

Public

Code Administrator Consultation Response Proforma

CMP434: Implementing Connections Reform

Industry parties are invited to respond to this consultation expressing their views and supplying the rationale for those views, particularly in respect of any specific questions detailed below.

Please send your responses to cusc.team@nationalenergyso.com by **5pm GMT on 26 November 2024**. Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address will not be accepted.

If you have any queries on the content of this consultation, please contact cusc.team@nationalenergyso.com

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
Respondent name:	Laura Henry	
Company name:	National Grid Electricity Distribution (NGED)	
Email address:	Laura.henry@nationalgrid.com	
Phone number:	07970333738	
Which best describes your organisation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer body <input type="checkbox"/> Demand <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator <input type="checkbox"/> Generator <input type="checkbox"/> Industry body <input type="checkbox"/> Interconnector	<input type="checkbox"/> Storage <input type="checkbox"/> Supplier <input type="checkbox"/> System Operator <input type="checkbox"/> Transmission Owner <input type="checkbox"/> Virtual Lead Party <input type="checkbox"/> Other

I wish my response to be:

(Please mark the relevant box)

Non-Confidential (*this will be shared with industry and the Panel for further consideration*)

Confidential (*this will be disclosed to the Authority in full but, unless specified, will not be shared with the Panel or the industry for further consideration*)

For reference the Applicable CUSC (non-charging) Objectives are:

Public

- a) *The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence;*
- b) *Facilitating effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity, and (so far as consistent therewith) facilitating such competition in the sale, distribution and purchase of electricity;*
- c) *Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency *; and*
- d) *Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements.*

**The Electricity Regulation referred to in objective (c) is Regulation (EU) 2019/943 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 June 2019 on the internal market for electricity (recast) as it has effect immediately before IP completion day as read with the modifications set out in the SI 2020/1006.*

Please express your views in the right-hand side of the table below, including your rationale.

Standard Code Administrator Consultation questions		
1	Please provide your assessment for the proposed solutions against the Applicable Objectives?	Mark the Objectives which you believe the proposed solutions better facilitate:
		Original <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d
		WACM1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d
		WACM2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input type="checkbox"/> d
		WACM3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input type="checkbox"/> d
		WACM4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input type="checkbox"/> d
		WACM5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input type="checkbox"/> d
		WACM6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d
		WACM7 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input type="checkbox"/> d
		Click or tap here to enter text.
2	Do you have a preferred proposed solution?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> WACM1 <input type="checkbox"/> WACM2 <input type="checkbox"/> WACM3

Public

		<input type="checkbox"/> WACM4 <input type="checkbox"/> WACM5 <input type="checkbox"/> WACM6 <input type="checkbox"/> WACM7 <input type="checkbox"/> Baseline <input type="checkbox"/> No preference
		Click or tap here to enter text.
3	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		We support the implementation approach for CMP434, provided that Distribution Network Operators have enough notice that the window is going to open and that the Modification Notice process for Bilateral Embedded Generator Agreements (BEGAs) is clear in relation to timescales for what can and cannot be achieved during the next application Window.
4	Do you have any other comments?	<p>Overall, NGED is supportive of CMP434, however, we have several concerns with how the Code modification is currently drafted, particularly in relation to the BEGA/Modification Notice process. Please see below for further information in relation to this.</p> <p>NGED cannot support several of the Work Group Alternatives (WACMs) due to the implications that they would have for embedded projects. More details on this are provided below.</p> <p>There are also several sections in the Legal Text which need further defining/alignment for embedded projects.</p> <p>The BEGA process needs to be clearer in Elements 2, 3, and 5 in relation to how the process will work for BEGA applications. The elements refer to the fact that the subsequent DNO Modification application will be submitted in the Gated application window rather than a gated application window which could allude to a Modification Application being required in the next Gated Application window. DNOs will use reasonable endeavours to make sure that, where possible, a</p>

Public

	<p>Modification Application is submitted in the next window. However, there will be a number of situations and scenarios where this will not be possible: for instance, if a Modification Notice is received towards the end of a window. It is also not clear how the 5 Working Day /15 Working Day process for DNOs works for the Modification Application Process following a Modification Notice. We ask that the NESO clarifies at what point in this process the DNO is expected to submit the Modification Application.</p> <p>In Element 10 (Connection Point and Capacity Reservation), it is not clear if DNOs can take part in this process. We ask that the proposal confirms if there will be a section on the self-declaration form where customers can request to be considered for capacity reservation. If embedded customers cannot take part in element 10, then there is a risk that embedded customers will not have the same opportunities as directly connected transmission parties to access capacity. We assume DNOs cannot take part as capacity reservation is realised through gate 1, which distribution customers cannot access. This means there is a risk, particularly for embedded onshore wind CP30 targets, that the technology does not exist and is not reserved in the areas that is most suitable for wind. This would suggest that policy intervention is necessary to allow capacity reservation at GSPs which lend themselves to wind, being in close proximity to suitable land. We would ask that NESO considers their position on this.</p> <p>In Element 11, section 11.3 (Ongoing Gate 2 Compliance – Land Requirements), we would welcome clarification on how this process will work for DNO customers. Is it assumed that they will not be expected to follow this process and that the ENA Allowable Changes guidance, which is already used at DNO level, will be used instead? We also ask if it is expected that there will be ongoing checks at DNO level for the Gate 2 compliance, as this is not clear in the document. Given that DNOs already follow a published allowable changes process we would not be looking to do anything different in this area.</p>
--	---

Public

		<p>In Element 13 (Gate 2 Criteria Evidence Assessment), it is not clear, other than the duplication checking, which part of the Gate 2 evidence which the DNOs will have already checked will be then checked again by NESO. We note that this is also unclear in the Gate 2 criteria methodology.</p> <p>In Element 16 (Introducing the proposed Connections Network Design Methodology) – although the CUSC does not govern the distribution use of system , should it refer to the fact that the DNOs will also use the CNDM to ‘undertake connections network design’ ? this will ensure the signalling and linkages are clearer.</p> <p>Element 18 (Set out the process for how DNOs and transmission connected iDNOs notify NESO of Relevant Embedded Small Power Stations or Relevant Embedded Medium Power Stations which meet Gate 2 criteria), reads as though the only evidence that a DNO needs to submit to NESO in relation to land rights is the red line boundary. We would welcome an explicit confirmation whether this is indeed the case or whether all of the Gate 2 evidence is expected.</p> <p>WORKGROUP ALTERNATIVES:</p> <p>WACM2: NGED cannot support WACM 2. DNOs will, where possible, put all applications that meet Gate 2 through within the required timescales, but there will be some circumstances where this is not possible for reasons outside of the DNOs control.</p> <p>WACM3: It is not clear from the proposed whether the reallocation is only intended to cover further [new] applications, or existing offers / agreements (including those being processed under CMP435), or what the intention is for Embedded Generation customers. We therefore do not support this WACM.</p>
--	--	--

Public

		<p>WACM5: We do not support this WACM as we believe that the ability for projects to be designated is useful for network operational purposes.</p> <p>WACM7: We do not support this WACM. If adopted, DNOs would need to consider whether the disclosure of project details by NESO could expose DNOs to risk of breaches of confidence, including under Section 105 of the Utilities Act, and what mitigations would be required in respect of this. The proposed pause also doesn't consider Distribution Embedded Generation Related Applications that may be made post close of the Gated Application Window, or the outcome of any detailed checks carried out within the Gated Design Process, which may limit its value, or otherwise need providing for.</p> <p>LEGAL TEXT:</p> <p>General: Amendments to the defined terms and usage will need to be double checked. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Developer's Equipment' (as used in 17.7.9) is not defined; - The definition of 'Developer Capacity' still refers to Request for a Statement of Works, which is no longer used. <p>Sections 6.5.1, 6.5.5 and 6.5.8 (Original): Can NESO clarify:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) what 'establishing an Appendix G' means for the purpose of 6.5.8; b) what the process for any Embedded Generation customers that trigger the need for 'establishing an Appendix G' is (is it intended for them to be included within a Transmission Evaluation Application under 6.5.5, rather than within the TIA Modification Application as anticipated by 6.5.8.2?); and c) how Appendix G, Transmission Evaluation Applications, and New Connection Site applications triggered by Transmission Evaluation Applications interact with each other, as the process as currently drafted for is unclear. <p>Section 17.6.2 (Original): Can NESO clarify exactly what needs to be provided by the DNO within the 5 Business Day Period and the 15 Business Day Period, as well as when then TEA application itself needs to be provided?</p> <p>Section 17.6.5 (Original): Can NESO clarify:</p>
--	--	--

Public

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what a Distribution Embedded Generation Related Application will look like for applications other than Transmission Evaluation Applications (in particular for large Embedded Generation customers), • when each will be used (including a Connection Application and a Modification Application), and • how this aligns with the revised Section 6.9 drafting? <p>Section 17.6.6 (a) (Original): Any Distribution Embedded Generation Related Application (i.e. including any Connection Application and/or Modification Application required for a large Embedded Generation customer) should have a 15BD post-window period for submission in line with that for TEA applications under 17.6.2.</p> <p>Section 17.7.1 (Original): Can NESO confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that the reference within this clause to the Gated Application Window should be construed by reference to the 15 Business Days post-close window that a DNO has to submit a Transmission Evaluation Application for small / medium Embedded Generation customers (and in line with our comment above, a Connection Application and/or Modification Application for a large Embedded Generation customer); and • how this requirement will be interpreted if the Distribution Embedded Generation Related Application is submitted in the next application window, in line with paragraph 17.6.6 (a), i.e. if a large Embedded Generation customer submits their application in one window, and DNO submits their related application in the next, would the customer be obliged to resubmit within the same window as the DNO submission? <p>Section 17.7.6 (Original): Can NESO clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • when Competency will be confirmed in respect of any Distribution Embedded Generation Related Application submitted in the post-close window period (including under 17.6.2, and noting the comments above in relation to large Embedded Generation customer applications); and • the process for payment of DNO submission application fees given the requirement for an application to be
--	--	--

Public

		<p>Competent (including application fees having been paid), which will be confirmed by NESO before the Gated Design Process?</p> <p>Section 17.7.8 (Original): Can NESO clarify how Reservation will work for Embedded Generation customers. This needs to include any New Connection Site application by a DNO triggered by Embedded Generation customers and noting paragraph [6.3.2 - Connection Point and Capacity Reservation at Gate 1] of the Connection Network Design Methodology (CNDM), which provides that a DNO can notify NESO of any Embedded Generation project which would benefit from connection point and capacity reservation?</p> <p>Section 17.7.9: additional wording has been included here in relation to Installed Capacity, please can NESO confirm how this will work for Embedded customers?</p> <p>Section 17.11 (Original): The G2 Criteria Methodology anticipates strategic alignment under the CNDM and project designation under the Project Designation Methodology (PDM) being undertaken as part of the G2 Criteria assessment prior to the end of a Gated Application Window, and before the start of the Gated Design Process. Paragraph 17.11 suggests instead that assessment of G2 Criteria is undertaken, and then projects are assessed in accordance with the CNDM and the PDM, which doesn't align and is confusing. We'd therefore suggest that this paragraph is deleted.</p> <p>Section 17.11 (Original): Our understanding is that NESO will identify a project as a Designated Project, and this will be done as part of the strategic alignment assessment prior to the end of Gated Design Process. We also understand that a DNO can notify NESO if it believes a project can be designated. Can NESO clarify what the process would be for small / medium Embedded Generation customers, including who would submit the application for designation? Could NESO also clarify how determination of designation by NESO will be factored into the timing for the strategic alignment assessment by the DNO, as this doesn't appear to currently be covered within the methodologies?</p>
--	--	---

Public

		<p>Section 17.12 (Original): Paragraph 18.16 provides that, for customers who don't progress through G2, the DNO agreements with NESO will either be terminated or changed to the equivalent of a G1 agreement. However, Section 17 does not provide for there to be a potential DNO G1 agreement - only a G1 BEGA agreement for a large Embedded Generation customer. Can NESO clarify the difference in approach or amend Section 17 to provide for the potential for G1 DNO agreements to be entered into.</p> <p>Section 17.13 (Original): Can NESO clarify what is intended to happen if not all Relevant Embedded Power Station customers accept their G2 offer (via the DNO), as well as how capacity reallocation works in general?</p>
5	Do you agree with the Workgroup's assessment that the modification does not impact the Electricity Balancing Regulation (EBR) Article 18 terms and conditions held within the CUSC?	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>