

Workgroup 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@nationalgrideso.com by **5pm on 06 August 2024**. Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration.

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

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
Respondent name:	Paul Munday	
Company name:	Ethical Power	
Email address:	Paul.munday@ethical-power.com	
Phone number:	07729 073916	
Which best describes your organisation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer body <input type="checkbox"/> Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator <input checked="" 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 Workgroup, Panel or the industry for further consideration*)

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

- 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 Workgroup Consultation questions		
1	Do you believe that the Original Proposal better facilitates the Applicable Objectives?	Mark the Objectives which you believe the Original solution better facilitates: Original <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
	<p>We believe that this solution better facilitates objective A due to,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a batched assessment of applications (as provided by an application window) will allow for a more efficient use of NGESO/NGET resources to complete system studies and plan transmission works and that A Gate process to allow projects that are able connect sooner be given an accelerated connection date. <p>We do not believe that this solution better facilitates objective B as the DFTC principal and retention of the Statement of Works, Project Progression and Modification Application processes do not improve, and possibly worsen, the connection process for Distribution Network Companies and their customers.</p> <p>Our concerns include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will DNOs be able to accurately forecast demand for connections? They may be tempted to ask for very high volumes to avoid the risk of exceeding their forecast, thus producing unnecessarily onerous estimates for Transmission works and later connection dates than needed. DNO users be disadvantaged due to the time taken to go through the Statement of Works process to reach Gate 2 while Transmission customers 'self certify'? 	
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach? (see pages 59-61)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		
3	Do you have any other comments?	
Click or tap here to enter text.		
4	Do you wish to raise a Workgroup Consultation Alternative Request for	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (the request form can be found in the Workgroup Consultation Section) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

the Workgroup to consider?	
Click or tap here to enter text.	

Specific Workgroup Consultation questions

5	<p>Do you agree with the elements of the proposed solution? Element 7 has been de-scoped and Element 10 is proposed to be codified within the STC through modification CM095. Please provide rationale for your answer and any suggestions for improvement to each element?</p>	
	<p>Element 1: Proposed Authority approved methodologies and ESO guidance (see pages 9-10, 55)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>
	<p>Many of these documents may only be drafted and not finalised, with only some going through a robust review and approval process. The rest are being issued by the ESO without any consultation. This will be late codification of some elements and mean reliance on guidance or methodologies yet to be written.</p>	
	<p>Element 2: Introducing an annual application window and two formal gates, which are known as Gate 1 and Gate 2 (i.e. the Primary Process) (see pages 11, 35-36)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
	<p>We support this but strongly recommend that the frequency and duration of the application window is subject to periodic review. It is important that there is enough time between application windows for NGESO to complete a batched assessment, but this may not mean just one application window is possible and there should be as much time/opportunity to submit applications.</p>	
	<p>Element 3: Clarifying which projects go through the Primary Process (see pages 11-12, 35-36)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
	<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
	<p>Element 4: Significant Modification Applications concept, including the proposed criteria and the proposed level of codification (see pages 12-13, 36-39)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
	<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
	<p>Element 5: Clarifying any Primary Process differences for customer groups (see pages 13-14, 35-36)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>
	<p>We believe that the DFTC principal and retention of the Statement of Works, Project Progression and Modification Application processes does not improve, and possibly worsen, the connection process for Distribution Network Companies and their customers. Our concerns include;</p>	

<p>1. Will DNOs be able to accurately forecast demand for connections? They may be tempted to ask for very high volumes to avoid the risk of exceeding their forecast, thus producing unnecessarily onerous estimates for Transmission works and later connection dates than needed.</p> <p>2. DNO users be disadvantaged due to the time taken to go through the Statement of Works process to reach Gate 2 while Transmission customers 'self certify'?</p>	
<p>Element 6: Setting out the process and criteria in relation to Application Windows and Gate 1, including introducing an offshore Letter of Authority equivalent as a Gate 1 application window entry requirement for offshore projects (see pages 15-16, 39-40)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
<p>Element 7: Fast Track Disagreement Resolution Process (de scoped from this modification – see pages 16, 58)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
<p>Element 8: Longstop Date for Gate 1 Agreements (see pages 16, 40-41)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
<p>Element 9: Project Designation (see pages 17-18, 48-49)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>The details and rules regarding this element are not clear enough and risks undermining the reforms until made clear, we do not believe this should be a part of this particular code modification.</p>	
<p>Element 10: Connection Point and Capacity Reservation (proposed to not be codified within the CUSC, but is intended to be codified within the STC through modification CM095 – see pages 18-20 and the CM095 Workgroup Consultation, pages 6-10)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
<p>Element 11: Setting out the criteria for demonstrating Gate 2 has been achieved and setting out the obligations imposed once Gate 2 has been achieved (see pages 20-24, 42-46)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>We are supportive of the proposed Gate 2 criteria on the basis that the Gate 2 methodology document is reviewed and modified if it does not succeed in only allowing projects that go ahead to be built from progressing – i.e. too many failed projects pass through Gate 2 before then being shelved.</p>	

<p>Element 12: Setting out the general arrangements in relation to Gate 2 (see pages 25-26, 47)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Although not explicitly outlined in this element of the consultation, we would highlight again our concern about embedded projects being subject to a Statement of Works process in order to notify of Gate 2 criteria being met. This is very likely to create delays for distribution connections and is too onerous a process for 'notification' especially if compared with the process for directly connected projects.</p>	
<p>Element 13: Gate 2 Criteria Evidence Assessment (see pages 26-27, 47-48)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
<p>Element 14: Gate 2 Offer and Project Site Location Change (see pages 28, 46)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>This proposal does not seem workable and is in contradiction to the principal of the purpose of Gate 2, i.e. a project secures land rights to reach Gate 2 but then begins a search for a new site due to change in POC, meaning the project is much further away from being ready to connect. A different solution is required and expect this will involve NGENSO publishing data about the queue and POC availability as well as hold 'pre Gate 2 application meetings' so that projects can get a view on likely Gate 2 offer before applying or securing land rights.</p>	
<p>Element 15: Changing the offer and acceptance timescales to align with the Primary Process timescales (e.g. a move away from three months for making licenced offers) (see pages 29, 42-46)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
<p>Element 16: Introducing the proposed Connections Network Design Methodology (CNDM) (see pages 29, 53-55)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
<p>Element 17: Introducing the concept of a Distribution Forecasted Transmission Capacity (DFTC) submission process for Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) and transmission connected Independent Distribution Network Operators (iDNOs) to forecast capacity on an anticipatory basis for Relevant Embedded Small Power Stations or Relevant Embedded Medium Power Stations aligned to the Gate 1 Application Window (see pages 30-33, 51-53)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>As already stated, we do not agree that DFTC will improve this process, a more collaborative approach whereby network operators share a holistic view of the network should be considered.</p>	
<p>Element 18: Set out the process for how DNOs and transmission connected iDNOs notify the ESO of Relevant Embedded Small Power Stations or Relevant</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>

	<p>Embedded Medium Power Stations which meet Gate 2 criteria (see pages 33-34, 51-53)</p>	
<p>As stated previously – we are concerned about embedded projects being subject to a Statement of Works process in order to notify of Gate 2 criteria being met. This is very likely to create delays for distribution connections and is too onerous a process for ‘notification’ especially if compared with the process for directly connected projects</p>		
<p>6</p>	<p>Are there any elements of the proposal which you believe should not be included as part of this proposed solution, which the Proposer believes represents the ‘Minimum Viable Product’ reforms required to the connections process? If not, why not? (Please note the element number in each of your responses if applicable)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Element 9 – project designation</p>		
<p>7</p>	<p>As per question 6, are there any additional features which you believe should be included as part of Minimum Viable Product reform to the connections process?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Reform to the Transmission Impact Assessment process, with a collaborative, not transactional, process between NGENSO and DNOs.</p>		
<p>8</p>	<p>Do you agree that the Gate 1 process should be a mandatory process step, or do you think Gate 1 should be an optional process step with projects being able to apply straight into the Gate 2 process if the project meets both the relevant Gate 2 and Gate 1 criteria?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Gate 1 should not be mandatory, NGENSO batch assessment may benefit from having more projects that have achieved Gate 2, i.e provide a little more certainty</p>		
<p>9</p>	<p>Do you believe that the proposed Gate 1 and Gate 2 process could duly or unduly discriminate</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>

	<p>against any types of projects? If so, do you believe this is justified?</p>	
	<p>Yes, Distribution projects may be impacted due to administrative burden on DNOs and poorer outlook on Gate 1 assessments due to inaccurate or cautious forecasts</p>	
10	<p>Please provide your views on the proposed options ((a) to (e) on page 45) to mitigate the risk of requiring a developer to submit their application for planning consent earlier than they would in their development cycle (with the risk this consent could expire and any extension from the Planning Authority is not automatic).</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
	<p>Option d should be most workable assuming Transmission connection dates can improve as expected (due to Reforms and CAP, Winser report etc) – completion date should reflect best outcome for all parties.</p>	
11	<p>Do you agree that DFTC should be included as part of CMP434? If not, do you believe that the reformed connections process can function without DFTC? Please justify your answer. (see pages 30-34, 51-53)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>
	<p>A process is needed but DFTC is not suitable. To make this workable DNOs should not be subject to the same processes as a ‘customer’ and should work in collaboration with TOs.</p>	
12	<p>The Proposer intends to set out supporting arrangements for TMO4+ via a combination of guidance and methodologies (e.g. DFTC, CNDM, Project Designation, Gate 2 Criteria). Do you anticipate any issues with having these outside of Code Governance? (see Pages 9-10, 55)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
	<p>Many of these documents may only be drafted and not finalised, with only some going through a robust review and approval process. The rest are being issued by</p>	

the ESO without any consultation. This will be late codification of some elements and mean reliance on guidance or methodologies yet to be written.