

# Meeting minutes

## Connections Process Advisory Group

**Date:** 25/10/2024      **Location:** Microsoft Teams

### Participants

Attendee	Attend/Regrets	Attendee	Attend/Regrets
Merlin Hyman, Regen	Attend	Patrick Smart, RES Group	Attend
Paul Hawker, DESNZ	Attend	Helen Snodin, Fred Olsen	Attend
Ian Thel, DESNZ	Attend	Grant Rogers, Q Energy	Attend
Jasmine Killen, Scottish Government	Attend	Catherine Cleary, Roadnight Taylor	Attend
Liam Cullen, Ofgem	Attend	Alan Davenport, Transmission Investment	Attend
James Macauley, Ofgem	Attend	James Brown, Baywa.re	Attend
Ellie Ritchie, Ofgem	Attend	Chanura Wijeratne, RES Group	Attend
Klaudia Starzyk, Ofgem	Attend	Claire Hynes, RWE	Attend
Richard Woodward, NGET	Attend	Deborah MacPherson, Scottish Power Renewables	Attend
Dan Clarke, NGET	Attend	James Norman, NESO	Attend
Sarah Kenny-Levick, NGED	Attend	Robyn Jenkins, NESO	Attend
Allan Love, SPT	Attend	Djaved Rostom, NESO	Attend
Annette Sloan, SSENT	Attend	Mike Robey, NESO	Attend
Zivanayi Musanhi, UKPN	Attend	Mike Oxenham, NESO	Attend
Susana Neves e Brooks, SSEND	Attend	Atia Adrees, NESO	Attend
Spencer Thompson, Eclipse Power	Attend	Alex Markham, NESO	Attend
Garth Graham, SSEN Generation	Regrets	Neil Copeland, NESO	Attend
Michelle Young, Scottish Government	Regrets	Will Kirk-Wilson, NESO	Attend
Matt White, UKPN	Regrets	Sabrina Gao, NESO	Attend

Jessica Savoie, ADE	Regrets	Kyle Smith, ENA	Regrets
Holly Macdonald, Transmission Investment	Regrets	Jennifer Pride, Welsh Government	Regrets
Andrew Scott, SSEND	Regrets	Neil Bennett, SSENT	Regrets
Matt Chatfield, DESNZ	Regrets	Ben Godfrey, NGED	Regrets
Chris Clark, Emtec Group	Regrets	Arjan Geveke, EIUG	Regrets
David Boyer, ENA	Regrets	Camille Gilsenan, NESO	Regrets
Alasdair Macmillan, Ofgem	Regrets	Kara Davies, Solar Energy UK	Regrets
Graham Pannell, Baywa.re	Regrets	Jade Ison, NGET	Regrets
Eleanor Hoare, Welsh Government	Regrets	Laura Henry, NGED	Regrets
Lee Wilkinson, Ofgem	Regrets	Salvatore Zingale, Ofgem	Regrets

## Agenda

#	Topics to be discussed	
1.	Minutes and actions of last meeting	Mike Robey, NESO
2.	Enabling Works update	Djaved Rostom, NESO
3.	Reforms: TMO4+ Update and stakeholder feedback	James Norman, NESO
4.	Transmission Impact Assessment Thresholds	Dan Clarke, NGET
5.	Next steps	Merlin Hyman, Regen & James Norman, NESO

## Discussion and details

### 1. Minutes and Actions from last meeting

CPAG reviewed the outstanding actions from the last meeting (12 September).

ENA has indicated that it will bring details of the impact of the reforms package on embedded projects to the next meeting.

It's thought that the Strategic Connections Group will bring forward details of Charging reforms in December.

**Decision 11.1.1:** CPAG approved the Minutes of Meeting 10 and

**Action 11.1.1** NESO to publish the approved minutes of meeting 10.

### 2. Enabling Works Update

NESO presented an update on its work with Transmission Owners to update the approach taken for Enabling Works. They described the primary purpose being to increase

---

consistency and follow-through on the Connections Action Plan Action in support of accelerating connections.

CPAG member questions and comments:

- How does the Connect & Manage report to Ofgem fit with this?
    - NESO commented that the original Connect & Manage approach has become too cumbersome and therefore it was not being undertaken and NESO don't expect it will be done within the reformed connections world.
    - NESO noted that their proposal is, for works to address thermal issues beyond the MITS or ETB boundary that the classification of required works as Enabling Works or Wider Works will be driven by an Economic Test.
  - Will there be a process for approval and will developers have visibility of the thresholds and detail?
    - NESO advised that this had not been discussed yet.
    - A member noted that understanding how judgements are made, with regards to what is in and out of scope for Enabling Works is very important and therefore NESO & TOs need to provide visibility of how this is done.
    - **Action: 11.2.1** NESO to take this question to the Enabling Works group for discussion
  - A member sought confirmation of the changes proposed. They believed the changes were about adopting a consistent approach on the classification of MITS substation and Economic Test Boundary as the places where economic impact are judged, and also that this approach will not affect the extent of physical works actually required but will impact on how works are categorised as enabling and wider.
    - NESO confirmed this and stated that the next step will be show the impacts.
  - A member noted that the previous plan had been to complete this Enabling Works activity by December but that was now not the case, and they wanted to understand why.
  - NESO noted the principal reason was the work undertaken on the economic assessment which needed the input of another NESO team, who are actively involved in developing the Clean Power 2030 advice, limiting their availability. However, the revised reform timetable does not need the new Enabling Works process until May as it is not necessary or appropriate to apply any changes until the Gate 2 to the whole queue exercise.
  - NESO advised that the new approach would apply across Great Britain, although it is expected that most of the project acceleration possible as a result of adopting the approach will likely be in England & Wales.
-

- 
- [From online chat: A member asked whether the intention was still to apply “effectiveness tests” for determining Enabling Works beyond the MITS, especially if they are pre-fault overloads?
    - NESO responded that effectiveness factors will be considered in the economic tests for works beyond MITS/ETB to understand how effective generators will be at resolving overloads. This is to help understand the volume of constraints that would need to be taken in order to resolve the overloads. There will also be a consideration of effectiveness when looking at whether a project contributes enough to a problem, but this will not be in the same way that is currently done in NGET’s area.]
  - A member asked about the location of required works and whether a sensitivity check will be undertaken.
    - NESO acknowledged the need for some flexibility in understanding local issues and to look at the optimum level of reinforcement required for reform, boundary capabilities and reducing constraint costs.
  - A member raised whether there was concern that existing contracts have Enabling Works that are too shallow.
    - NESO advised that there was concern that Enabling Works were too wide in England and Wales and concern about the difference between England & Wales and Scotland. NESO would like all TOs to apply the same approach.
  - A member expressed concern that their customers, connecting to the transmission system felt that TO planning assumptions are too conservative and developers want this to be speeded up. They clarified this related to both construction timescales and for what is considered Enabling Works.
    - NESO noted that it was looking for TOs to deliver network reinforcement as soon as possible and that it understood that TOs were looking at optimising this too.
  - [From online chat: A member asked whether the Economic Test Boundary (ETB) would increase the cancellation charges for generators? They felt that the current cancellation charges from transmission reinforcements are disproportionately high, and they were concerned the ETB may increase them.
    - **Action 11.2.2:** NESO responded that they’d need to take this away and consult colleagues.]
  - [From online chat: A member asked whether there was a sense of the impact on constraint costs of the ETB approach.
    - NESO responded that ETB compared to MITS substation will likely help reduce constraints costs but have not yet done an analysis to quantify that impact. The implementation of Connect & Manage acknowledged that constraint costs would increase as not all the works (i.e. wider works) would need to be delivered
-

---

ahead of the connection. The key aim is to ensure the right balance between delivering the right set of works to facilitate customer connections and the risk of increase in constraint costs until the wider works are delivered if it is economical to do so.]

---

### 3. Connections Reform TMO4+ Update and stakeholder feedback

NESO drew attention to its recent webinars on TMO4+ and had reshared the webinar resources with CPAG members for information. They highlighted that the TMO4+ methodologies consultation will launch on 05 November, the day of the Customer Connections Seminar and that NESO's Clean Power 2030 advice would also be published on 05 November. The consultation documents will include:

- The Gate 2 criteria methodology
- Connections Network Design Methodology
- Project Designation Methodology
- Draft NESO connections reform data impact assessment
- Great Britain's Connections Reform overview document
- Consultation response proforma

NESO noted the volume of information being published and thanked stakeholders for their patience.

NESO advised for embedded generation projects, NESO's Clean Power 2030 advice proposes separate Transmission and Distribution pots / parts of the pathway as well as considering technology, capacity and location. This applies to both the 2030 pathways and to the 2031-35 pathway. The Distribution pots will be filled from DNO recommendations (with the Gate 2 process verified).

- A member queried whether there would be a single connections queue, or did these pots suggest something closer to the previously proposed Distribution Forecasted Transmission Capacity.
  - NESO advised to refer to the Connections Network Design Methodology for the specific details of the proposed approach to queue formation.
- A member asked for more details of the Clean Power 2030 pots.
  - NESO advised these will propose showing the size for each five-year block.
  - A member queried whether these will address the risk of undersupply
  - NESO confirmed this was within the methodology. Level of over-supply would be set by the plan and administered by the NESO (with DNO recommendations for embedded projects). Overall at Gate 2, projects will need to meet readiness criteria and also now to be strategically aligned to the Clean Power 2030 pots

---

(to 2030 and to 2035). NESO anticipates there would also be some flexibility between adjacent zones for projects of the same technology.

- NESO noted that the Clean Power 2030 advice was based upon an assessment of the market, real projects, connections registers, network companies' views on the market and so on.
- A member emphasised their view that the Clean Power Plan needed to be flexible to market conditions.
  - NESO noted that the advice for the plan proposed a longer time horizon to 2035, not just 2030 which would help and noted the need to consider other plans too. NESO also noted that the SSEP (which NESO has now been commissioned to provide advice to Government on) would update the strategic energy plan when it is published by end 2026.
  - A member noted that there could local planning variations and that these are also dynamic over time.
- [From online chat: a member recognised Clean Power 2030 was good, but raised that it will create winners and losers so the criteria is key and also not just customer readiness but DNO readiness and the link to project progression works; who will prioritise that?]
- A member noted that DNO customers are full of customers concerned about projects that might be impacted by the Clean Power 2030 plans. They asked whether every project that has been through a Transmission Impact Assessment (TIA) would be affected, even those projects where the TIA showed no impact. They urged that this level of detail was now needed to clarify these concerns.
  - NESO acknowledged this and advised that it would need to check this with ENA and DNOs.
- NESO noted that the code modification process still provided opportunities to input.

### Financial Instrument

NESO noted that there had been a lengthy discussion on the proposed additional financial instrument at the Transmission Charging Methodologies Forum (TCMF). NESO think there is a defect (with speculative re-seller projects blocking the queue), necessitating the additional financial instrument, but some disagree, and some believe the TMO4+ reforms will resolve the problem. Following the feedback NESO is now undertaking further analysis before it decides what to do next.

- A member thanked NESO for looking at this and expressed the view that the current approach needs simplifying. They noted that securities can vary widely, and they felt that some are over-stated. They recognised that developers included large portfolios and individual very small projects. Amongst all these, some are speculative, and the
-

---

question is how to best challenge these. They encouraged NESO to continue exploring this challenge as it was very important for real projects.

- A member asked if they could collect concise views from members and share these with NESO.
  - NESO agreed.
- Another member did not believe there was a need for the additional financial instrument. They felt that the additional security being proposed will impact the viability of some good projects. They felt it reasonable to review User Commitment holistically and that CMP192 had tried to do that (although they felt that CMP192 was not perfect). They felt the £20,000/MW security was very big. Whilst they acknowledged the intention, they believed that it would remove or delay valid Clean Power 2030 projects. They supported further investigation.
- [From online chat – A member suggested that both the CP30 proposals and this financial instrument proposal are already impacting customer behaviour. They suggested that there was a quite urgent need to publish guidance on allowable / significant changes. Otherwise, they felt there was a risk of customers doing weird and wacky things before TMO4+ implementation locks them down by technology and land parcel.
- A member urged NESO to get the £/MW figure right and suggested this could be banded for certain types of connections, maybe by location]
- NESO noted that there was a challenge that we all don't yet know how developers will react in the reformed connections world, but the problem was that there was insufficient time to wait and find out before acting.
- A member queried the scope and NESO advised that the proposed approach would apply to projects currently liable for User Commitment (including indirectly via DNO's liability for transmission works).

---

#### 4. Transmission Impact Assessment (TIA) Thresholds position paper

NGET introduced the updated Transmission Impact Assessment threshold paper and advised that this was on the agenda for the Connections Delivery Board for their steer.

The paper proposes codifying the lower threshold at which TIA applies, and for this threshold to move from 1MW in England & Wales to 5MW (and potentially up to 7.5MW or even 10MW). The code modification would be separate to the TMO4+ modifications and they'd propose that it applies retrospectively to unblock projects.

- A member asked about the timing of implementation and the scale of the impact. They were concerned about the scale of the change; would a significant volume of projects be affected?
  - NGET noted about 1% of projects would benefit from this change.

- 
- NGET noted that implementation and go-live was time-sensitive with TMO4+ and Connections Action Plan actions.
  - A member thanked NGET for listening to previous feedback. They noted that there were different issues in Scotland but that this was still important.
    - NGET noted that Grid Supply Point size and voltages were different in Scotland and therefore the paper does not propose harmonisation.
    - A member expressed that any increase in the thresholds above 200kW in Scotland would be welcomed.
    - SPT noted that thresholds had been reviewed, but no change was recommended. They stated that 6GW sought connection by 2030, facilitated by SPD, which will see the networks really full. SPD offer different products and solutions to offset this such as net zero connections. Therefore, on the balance of risks SPT feel that the thresholds cannot be moved.
  - A member noted that with NGET's move to a 5MW threshold, this would create a very marked difference between 5MW in England & Wales and 200kW in Scotland. They questioned how this will fit with GB Energy and Local Power Plans; what would be the impact?
    - NGET advised that further analysis would be required to understand the impact of the new threshold. This could also be undertaken for the Scottish TOs. The code modification process would require this sort of analysis, workgroup development and would also include industry consultation.
    - SSENT noted the paper includes their proposed increase from 50kW to 200kW, where this was possible and also that they were engaged with the working discussion on thresholds.
    - DESNZ confirmed TIA thresholds were being considered in respect of Local Power Plans.
  - [From online chat: A member thanked NGET for the proposed increase in the lower threshold to 5MW. They felt this would make a big difference and they hoped Scottish TOs would also follow.
    - Another member agreed and asked if there was any reason why there couldn't be a similar demand threshold. They appreciated that the paper says this is out of scope, but they felt that it just seems like it might be a missed opportunity.
    - NGET responded that they were looking to establish demand thresholds. They advised that work was already underway with SSEN to do this to alleviate constraints.
    - Another member queried whether there was a nationwide limit that applies to demand, as well as generators, or does this depend on the Grid Supply Point?
-



- **Action 11.4.1** NGET noted that they'd need to take this question away.]
- The Chair concluded the discussion, thanking NGET for the updated threshold position paper and asked that CPAG's endorsement of the proposals in the paper be noted by the Connections Delivery Board.
  - **Action 11.4.2** To note CPAG's endorsement of the updated TIA Thresholds position paper when taken to CDB.

#### Government update

DESNZ noted that Government would soon be communicating its views on the reforms, which should provide further clarity.

DESNZ also noted that the Government's Clean Power Plan, once published would need to work with the connection reforms and that DESNZ continued to work with Ofgem and NESO on this.

- A member agreed that local energy is big consideration for their stakeholders, for microgrids, for example.

#### 5. Next steps

- NESO advised that following the 05 November physical seminar, there would be a webinar on 14 November.
- CPAG agreed to move back its November meeting to 21 November.
  - **Action 11.5.1** NESO to circulate revised invitation for the November meeting
  - NESO recommended no meeting in December as its team had a very intense period to review consultation responses and consider edits and to submit the methodologies and the final code modification reports before submitting to Ofgem before Christmas.

#### Any other business

- A member raised Transitional Arrangements under the new timeline. They raised whether an update could be provided on this at some point, for example how mod apps will be treated?

## Action Item Log

Action items: In progress and completed since last meeting

ID	Description	Owner	Due	Status	Date
11.1.1	NESO to publish the minutes of meeting 11	Mike Robey	01/11/2024	In progress	

Public

11.2.1	Confirm whether developers will have visibility of how Enabling Works judgements are made	Djaved Rostom	21/11/2024	Open
11.2.2	Provide details of what the impact of the Economic Test Boundary will be on cancellation charges	Djaved Rostom	21/11/2024	Open
11.4.1	To clarify whether a nationwide limit applies to demand (re TIA thresholds) or whether this is dependent upon the GSP.	Dan Clarke (NGET)	21/11/2024	Open
11.4.2	To note CPAG's endorsement of the updated TIA Thresholds position paper when taken to CDB	NGET & CDB secretariat	31/10/2024	Complete
11.5.1	Reschedule November meeting for 21 <sup>st</sup> November	Mike Robey	01/11/2024	Complete

## Previous actions

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	Complete	
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	On agenda for CDB meeting	
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	Revised paper shared at meeting 11.	25/10/2024
10.4.4	ALL to share any further feedback on TIA thresholds with NGET	ALL	11/10/2024	Closed	25/10/2024
10.4.5	NGET to return to CPAG with an updated paper, reflecting the discussions	Dan Clarke	25/10/2024	Revised paper shared at meeting 11	25/10/2024
10.5.1	ENA & DNOs to provide an update at the next CPAG meeting	Kyle Smith	25/10/2024	Presented at meeting 11	25/10/2024
10.5.2	ESO to provide an update on TMO4+ and Clean Power 2030 alignment	James Norman	25/10/2024	Presented at meeting 11	25/10/2024

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		
7.3.4	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		
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

ID	Description	Owner	Date
11.1.1	Minutes of meeting 10 approved for publication	Merlin Hyman	25/10/2024
10.2.1	Minutes of meeting 9 approved for publication	Merlin Hyman	12/09/2024
9.2.1	Minutes of meeting 8 approved for publication	Merlin Hyman	22/07/2024
8.2.1	Minutes of meeting 7 approved for publication	Merlin Hyman	19/06/2024
7.2.1	Minutes of meeting 6 approved for publication	Merlin Hyman	09/05/2024
6.2.2	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