

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:	Ravinder Shan	
Company name:	FRV Powertek Limited	
Email address:	ravinder@frvpowertek.com	
Phone number:	07340498332	
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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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
		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 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
We agree with the approach and the license obligation on the ESO to consult and requirement of the Authority for approval of these methodologies. We understand the need for flexibility by ESO but require that these methodologies are published as soon as possible so that they can be approved in time as their approval is contingent on implementation of Connection Reform.	
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
Click or tap here to enter text.	
Element 5: Clarifying any Primary Process differences for customer groups (See pages 11-12,32)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.	
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
Approve the element in principle but need to understand how it will work? How will a project be designated, what will be application process to be designated? Will this favour certain technologies over others? Will this favour certain locations over others?	
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
Support the element. For Planning compliance, Milestone 1 should be aligned with Workgroup recommendations as it is hard to envisage that planning activities can commence in parallel till the Gate 2 offer with firm POC is received. Also propose that M1 should be calculated back from connection date for projects where connection date is more than 6 years from the Gate 2 offer date.	
Element 13: Gate 2 Criteria Evidence Assessment (See pages 22-23, 39-40)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Suggest adding 'Requested Point of Connection:' as most of the existing offers (Step 2) have only indicative node as POC. Also suggest adding 'Planning status:' as for the existing queue there are several projects that are in advanced stages of development.	
Element 14: Gate 2 Offer and Project Site Location Change (See pages 23-24, 40-41)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
We do not think that this element is aligned with 'First Ready, First Connect' objective and does not meet the MVP criteria. In case offered Point of Connection is different then the developer should go back to Gate 1 and reapply whenever ready for Gate 2 at the new location. It is unfair to hold the queue position for 12 months as there might be other projects at this new POC who have met Gate 2 criteria later but are ready to progress.	

	The existing queue has lot of projects in advanced stages of development and should be able to connect earlier rather than wait for some other project that requested some other connection point and is ahead in the queue now.	
	Element 16: Introducing the proposed Connections Network Design Methodology (CNDM) (See pages 24-25, 41-42)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	We agree with the approach but need to see the CNDM document to assess that methodology aligns with the objectives. For the existing queue, the new queue position should be assessed based the progress of the project rather than just the date of signing the options as there are many projects that are much further along in their development process.	
	Element 19: Contractual changes (See pages 26-28, 43-46)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
	Element 20: Cut Over arrangements (See page 28, 47)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Element 14 as mentioned above.	
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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	