

**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](mailto: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](mailto:cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com)

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
<b>Respondent name:</b>	David Palmer	
<b>Company name:</b>	Welsh Power	
<b>Email address:</b>	David.palmer@welshpower.com	
<b>Phone number:</b>	07900 741931	
<b>Which best describes your organisation?</b>	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D
	Generally yes, particularly in terms of promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements. It helps with streamlining connection processes, reducing delays and improving overall project timelines.	
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach? (see pages 59-61)	<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 <a href="#">Workgroup Consultation Section</a> ) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	

Specific Workgroup Consultation questions		
5	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 <a href="#">CM095</a> . Please provide rationale for your answer and any suggestions for improvement to each element?	
	Element 1: Proposed Authority approved methodologies and ESO guidance (see pages 9-10, 55)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Ensures high governance and flexibility. We believe the proposed methodology review should be undertaken more frequently than currently stated, and increased transparency in methodology development.	

<p><b>Element 2:</b> 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>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>This should establish more defined criteria for progressing connection applications, and therefore in time reducing congestion in the queue. This process (first ready, first served) is more efficient than being (first come, first served). Suggestions for improvement is clear gate requirements, confirmed connection point before Gate 2 for planning purposes and a feedback mechanism if projects do not pass through Gates.</p>	
<p><b>Element 3:</b> Clarifying which projects go through the Primary Process (see pages 11-12, 35-36)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>No comments</p>	
<p><b>Element 4:</b> Significant Modification Applications concept, including the proposed criteria and the proposed level of codification (see pages 12-13, 36-39)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>More clear definitions on how a modification application is deemed “significant” and a higher level of transparency in regards to affected queue positions.</p>	
<p><b>Element 5:</b> Clarifying any Primary Process differences for customer groups (see pages 13-14, 35-36)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>No comments</p>	
<p><b>Element 6:</b> 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>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>No comments</p>	
<p><b>Element 7:</b> Fast Track Disagreement Resolution Process (de scoped from this modification – see pages 16, 58)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>We believe that this process should be developed ahead of and issued at the point of Connections Reform implementation.</p>	
<p><b>Element 8:</b> Longstop Date for Gate 1 Agreements (see pages 16, 40-41)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>We believe that a long-stop date of 3 years from Gate 1 offer acceptance is a suitable timeframe in order to provide all evidence for Gate 2 criteria.</p>	
<p><b>Element 9:</b> Project Designation (see pages 17-18, 48-49)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>We believe that projects that are crucial for system security and efficiency is prioritised, however this should not negatively impact the queue position of other</p>	

Projects which meet all criteria. Additional transparency and criteria from TOs and ESO is needed on this element.	
<b>Element 10:</b> Connection Point and Capacity Reservation (proposed to not be codified within the CUSC, but is intended to be codified within the STC through modification <a href="#">CM095</a> – see pages 18-20 and the <a href="#">CM095 Workgroup Consultation</a> , pages 6-10)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Given the current connection queue we agree that Reserved bays are necessary. We would like to see greater transparency of these reserved bays and clarity should they be released later.	
<b>Element 11:</b> 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)	<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.	
<b>Element 12:</b> Setting out the general arrangements in relation to Gate 2 (see pages 25-26, 47)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
No comment on the basis that projects that are able to meet both Gate 1 and Gate 2 requirements can apply to both stages at the same time.	
<b>Element 13:</b> Gate 2 Criteria Evidence Assessment (see pages 26-27, 47-48)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
No comments other than that above for Element 11 relating to the RLB.	
<b>Element 14:</b> Gate 2 Offer and Project Site Location Change (see pages 28, 46)	<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.	
<b>Element 15:</b> 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)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
No comments.	
<b>Element 16:</b> Introducing the proposed Connections Network Design Methodology (CNDM) (see pages 29, 53-55)	<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.	

	<p><b>Element 17:</b> 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>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>No comments.</p>		
	<p><b>Element 18:</b> Set out the process for how DNOs and transmission connected iDNOs notify the ESO of Relevant Embedded Small Power Stations or Relevant Embedded Medium Power Stations which meet Gate 2 criteria (see pages 33-34, 51-53)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>No comments.</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>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>None.</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>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>None.</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</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

	relevant Gate 2 and Gate 1 criteria?	
	As proposed, projects which meet and can provide evidence for Gate 2 criteria should be able to pass Gate 1 and Gate 2 in a single application for a more efficient and streamlined process.	
9	Do you believe that the proposed Gate 1 and Gate 2 process could duly or unduly discriminate against any 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”.	
10	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).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	a). This may delay project timelines if validity periods are mismanaged. b). Provides financial flexibility for developers. c). Risks delays if substation location is not confirmed/changed in offer. d). Fine e). Good, offers a chance to correct expired permissions, however this rectification period would need to be sufficient.	
11	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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	No preference either way.	
12	The Proposer intends to set out supporting arrangements for TMO4+ via a combination of guidance and methodologies (e.g.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<p>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>No, however the guidance and methodologies listed above may benefit from a lighter touch governance regime if there were any deficiencies found in the codified texts.</p>	