

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:	David Palmer	
Company name:	Welsh Power	
Email address:	david.palmer@welshpower.com	
Phone number:	07900 741931	
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:

- The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence;*
- 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;*
- 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 Generally, yes. It helps with streamlining connection processes, reducing delays and improving overall project timelines.
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach? (See page- 57-58)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Yes, we support the proposed implementation approach. The clear timelines and structured processes should help in better planning and execution of projects.
3	Do you have any other comments? No comment.	
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
Yes, we agree with the development and approval of the three proposed approved Methodologies, however if the "Gate 2 Criteria Methodology" was not approved prior to the go-live date, this would cause lack of transparency and a sub-optimal outcome.	
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
We agree with the type of connection projects which will follow the primary process.	
Element 5: Clarifying any Primary Process differences for customer groups (See pages 11-12,32)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
No comment.	
Element 8: Longstop Date for Gate 1 Agreements (See pages 12-13, 32-33)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
No comment.	
Element 9: Project Designation (See pages 14-15, 33-34)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
We believe that projects that are crucial for system security and efficiency are prioritised, however this process should not unduly discriminate against other legitimate projects from being brought forward in the queue due to not meeting all stated requirements. Additional transparency and criteria from TOs and ESO is needed on this element, along with a dispute process if a developers queue position is adversely affected.	
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
Generally agree with the Gate 2 criteria. The RLB submitted at the gate 2 application stage cannot be expected to include any connection cable and User bay property rights at that stage as the location of the Connection Point isn't confirmed until the Gate 2 offer is issued.	
Element 13: Gate 2 Criteria Evidence Assessment (See pages 22-23, 39-40)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Generally agree with evidence assessment and the ability to advance with contracted connection date within the self-declaration letter. No comments other than that above for Element 11 relating to the RLB.	
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
Generally agree with proposal, however the 12 month time period may not give developers enough time to change project site location as this depends on many factors and will incur additional costs. A suggestion would be for ESO to offer a	

	range of suitable alternative locations and more effective info on these locations at earlier stages.	
	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
	An improvement would be to codify the proposed new capacity reallocation mechanism as the absence of codified methodology may increase the risk of disputes among stakeholders/lack of transparency.	
	Element 19: Contractual changes (See pages 26-28, 43-46)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	No comment.	
	Element 20: Cut Over arrangements (See page 28, 47)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	No comment.	
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
	None.	
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
	No comment.	
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
	In so far as is practicable, all projects should have the same requirements for each gate, and the process can be deemed "technology neutral".	