

Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma

CMP435: Application of Gate 2 Criteria to existing contracted background

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:	Dennis Gowland	
Company name:	Research Relay Ltd	
Email address:	dennis@researchrelay.com	
Phone number:	07739392965	
Which best describes your organisation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer body <input type="checkbox"/> Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network <input type="checkbox"/> 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.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D
Click or tap here to enter text.		
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach? (See page- 57-58)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Subject to comments on CMP434		
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 the Workgroup to consider?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (the request form can be found in the Workgroup Consultation Section)
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		

Specific Workgroup Consultation questions	
5	<p>Do you agree with the elements of the proposed solution for CMP435? <i>Please note that the application of these elements may be different to CMP434, therefore please answer the questions in respect to CMP435.</i></p> <p>Elements 2,4,6,7,12,15,17 and 18 are not part of the CMP435 Proposal and is only part of the CMP434 Proposal. Element 10 is proposed to be codified within the STC through modification CM095.</p> <p>Please provide rationale for your answer and any suggestions for improvement to each element?</p>

Element 1: Proposed Authority approved methodologies and ESO guidance (see Page 8-10,29)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Subject to comments made on CMP434	
Element 3: Clarifying which projects go through the Primary Process (See pages 10-11,29-31)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Subject to comments made on CMP434.	
Element 5: Clarifying any Primary Process differences for customer groups (See pages 11-12,32)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
I read it that for Gate 2 entry there will be no requirement for an offshore user to provide an LOA?	
Element 8: Longstop Date for Gate 1 Agreements (See pages 12-13, 32-33)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.	
Element 9: Project Designation (See pages 14-15, 33-34)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Again – as per CMP434 response, transparency will be very important.	
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 16-21, 34-39)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Subject to: Option agreements and planning timescales are especially relevant to projects captured by CMP435 – i.e. those already contracted with ESO (and where relevant DNO. –There seems to be some mitigation allowed for by the proposer. Otherwise as per comments to CMP434.	
Element 13: Gate 2 Criteria Evidence Assessment (See pages 22-23, 39-40)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.	
Element 14: Gate 2 Offer and Project Site Location Change (See pages 23-24, 40-41)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Subject to any comments made on CMP434.	
Element 16: Introducing the proposed Connections Network Design Methodology (CNDM) (See pages 24-25, 41-42)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.	
Element 19: Contractual changes (See pages 26-28, 43-46)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
I note from the report that directly connected projects that have an existing BCA, if failing the gate 2 test, would revert to gate 1 and that liabilities and securities would fall away. It is unclear if that is the case for BELLA/BEGA contracts – please clarify . Also – in the event that these fall away – would there be a refund of securities? Would it apply equally to those opting for Fixed and Non-Fixed – what would be the case for those who had paid	

	elements of the £1,£2,£3?	
	Element 20: Cut Over arrangements (See page 28, 47)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	The proposed deadlines are very tight? Are they feasible?	
6	Are there any elements of the proposed CMP435 solution - as per Q5 - which you believe are not appropriate to include when you consider how to most effectively implement TMO4+ to projects in the existing contracted background (as opposed to the process for new applicants via CMP434)? If yes, please provide supporting justification.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
7	In relation to Q6, are there any features which you believe are missing in the proposed CMP435 solution that would more effectively facilitate implementation of TMO4+ to the existing contracted background. If yes, please provide details and justification.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
8	Do you believe any groups of projects should be exempt from the scope of CMP435 or from some elements of the proposed solution? If so, please advise on which groups and elements and provide rationale to why.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
9	Do you believe that the proposed solution could duly or unduly discriminate against any particular types of projects? If so, do you believe this is justified?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	There could be unintended consequences for smaller players (such as local authority led large community projects) who do not have access to a team of experts and will rely on accurate and easy to assimilate information from ESO/TO/DNO and access to one to one assistance from Connections Managers.	