of small and medium projects was emphasised.

There was a discussion around expanding and clarifying definitions within the document, particularly concerning the term "developer" and its application across different sections. The discussion also touched on the relevance of these definitions to installation capacity and other related terms.

Participants discussed the need to specify the inclusion of large power stations and the advancement of connection dates.

5. WACMI Legal Text

The EA gated design process involves a series of checks and a publication period to allow applicants to decide on their next steps. The timing of publication and subsequent actions, such as withdrawal or advancement requests were considered.

It was highlighted that a structured time period needs to be created within the text, which is currently absent despite being present in the gated timetable. This structuring is essential for aligning the text with the timetable and ensuring consistency across documents. A 10-business-day period is provided for applicants to decide on withdrawal or advancement. With a publication that occurs after initial checks but before the start of the gated design process.

There is a need to define the information expected in the application register, which builds on the existing Transmission Entry Capacity (TEC) register. This includes details such as gate status, location, capacity, and connection dates, with a focus on technology types and installed capacities.

Public

6. Voting run through

Not discussed. This will be reviewed at a future Workgroup

7. Action Log

Not discussed. These will be reviewed at a future Workgroup.

8. AOB

None.

9. Next Steps

- NESO Legal Representative to review and address the outstanding comments in the legal text section 18.17
 - Updated versions of Legal Text and WACM1 Legal Text will be circulated for feedback
 - Workgroup to continue reviewing the Legal Text and address any outstanding comments in upcoming meeting
 - NESO to provide a process diagram for Workgroup report
-

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
21	WG3	NESO Connections Team	When considering transitional arrangements, include guidance for staged projects	To be covered in more detail under Phase 2	Ongoing	Propose to Close
84	WG11	PM/HS	To discuss how to make Offshore projects holding offers in scope of the modification	Holding offers would become an existing agreement if signed prior to the cut over date.	Ongoing	Propose to Close
89	WG14	MO	STC solution to expand on intended process and contract changes (particular importance for TOs)	ESO Legal are working on CM095 and CM096 legal text solutions. Ongoing weekly conversations with TOs is taking place. Looking to possibly withdraw CM096 if G2TWQ process to be contained within STCP (as is expected).	Ongoing	Closed
96	WG15	PM	CNDM team to be asked how existing projects not meeting Gate 2 will be factored into the CNDM (in	Question shared with CNDM team for consideration in relation to methodology drafting process.	Ongoing	Open

Public

			case of any consequential issues for removing the Gate 1 longstop)			
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 and Minimums).	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.	Ongoing	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.	Ongoing	Open



Public

111	WG18	MO	NESO and Ofgem to discuss expectations re: TOR i) and feedback to Workgroup.	NESO have confirmed their view that Annex B relates to TMO4+ and the wider connection reform program and have outlined the intention of impact assessments and RFI in WG22.	Ongoing	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	Ongoing	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 and Minimums).	Ongoing	Open
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	Ongoing	Open
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



Public

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Define installed capacity.2) Will it be possible to reduce installed capacity as part of 435 Gate 2,3) What is the relationship to developer capacity and TEC,4) It is user-defined and needs to match with value in EA?	<ol style="list-style-type: none">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 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	TBC	Open



Public

				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
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 and Minimums).	TBC	Open



Public

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	As per updates presented in WG24	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
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	Checked and waiver only refers to Gate 1 Projects.	TBC	Open



Public

			projects (adding clarity to the clause if needed)			
			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
128	WG22	MO				
	WG22		To confirm the period for securities to be paid back		TBC	Open
129		AQ/AC				
			ENWL to check if an equivalent Alternative is required to their CMP434's Alternative.		TBC	Open
130	WG22	ENWL				
			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
131	WG23	MO				
			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
132	WG23	RP				



Public

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	Propose to close
-----	------	----	---	--	-----	------------------

