

# Connections Process Advisory Group

## Meeting 10 Minutes

Date: 12/09/2024

Location: MS Teams

### Participants

Attendee	Attend/Regrets	Attendee	Attend/Regrets
Merlin Hyman, Regen, CHAIR	Attend	Grant Rodgers, Qenergy	Attend
Neil Bennett, SSEN Transmission	Attend	Jessica Savoie, The Ade	Attend
Jon-Paul Bignold, Ofgem	Attend	Freddie Saunders, Department for Energy Security and Net Zero	Regrets
David Boyer, ENA	Attend	Andrew Scott, SSE Distribution	Regrets
Lynne Bryceland, SPT	Regrets	Annette Sloan, SSENT	Regrets
Matt Chatfield, Department for Energy Security and Net Zero	Regrets	Patrick Smart, RES Group	Attend
Chris Clark, Emtec Group	Attend	Kyle Smith, ENA	Attend
Daniel Clarke, NGET	Attend	Helen Snodin, Fred Olsen	Attend
Catherine Cleary, Roadnight Taylor	Attend	Klaudia Starzyk, Ofgem	Attend
Liam Cullen, Ofgem	Attend	Ian Thel, Department for Energy Security and Net Zero	Attend
Mike Dutton, NGET	Observe	Spencer Thompson, INA	Attend
Rory Fulton, Ofgem	Attend	Jonathan Whitaker, SSE	Attend
Arjan Geveke, EIUG	Attend	Matt White, UKPN	Regrets
Ben Godfrey, National Grid Electricity Distribution	Attend	Lee Wilkinson, Ofgem	Regrets
Garth Graham, SSE Generation	Attend	Michelle Young, Scottish Government	Attend
Paul Hawker, Department for Energy Security and Net Zero	Regrets	Salvatore Zingale, Ofgem	Regrets
Claire Hynes, RWE	Attend	Camille Gilsean, ESO	Regrets
Jade Ison, National Grid Electricity Transmission	Attend	Robyn Jenkins, ESO	Attend
Allan Love, SPT	Attend	Alex Curtis, ESO	Attend
James Macauley, Ofgem	Regrets	James Norman, ESO	Attend
Holly Macdonald, Transmission Investment	Attend	Mike Oxenham, ESO	Attend
Michelle MacDonaldSandison, SSE	Attend	Mike Robey, ESO (Tech Sec to CPAG)	Attend
Andrew Mackintosh, SPEN	Attend	Paul Mullin, ESO	Observe
Alasdair MacMillan, Ofgem	Regrets	Sabrina Gao, ESO	Observe
Deborah, MacPherson, ScottishPower Renewables	Attend	Alex Markham, ESO	Observe
Kyle Murchie, Roadknight Taylor	Attend	Richard Paterson, ESO	Observe
Zivanayi Musanhi, UKPN	Attend	Alison Price, ESO	Observe
Graham Parnell, BayWa r.e.	Attend	Will Kirk-Wilson, ESO	Observe
Jennifer Pride, Welsh Government	Regrets		

Agenda

1.	Welcome and introductions	Merlin Hyman, Regen
2.	Minutes and actions from meeting 9	Mike Robey, ESO
3.	Transitional Arrangements	Alex Curtis, ESO
4.	Transmission Impact Assessment Thresholds	Jade Ison & Dan Clarke, NGET
5.	TMO4+ update - including update following code change workgroup consultations, methodologies, additional technical and technological criteria and proposal for an additional financial element	Mike Oxenham & James Norman, ESO
6.	Next steps	James Norman
7.	Any Other Business	Merlin Hyman

Discussion and details

# Minutes from meeting, including online meeting group text chat during meeting, where referenced as “[From online chat]”

1. Welcome and Matters arising

2. Minutes and actions from meeting 9

- ESO noted that the code change timetable for TMO4+ has been re-baselined and agreed at CUSC and STC panels. It now requires Ofgem approval.
- ENA advised that the Strategic Connections Group will provide an update on charging reforms at CPAG's October or November meeting
- ESO noted that the draft minutes of meeting 9 had been shared with the TMO4+-related code change workgroups to support their considerations, given the extended period between CPAG meetings over the summer, on the understanding that the draft minutes would remain draft until CPAG approved the minutes, which is proposed today.
- **Decision 10.2.1:** CPAG approved the meeting 9 minutes.
- **Action 10.2.1:** ESO to publish meeting 9 minutes.

3. Transitional arrangements

- Phase 1 of the transitional arrangements are now live for new Transmission connection applications from 02 September. Further information is available [here](#).
- Modification Applications, Project Progressions and BEGA & BELLA applications continue to follow the existing connections process for the time being, whilst a second derogation and letter of comfort is developed and submitted to The Authority/Ofgem. ESO noted some complexity to be worked through to avoid unintended consequences.
- A member asked how this affects demand projects.
  - ESO confirmed that the transitional arrangements apply to Transmission-connected demand projects.
- A member asked how this affects embedded projects.
  - ESO advised that the intention was to include embedded projects within phase 2 of the transitional arrangements and a workshop with ENA took place 09 September to develop this.
- In response to a member question, ESO advised that cancellation liabilities do not apply to transitional offers.
- A member queried the duration of the transitional period.

- ESO noted that Ofgem's letter references transitional arrangements until the end of March 2025 and this could be extended if needs be.

#### 4. Transmission Impact Assessment Thresholds

The paper circulated to CPAG members included the following recommendations:

- National Grid Electricity Transmission and ESO support retaining the existing lower and upper qualifying thresholds for the TIA process (embedded generators between 1MW and 99.9MW)
- Scottish Power Transmission and Scottish Power Distribution believe the lower threshold of 200kW for TIA retains the right balance between accelerating connections ahead of transmission reinforcements while maintaining a manageable level of risk in the Transmission and Distribution networks.
- SSEN Transmission has concluded that the lower threshold for the TIA process can be raised to 200kW for the majority of Grid Supply Points covering mainland northern Scotland (a four-fold increase from the current 50kW threshold). The lower threshold will remain at 50kW on the islands within its area.
- The Chair sought clarification of the governance of these recommendations. The ENA noted that consistency was a theme within the Connections Actions Plan and in the ENA's role as secretariat to the Connections Delivery Board (CDB), it will follow up this question.
  - **Action 10.4.1:** ENA to confirm the CDB's role in the governance of TIA thresholds noting the view of CPAG members that this is a strategic issue for government's Local Power Plan commitments and should be considered by CDB.
- A member queried how the TIA thresholds linked to the government's policy on Local Power Plans, do these recommendations stymie embedded generation projects of 1MW and above?
  - **Action 10.4.2** DESNZ to discuss this with their Local Power Team.
- A member highlighted the complexity of this subject and noted that iDNO customers are held up by these thresholds. They asked what assumptions were considered.
  - NGET advised that assumptions had not been changed and drew attention to the technical limits initiative at Grid Supply Points was helping 10GW of embedded generators to connect earlier.
  - NGET also noted that it had changed its assessment of wider assumptions through working with ESO on revised Construction Planning Assumptions and the Connections Network Design Methodology.
  - NGET concluded by noting that this was its current recommendation but also acknowledged that this may be reviewed in future.
- A member proposed that NGET re-analyse the opportunity to raise the lower threshold by splitting the analysis of the impact of 1-10MW projects into two parts (1MW to <5MW and 5MW to <10MW). The member felt that 5 to <10MW projects were less likely to be a local project and would therefore allow consideration of whether the TIA threshold could be raised for 1MW to <5MW to support Local Power policy.
  - [From online chat: a member asked NGET to look at assumptions for residential / industrial / commercial connections with local batteries / solar to help developers for projects often less than 5MW.]
  - **Action 10.4.3** NGET to reanalyse the impact of raising the lower TIA threshold from 1MW to <5MW and 5MW to <10MW capacity projects.
- [From online chat: A member stated they could not support the paper's recommendation and requested a further review.]
- [From online chat: A member suggested that consistency could be best served in Scotland by reclassifying 132kV as Distribution. Another member highlighted this as a good solution.]
- A member noted a typographic error on page 3 of the paper (regarding who raised GC115) and noted that the Authority will be publishing its impact assessment for GC115 soon.
- A member noted the legal requirement for harmonisation.
  - [From online chat: a member highlighted the need for consistency in how DNOs operate TIA, as they felt this was not the case at the moment. Another member noted that Recital 3 suggests that it needs to be applied by the TO in a consistent basis. The member noted that

- 
- TIA was designed to get to the transmission impact quicker than Statement of Works, but that this was often not the case.]
- [From online chat: A member noted that the TIA threshold in CUSC is currently blank, which appears to be an oversight from the implementation of CMP298. Another member noted that they understood that the MW threshold is not referenced in CUSC as the impact can change depending on the network impact. They stated that the obligation is on the DNO to consider and determine where they believe there is an impact hence why it can vary across DNO areas.]
  - A member supported updating the impact assessment to split 1-10MW sites into two groups (1-5 and 5<10MW). They raised whether code or regulatory changes would be required.
    - NGET noted that the 1MW threshold appears in CUSC but was not familiar with the situation for the thresholds in Scotland.
  - A member suggested the processes could be formalised in Scotland.
    - SPT noted that there has been a clear and standard approach since 2018, with a live SPT document, that was last reviewed in April, as per the Connections Action Plan.
  - A member supported increasing the TIA threshold to 5MW. They noted that the current 1MW threshold in England and Wales could be a barrier to housing developments and industrial demand.
  - A member proposed a possible code mod to 'harmonise' the TIA threshold to 5MW across Great Britain to align Scotland with England and Wales, all having the same threshold to provide consistency.
  - A member highlighted that the CUSC urgency approach can be pursued quickly and volunteered to help work on this. They noted that the use of the urgency process would need to have Ofgem support.
  - For DNO's, a member noted that the experience was that project progressions had not been working well, but this had subsequently been resolved for smaller projects. However with network congestion it was growing harder. They noted that applying technical limits at Grid Supply Points was helping to accelerate connection of embedded generation. The connection reform package, with 3 or 4 project progression cycles per year will help address the concerns.
    - A member asked how projects could progress if they were not suitable for technical limits.
    - The member noted the need to consider net export from connections and acknowledged this could be difficult. They felt technical limits were an interim solution until the connection reforms go live with an appropriate mix of technologies.
  - A member raised the trade-off between earlier connection dates and curtailment and asked whether any insight was available on this.
    - A member offered a follow-up meeting for interested parties to discuss further.
    - Another member noted that constraint costs in the southern half of GB were a massive concern and emphasised the need to manage this carefully. They supported greater transparency and consistency to avoid impacting investor confidence.
  - [From online chat: A member noted that if a code mod isn't required for TIA and it is currently up to individual DNOs or TOs, is that the right approach or should that change such that strategic deployment at the national level should be considered.
    - ENA noted that they would discuss at CDB secretariat how/when this topic should come to the CDB.]
  - The Chair summarised the outcome and next steps:
    - **Action 10.4.1:** ENA to confirm the CDB's role in the governance of TIA thresholds.
    - **Action 10.4.2** DESNZ to discuss linkages to Local Power Plans with their Local Power Team.
    - **Action 10.4.3** NGET to reanalyse the impact of raising the lower TIA threshold from 1MW to <5MW and 5MW to <10MW capacity projects.
    - **Action 10.4.4** ALL to share any further feedback with NGET.
    - **Action 10.4.5** NGET to return to CPAG with an updated paper, reflecting the discussions.
-

---

## 5. TMO4+ progress update

- The CUSC and STC panels have supported a revised timetable for the TMO4+ code change work groups and this has now gone to the Authority for a decision. The timetable proposes submitting the Final Modification Reports in mid-December, a decision on the code changes in Q1 2025, with implementation in Q2 2025.
  - The in-person event 16 September seeks to address some of the workgroup concerns regarding the TMO4+ methodologies.
  - The Distribution Forecasted Transmission Capacity concept has been removed from the scope of the CMP434 and 435 code modification proposals and instead Grid Code modification 139 is looking to enhance planning data exchange to facilitate whole system planning.
  - A member expressed pleasure that ESO had listened to feedback and the presented changes seemed to be practical. The question is will these measures reduce the queue?
    - ESO noted the data arising from the request for information (RFI) to the existing queue. ESO also noted the consideration of the government's Clean Power 2030 objective, which establishes the need to go further on connections reform, such as consideration of technical or technological criteria and potentially an additional financial element.
    - The member felt the code modifications were now a little looser, for example with Gate 1 now not obligatory.
    - ESO responded that it didn't want/need everyone to come through Gate 1, with many stakeholders expressing that they would not go through an optional Gate 1. ESO noted that it will not actively discourage projects from going through the Gate 1 process.
  - A member emphasised the need for caution when using the RFI data as some developers will have been bullish about their status. They queried whether applying a technical / technology element was now a given within TMO4+.
    - ESO responded that the technical / technology element was not yet confirmed, but that it would be needed to deliver Clean Power 2030. The general consensus that there is a need to do more, hence the proposed technical/technology and financial elements.
    - ESO also reassured that the RFI response data was not the only information that it was considering, for example ESO is also reviewing public planning registers. ESO is also considering a follow-up exercise with projects in the queue that did not respond to the RFI.
    - A member supported treating RFI responses with caution. They also noted the RFI asked about readiness for January 2025, but the latest thinking was for reform go-live in Q2 2025, therefore the proportion 'ready' should be higher.
  - [From online chat: ESO noted that there was still potential for further refinement of the proposal through workgroup discussions and the potential alternatives being discussed do change what ESO has proposed in small or big ways.]
  - [From online chat: A member noted that they had submitted an alternative to CMP434 and CMP435 that would remove the matter raised about land and add in other elements dealing with such things as existing projects with Government Support Contracts plus a cost recovery mechanism as well as changing what a project receives at Gate 1 and what is needed for Gate 2 (financial commitment).]
  - A member asked what the impact of the updated proposal was on embedded projects. They noted the removal of DFTC now that Gate 1 was optional and highlighted their wish to see some of the pain for Distribution-connected customers removed. They asked whether there was anything more that could be done for embedded connections to avoid transmission constraints.
    - ENA noted that work continues on raising entry requirements for Distribution-connected customers, such as ensuring milestone management better aligns to the TMO4+ reforms. ENA noted that DNOs were working with industry and ESO on this.
    - A DNO representative noted the opportunity for a strategic review for charging. For generation customers, the costs are still significant and DNOs are working with Ofgem through an ENA working group to find a sensible solution for generation constraint costs at the T/D boundary.
    - A member noted that RFI responses may not be representative for Distribution-connected customers due the lower response rate.
    - A member asked about the existing D-queue and the impact of the proposals on it.
-

- The Chair concluded the discussion requesting that ENA and DNOs return to a future CPAG meeting to provide a fuller update on the impact on Distribution-connected customers. The Chair expressed that members would value a clear picture of the measures ENA/DNOs consider are required to implement connections reform at distribution level, what changes to codes, terms and conditions etc. will be forthcoming.
- **Action 10.5.1:** ENA & DNOs to provide an update at the next CPAG meeting
- ESO advised that ESO is taking a briefing on Clean Power 2030 to the Connections Delivery Board and a paper proposing alignment of the connections reform proposals to Clean Power 2030.
  - DESNZ confirmed that it will be government that publishes the Clean Power Plan, and that this will draw on the advice ESO submits.
  - A member noted that there was anxiety amongst stakeholders about these changes, which may undermine the whole process. The concern included whether government would be picking winners and it's not clear who these would be and on what basis they would be picked. They preferred beefing up the TMO4+ requirements, rather than a third party influence coming in. They expressed concern about investor confidence. Were the proposed changes a knee-jerk reaction to the RFI responses?
  - Another member agreed and expressed concern about moving away from a technical / technology and location-agnostic approach. They felt that this moves the investment proposition significantly. They warned that uncertainty means things don't get built. They felt that TMO4+ has been going in the right direction, but these new proposals bring too much uncertainty. With such a substantial change they questioned whether the group had wasted its time on TMO4+?
  - [From online chat: A member noted that they felt the step change in direction presents a real UK credibility risk.]
  - Another member shared that they had raised an alternative approach, linking to government support contracts where a market process has been followed by Ofgem and DESNZ. They also expressed willingness to help draft the methodologies to help take account of industry's views.
  - Another member supported the proposed alignment of TMO4+ with Clean Power 2030. They felt that the TMO4+ proposals alone do not do enough to establish a viable and efficient queue and therefore something more needs to be done. They noted that they would submit an alternative proposal that is both transparent and competitive. They noted that some technologies, such as floating offshore wind had government support, so were in a better position than other technologies.
  - [From online chat: A member noted that the distribution code changes identified as required within the schedule had not been raised yet, therefore there is a need to work at pace to meet the intention to submit final modification reports for the entire package to Ofgem by 20 December this year.]
  - A member noted how difficult it would be to set the levels required for Clean Power 2030 at each Grid Supply Point.
- ESO recognised the concerns and emphasised that the time spent developing TMO4+ was not wasted effort and that the TMO4+ proposal always included measure to future-proof the approach to strategic energy planning.
- The Chair thanked all participants for their contributions and noted that ESO would return to the next meeting to provide an update on TMO4+ and Clean Power 2030 alignment.
- **Action 10.5.2:** ESO to provide an update on TMO4+ and Clean Power 2030 alignment.

## 6. Next steps

- ESO is hosting an in-person event Monday 16 September which CPAG members and TMO4+ code change workgroup participants have been invited to focussed upon the potential to apply a technology lens to Connections Reform in the context of Clean Power 2030. ESO will also schedule a follow-up webinar.
- The next CPAG meeting was scheduled for 10 October. The Chair noted the following proposed agenda items:
  - TMO4+ progress update and Clean Power 2030 alignment



- Transmission Impact Assessment thresholds – updated paper following today’s discussion
- An update on implications of reforms for embedded projects connecting to the distribution networks

**Decisions and Actions**

**Decisions: Made at last meeting**

ID	Description	Owner	Date
10.2.1	Meeting 9 minutes agreed	Merlin Hyman	12/09/2024

**Action items: In progress and completed since last meeting**

ID	Description	Owner	Due	Status	Date
10.2.1	ESO to publish meeting 9 minutes	Mike Robey	30/09/2024		
10.4.1	ENA to confirm the CDB’s role in the governance of TIA threshold noting the view of CPAG members that this is a strategic issue for government’s Local Power Plan commitments and should be considered by CDB.	Kyle Smith	25/10/2024		
10.4.2	DESNZ to discuss this with their Local Power Team	Ian Thel	25/10/2024		
10.4.3	NGET to reanalyse the impact of raising the lower TIA threshold from 1MW to <5MW and 5MW to <10MW capacity projects	Dan Clarke	25/10/2024		
10.4.4	ALL to share any further feedback on TIA thresholds with NGET	ALL	11/10/2024		
10.4.5	NGET to return to CPAG with an updated paper, reflecting the discussions	Dan Clarke	25/10/2024		
10.5.1	ENA & DNOs to provide an update at the next CPAG meeting	Kyle Smith	25/10/2024		
10.5.2	ESO to provide an update on TMO4+ and Clean Power 2030 alignment	James Norman	25/10/2024		
7.3.4	SCG to return to CPAG to share details on Charging Reforms after options have been presented to CDB	Su Neves e Brooks	11/07/2024	Present at Oct or Nov CPAG	

**Action Item Log - Action items: Previously completed.**

ID	Description	Owner	Due	Status	Date
9.2.1	ESO to publish minutes of meeting 8	Mike Robey	29/07/2024	Complete	25/07/2024
9.3.1	ESO to share the revised code modification timeline with CPAG once confirmed	Mike Oxenham	11/07/2024	Complete	

9.7.1	CPAG members to review and respond to the circulated bay sharing policy	ALL	30/08/2024	Complete	
9.8.1	ESO to update CPAG members after the 01 August CDB meeting	James Norman & Merlin Hyman	09/08/2024	Complete	
8.2.1	ESO to publish the minutes of meeting 7	Mike Robey	26/06/2024	Complete	19/06/2024
8.4.1	ENA / SCG to return to CPAG once the network design methodology is clearer to share an update on the DFTC approach	Kyle Smith		DFTC removed from TMO4+	
8.7.1	ESO to share further details of transitional arrangements at the next CPAG meeting	Alex Curtis	22/07/2024	Complete	22/07/2024
8.8.1	ESO to cancel the August meeting	Mike Robey	26/06/2024	Complete	26/06/2024
8.8.2	ESO will share a high-level summary of responses to the Request for Information to the current queue at the July CPAG meeting.	Ruth Matthew	11/07/2024	Complete	22/07/2024
7.2.1	ESO to publish minutes of meeting 6	Mike Robey	17/05/2024	Complete	14/05/2024
7.3.1	ESO to share a timeline for TMO4+ with CPAG	Mike Robey	19/06/2024	Share at next CPAG	19/06/2024
7.3.2	ESO to share the draft RFI with CPAG members for comment	Mike Robey	10/05/2024	Complete	10/05/2024
7.3.3	ESO to continue discussion with Ofgem and to confirm if/how queue management implementation will be affected through the transition towards TMO4+	Laura Henry	19/06/2024		
7.4.1	SCG will share the DFTC rulebook at the next CPAG meeting	Ben Godfrey & Kyle Smith	19/06/2024	Complete	19/06/2024
7.5.1	SCG to organise a stakeholder meeting and to invite interested CPAG members and to report back to CPAG.	Kyle Smith & Paul Glendinning	05/06/2024	Complete	19/06/2024
7.10.1	ESO to reschedule June meeting	Mike Robey	17/05/2024	Complete	19/06/2024
6.2.1	The Strategic Connections Group to return to CPAG with a paper on the implications for embedded customers.	Ben Godfrey	09/05/2024	Complete	09/05/2024
6.2.2	ESO to publish minutes of meeting 5	Mike Robey	25/04/2024	Complete	14/05/2024
6.3.1	ESO to submit CUSC and STC code modifications on Friday 19 April	Paul Mullen	19/04/2024	Complete	19/04/2024
6.4.1	ESO to provide further clarification to CPAG on MITS definitions, and implication of potential impacts on Charging and User Commitment.	Djaved Rostom	09/05/2024	Complete	09/05/2024
6.5.1	ESO and TOs to develop formal bay sharing policy	ESO, TOs	28/06/2024	Complete	July mtg
5.2.1	ESO to publish the minutes of meeting 4	Mike Robey	21/03/2024	Complete	21/03/2024
5.3.1	The Gate 2 approach will be taken to the March CDB for their steer.	James Norman	21/03/2024	Complete	21/03/2024
5.4.1	ESO and DNO to consider the revised proposals within DFTC discussion	ESO & DNOs	25/04/2024	Ongoing and moved to DFTC updates	09/05/2024
5.4.2	ESO to take Package 3.1 recommendation to the March CDB meeting.	James Norman	21/03/2024	Complete	21/03/2024
5.5.1	DFTC to come back to CPAG to reflect how it would work if Gate 2 were applied to the whole queue.	Ben Godfrey	25/04/2024	Complete	25/04/2024
5.6.1	ESO to take its disincentivising mod apps recommendation to the March CDB meeting.	James Norman	21/03/2024	Complete	21/03/2024



5.7.1	ESO to take its paper on the single digital view CAP action to CDB for their steer	Adam Towl	21/03/2024	Complete	21/03/2024
5.8.1	ESO to schedule CPAG meetings beyond April 2024	Mike Robey	28/03/2024	Complete	28/03/2024
4.1.1	ESO to look into sending papers in more than one batch, if this allows at least some to be circulated earlier.	Mike Robey	29/02/2024	Ongoing	04/03/2024
4.1.2	ESO to trial pre-recording some presentations to introduce topics in advance of the meeting.	Mike Robey	29/02/2024	closed	12/09/2024
4.2.1	ESO to publish Minutes of meeting 3	Mike Robey	29/02/2024	Complete	26/02/2024
4.3.1	ESO to return to CPAG to share its updated recommendation for Package 2.	Djaved Rostom	04/04/2024	Complete	18/04/2024
4.4.1	ESO will take forward the options Packages 3.1, 4.4 and 5 for more detailed discussion.	Mike Oxenham	07/03/2024	On agenda 07 March	07/03/2024
4.6.1	ESO to return to CPAG to discuss disincentivising mod apps	Ruth Matthew	07/03/2024	On agenda 07 March	07/03/2024
3.2.1	ESO to publish the minutes of meeting 2	Mike Robey	22/02/2024	Complete	16/02/2024
3.5.1	ESO agreed to look into holding a targeted workshop on Gate 2 to gather more views	Paul Mullen	28/02/2024	Scheduled	28/02/2024
3.7.1	ESO will bring fuller details on packages 3, 4 and 5 to the next CPAG meeting, providing clear links to the Connections Action Plan	Mike Oxenham	22/02/2024	Complete	22/02/2024
3.7.2	ESO to re-issue slides to address a typo on slide 36	Mike Robey	08/02/2024	Complete	08/02/2024
2.2.1	ESO to publish Terms of Reference	Mike Robey	08/02/2024	Complete	08/02/2024
2.2.2	ESO to publish minutes of meeting 1	Mike Robey	08/02/2024	Complete	08/02/2024
2.3.1	ESO to scope code defects and bring them to a future CPAG meeting	Paul Mullen	07/03/2024	On agenda 07 March	07/03/2024
2.4.1	ESO to bring update on queue position allocation to the 08 February CPAG meeting	Paul Mullen	08/02/2024	Complete	08/02/2024
2.5.1	ESO to bring bay re-allocation and standardisation back to CPAG	Shade Popoola	22/02/2024	Complete	22/02/2024
1.2.1	ESO to circulate the updated Terms of Reference document	Mike Robey	25/01/2024	Complete	22/01/2024
1.3.1	ESO to share its analysis of the impact of CMP376 on the existing TEC queue.	Kav Patel	08/02/2024	Quarterly updates to be provided	Ongoing
1.4.1	ESO to look at how and when details of the outcome of the ongoing transmission works review can be shared	Robyn Jenkins	08/02/2024	Update shared	08/02/2024
1.4.2	Technical secretary to follow-up liaison and co-ordination with CDB	Mike Robey	25/01/2024	In place	24/01/2024
1.4.3	ESO to confirm how much detail of code mods will be taken to CPAG before going to code mod working groups.	Paul Mullen	25/01/2024	Discussed 25 January	25/01/2024

**Decision Log – Decisions previously made**

ID	Description	Owner	Date
6.2.2	Minutes of meeting 8 approved for publication	Merlin Hyman	22/07/2024

ID	Minutes of meeting 7 approved for publication	Merlin Hyman	19/06/2024
ID	Minutes of meeting 6 approved for publication	Merlin Hyman	09/05/2024
ID	Minutes of meeting 5 approved for publication	Merlin Hyman	18/04/2024
5.2.1	Minutes of meeting 4 approved for publication	Merlin Hyman	07/03/2024
4.2.1	Minutes of meeting 3 approved for publication	Merlin Hyman	22/02/2024
3.2.1	Minutes of meeting 2 approved for publication	Merlin Hyman	08/02/2024
2.1.1	Terms of Reference v2 approved for publication	Mike Robey	25/01/2024
2.2.1	Minutes of meeting 1 approved for publication	Mike Robey	25/01/2024