

Public

# Connections methodologies update

An overview of proposed  
amendments to be made to the  
connections methodologies –  
March 2025

Public

## Contents

1. Context.....	3
Purpose of this document .....	4
2. Overview of changes to connections methodologies.....	4
A. Ofgem minded-to consultation related changes.....	5
B. Clean Power 2030 Action Plan related changes .....	6
Long duration energy storage.....	6
‘Geothermal power’ and ‘run-of-river hydro’ technologies.....	7
C. Clarificatory changes.....	8
D. Typographical changes .....	9
3. Next steps.....	9
Annex 1 – Table setting out changes to the connections methodologies.....	10

Public

## 1. Context

- 1.1 At the National Energy System Operator (NESO), we recognise the challenges facing our connections customers and the need to fundamentally reform the electricity transmission connections process in order to deliver Clean Power by 2030 and maintain an efficient transition to net zero.
- 1.2 On 20 December 2024 we submitted our ambitious plans to reform the electricity transmission connections process to ensure that the mix of projects in the reformed connections queue best reflects Great Britain’s (GB’s) Clean Power needs in 2030, whilst providing an efficient transition and clear investment signal to 2035, so that we maintain efficient progress towards net zero. This took the form of a package of proposed changes to relevant industry codes and the introduction of three new ‘connections methodologies’ that, together with changes to the electricity system operator (ESO) licence and relevant network company licences, will set the regulatory and commercial framework for the reformed connections process.
- 1.3 The three proposed methodologies are:
  - Gate 2 Criteria Methodology<sup>1</sup>
  - Connections Network Design Methodology (CNDM)<sup>2</sup>
  - Project Designation Methodology<sup>3</sup>
- 1.4 On 14 February 2025 Ofgem published its ‘*Consultation on connection reform (TM04+) enablers, including a statutory consultation on modifications to licence conditions*’<sup>4</sup>. In that consultation Ofgem set out its minded-to intention to approve the three connections methodologies.
- 1.5 On 14<sup>th</sup> March we submitted our formal response to Ofgem’s consultation.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.neso.energy/document/350236/download>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.neso.energy/document/350241/download>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.neso.energy/document/350246/download>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/consultation/consultation-connection-reform-tm04-enablers-including-statutory-consultation-modifications-licence-conditions>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.neso.energy/about/operational-information/our-consultation-responses>

Public

## Purpose of this document

- 1.6 We have taken the opportunity to review the three connections methodologies in the context of Ofgem’s consultation and further engagement with a range of stakeholders since 20 December 2024. In that context we have identified some minor changes to be made to the three connections methodologies. This document provides an overview of the changes we propose to make to the three connections methodologies, and the reasons for those changes.
- 1.7 We have published ‘marked-up’ versions of the three connections methodologies alongside this document<sup>6</sup>. We are submitting the minor changes to Ofgem to feed into its final decision on the methodologies. Subject to Ofgem’s decision, the three connections methodologies (including the minor changes) would be used (alongside the updated industry codes and licences) as the basis for implementing connections reform in 2025.
- 1.8 These changes are either in response to limited and targeted updates by Ofgem or Government, or are clarificatory or typographical. In our view these changes have low overall impact beyond being beneficial clarifications or consequential changes to reflect latest Government or Ofgem policy positions. We are publishing these changes for information and to provide clarity to stakeholders.

## 2. Overview of changes to connections methodologies

- 2.1 The changes to the three connections methodologies fall into the following categories:
  - A. Ofgem minded to consultation related changes
  - B. Clean Power 2030 Action Plan related changes
  - C. Clarificatory changes
  - D. Typographical changes

---

<sup>6</sup> Gate 2 Criteria Methodology (March 2025): <https://www.neso.energy/document/357066/download> ;  
 Project Designation Methodology (March 2025): <https://www.neso.energy/document/357071/download> ;  
 Connections Network Design Methodology (March 2025): <https://www.neso.energy/document/357076/download>

## Public

- 2.2 In Annex 1 we have included a table setting out changes to the connections methodologies, the categories these correspond to, and the reasons for the changes.
- 2.3 In the accompanying three marked-up connections methodologies, these changes are highlighted in red text.

### A. Ofgem minded-to consultation related changes

- 2.4 If Ofgem maintains its consultation minded-to positions within its final decision, then this would require some associated changes to the methodologies. The main example is the introduction of ‘WACM1’ for CMP435 and ‘WACM7’ for CMP434, which introduce an additional ‘pause’ stage and associated additional activities by NESO, network companies and Users that were not included within the 20 December 2024 versions of the connections methodologies<sup>7</sup>.
- 2.5 We set out in our formal response to Ofgem’s consultation that we do not support the introduction of WACM1 or WACM7. However, as the final decision sits with Ofgem, we have marked up the Gate 2 Criteria Methodology and the CNDM based on the introduction of WACM1 and WACM7.<sup>8</sup> For ease of reference we have marked up WACM1 / 7 related changes in a different highlighted form.
- 2.6 We have assumed that the additional ‘pause’ stage associated with WACM1 and WACM7 occurs after the initial readiness and effectiveness checks, but before the queue formation stage in CMP435 and CMP434 respectively. The marked-up versions of the connections methodologies therefore reflect the pause happening at that time. If Ofgem decides that the pause stage should happen at another point during the CMP435 or CMP434 process (e.g. after the queue formation stage), then we will reflect this within the Gate 2 Criteria Methodology and CNDM.

---

<sup>7</sup> ‘WACMs’ are Workgroup Alternative CUSC Modifications. During the workgroup stage, several alternative solutions were raised on CMP434 and CMP435. WACM1 (CMP435) and WACM7 (CMP434) proposes the introduction of a pause for market self-regulation before NESO and TOs undertake the network assessment. The pause would obligate NESO to compile and publish a public register containing the following information of projects which have met Gate 2: connection point, completion date, installed capacity and technology type of each project. This would have to be done by NESO at least 10 business days prior to the start of the Gated Design Process.

<sup>8</sup> WACM1 / 7 have no impact on the Project Designation Methodology

Public

## B. Clean Power 2030 Action Plan related changes

- 2.7 The strategic alignment criteria in the Gate 2 Criteria Methodology (which are also referenced in the CNDM) are closely aligned to Government’s Clean Power 2030 Action Plan, and in particular the Connections Reform annex to that plan<sup>9</sup>.

### Long duration energy storage

- 2.8 Since we published the three connections methodologies on 20 December 2024, Government has worked with Ofgem, with advice from NESO, to further develop its approach towards Long Duration Energy Storage (LDES). This includes design of the new Cap and Floor scheme for LDES.<sup>10</sup>
- 2.9 On page 10 of the Connections Reform annex Government referred to *“As per the position set out in the Government Response to the LDES Consultation, LDES are storage technologies with a minimum duration of at least 6 hours. Government is currently considering whether to increase the minimum duration beyond 6 hours, including through advice being provided by NESO. Government will confirm the final position in Q1 2025, in the LDES Technical Decision Document it will publish with Ofgem”*.
- 2.10 On 11<sup>th</sup> March 2025, Government and Ofgem jointly published the “LDES Technical Decision Document”.<sup>11</sup> That document has a ‘Grid connection reforms’ section that sets out:
- 2.11 *“As stated elsewhere in this document, to be considered LDES, an asset must be capable of discharge at full power for at least eight hours, and full power must be at least 50MW or 100MW (depending on technology maturity).*
- 2.12 *In addition, given the large number of lithium-ion batteries already in the connections queue and that the modelling which informed the permitted capacities in the Clean Power 2030 Action Plan did not include lithium ion as LDES, we are clarifying that for the purposes of the Clean Power 2030 Action Plan pathway which will be used for connections, lithium-ion electricity*

<sup>9</sup> <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6776751e6a79200ddfa21b83/clean-power-2030-action-plan-connections-reform-annex.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/long-duration-electricity-storage-proposals-to-enable-investment#read-the-full-outcome>

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/decision/long-duration-electricity-storage-technical-document>

## Public

*storage projects will be treated as batteries. This does not affect their eligibility for the LDES cap and floor regime, should they otherwise be eligible. NESO and Ofgem are exploring whether successful bids for the LDES cap and floor which had lost their place in the queue will be able to re-enter as batteries (if lithium-ion) or LDES (in all other cases). Note that this categorisation as ‘battery’ or ‘LDES’ would not affect queue position or connection date.”*

- 2.13 We will therefore use the above wording from the LDES Technical Decision Document to define LDES for the purposes of connections reform, also noting that lithium-ion electricity storage projects will be treated as batteries for connections reform purposes.
- 2.14 We have also decided that it is important for the reformed connections process to align with and support implementation of the new cap and floor scheme for LDES. As such, we have also included “holding a live LDES Cap and Floor agreement” within scope of protection clauses 2a and 2b of Strategic Alignment Criterion (a). This supplements and aligns with the current protections within clauses 2a and 2b for Interconnector or Offshore Hybrid Asset projects that have obtained regulatory approval from the Authority, in the form of either a Cap and Floor agreement or Merchant Interconnector approval.

### **‘Geothermal power’ and ‘run-of-river hydro’ technologies**

- 2.15 Government set out in its CP30 Action Plan that *“For technologies not included within the pathways, or generation connecting from outside GB, NESO should separately consider the correct route through the connections process to facilitate timely connections for these projects, as appropriate”*.
- 2.16 Working with Government, we have identified two additional ‘clean’ technologies that are not in scope of the CP30 Action Plan. These are: ‘geothermal power’ and ‘run-of-river hydro’. These technologies were not included within the pathways in the CP30 Action Plan as they are very small scale and therefore did not merit their own specific technology classification. However, the nature of the generation also does not fall within the scope of any of the defined technologies within the CP30 Action Plan.
- 2.17 We understand that the overall capacities of projects in these technologies in the connections queue in 2025 is likely to be very low (significantly less than IGW and potentially less than 100MW), but should projects in those technology categories seek inclusion in the reformed connections queue, it is not apparent that they would meet any of the project designation criteria.

## Public

- 2.18 The effect of both of the above would be that ‘geothermal generation’ and ‘run-of-river hydropower’ projects would not be able to be included within the reformed connections queue.
- 2.19 For that reason, we propose that ‘geothermal generation’ and ‘run-of-river hydropower’ projects will be deemed to have met the strategic alignment element of the Gate 2 criteria (under Strategic Alignment Criteria (d)). This follows the approach already used for wave, tidal, non-GB generation and transmission-connected demand.
- 2.20 For the avoidance of doubt, projects in these technologies would still need to meet the Gate 2 readiness criteria. Further, this would not reduce the permitted capacities available for other technologies. Finally, given that the overall capacities of projects in the ‘geothermal generation’ and ‘run-of-river hydropower’ technologies in the connections queue in 2025 is likely to be very low, we do not consider that this would have any material detrimental impact on connection dates of other projects in the reformed connections queue.

## C. Clarificatory changes

- 2.21 We have made a range of clarificatory changes to parts of the three connections methodologies in order to ensure that the methodologies are clearly understood by all stakeholders. The relevant sections and associated clarificatory changes were identified on the basis of questions received from Users, network companies and other stakeholders. We thank stakeholders for these questions and for identifying the opportunities to further clarify the intent of parts of the methodologies.
- 2.22 Most of the clarificatory changes relate either to the protection clauses within the Gate 2 strategic alignment criteria, or to the Gate 2 readiness criteria (notably the format of the Original Red Line Boundary and confirming where DNOs/Transmission Connected iDNOs also need to carry out the same process as NESO in respect of some of the Gate 2 Criteria checks).
- 2.23 We have also removed a large part of the Readiness Declaration section within the Gate 2 Criteria Methodology as we are publishing the final form of Readiness Declaration shortly, which will confirm what Users need to provide to seek to meet Gate 2 Criteria.



## Public

- 2.24 For further clarifications on connections reform more generally please see our FAQ document: <https://www.neso.energy/industry-information/connections/connections-reform>

### D. Typographical changes

- 2.25 We have taken the opportunity to mark-up revised connections methodologies to make some typographical changes. These relate to instances of missing words, mis-labelling of diagrams or inaccurate cross-references.

## 3. Next steps

- 3.1 We understand that Ofgem will review consultation responses before making its final decision on connections reform. This will include decisions on the code modifications, connections methodologies and ESO / network company licence changes.
- 3.2 We will work with Ofgem to make any further relevant changes to the three connections methodologies, should any further changes be necessary as a result of Ofgem’s decision.
- 3.3 Following Ofgem’s decision (and subject to a decision to approve the methodologies), we will publish the final approved methodologies (in a clean, non marked-up form), which would then be used (alongside updated industry codes and network licences) to implement connections reform in 2025.
- 3.4 In line with our current draft licence conditions, we will keep the methodologies under review, consult with industry, and submit the methodologies (whether updated or not) to Ofgem for ongoing approval, no later than one year from the date of Ofgem’s decision (assuming this decision is to approve the methodologies). This is so that the methodologies can continue to be fit for purpose for use in the reformed connections process in 2026 and beyond.

Public

## Annex 1 – Table setting out changes to the connections methodologies

The table below sets out the changes we have made to the connections methodologies, and the reasons for these changes.

<b>A</b>	<b>Ofgem minded-to consultation related changes</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Clean Power 2030 Action Plan related changes</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Clarificatory changes</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>Typographical changes</b>

Category	Methodology	Section	Page	Change	Reason
A	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	2.4, 8.1 and 9.1	10, 49, 67	Reflect that a User can request advancement of their contracted connection date in the window or in the Pause (or adjust a request made in the window within the Pause).	To accommodate the 'Pause' that would be introduced by WACM1 (CMP435) and WACM7 (CMP434).
A	CNDM	5.2	23	Explanation of the 'Pause' and addition to diagram to show when it would take place in CMP435.	To accommodate the 'Pause' that would be introduced by CMP435 WACM1.

## Public

A	CNDM	5.25	53	Clarification that the advancement request can be adjusted or newly requested during the 'Pause'.	To accommodate the 'Pause' that would be introduced by CMP435 WACM1.
A	CNDM	7.2	66	Explanation of when the 'Pause' would take place in CMP434.	To accommodate the 'Pause' that would be introduced by CMP434 WACM7.
A	Project Designation Methodology	Figure 1	30	Changes to consultation step based on Ofgem's proposed licence changes.	To align with Ofgem's proposed licence requirements published for consultation on 14 February 2025.
B	Gate 2 Criteria methodology	6.3	44 and 45	'Geothermal power' and 'run-of-river hydro' technology categories added to the table of technologies not in scope of the CP30 Action Plan and that will automatically meet the Gate 2 Strategic Alignment Criteria (under Strategic Alignment Criteria (d)).	CP30 related clarification. Following engagement with Government we have determined that these 'clean' small-scale technologies are not in scope of the CP30 Action Plan, nor are they within scope of the other technologies within the CP30 Action Plan.
	CNDM	5.4 and 7.2	26 and 67		

## Public

B	Project Designation Methodology	2.1.1(d), 2.2 (d), 3.5.2	9, 12 and 22	Updates to reflect that Geothermal power' and 'run-of-river hydro' technology categories have been added to the table of technologies not in scope of the CP30 Action Plan and that will automatically meet the Gate 2 Strategic Alignment Criteria (under Strategic Alignment Criteria (d)).	CP30 related clarification – as per above.
B	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	6.3	45	Updated LDES definition to refer to DESNZ and Ofgem's Long Duration Electricity Storage: Technical Decision Document.	CP30 related clarification.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	2.1	5	Clarification that projects with stages will need to confirm which stages they are seeking to meet the Gate 2 Criteria for and provide evidence as appropriate.	Not currently specified in methodology.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	2.2	8 and 45	Defined "Non-GB projects".	Not currently specified in methodology.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	2.2	8	Embedded Small Power Stations and Embedded Medium Power Stations wanting to request a BEGA in the enduring process under CMP434, will still be required to submit a BEGA application to NESO in	Not currently specified in methodology.

## Public

				addition to DNO/Transmission Connected iDNOs applying on their behalf to NESO.	
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	4.1, 5.1	14, 15, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 31	Making explicit where DNOs/Transmission Connected iDNOs also need to carry out the same process as NESO in respect of some of the evidence/checks.	Not currently specified in methodology.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	4.1a	15	Cross-refer to Letter of Authority Guidance and added that Users will need to justify why a reduced minimum acreage is appropriate for their Project Site.	Clarification change, to reflect original intent.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	4.1b	17	Further clarity on what we want from Users to provide in their Original Red Line Boundary submission including what is mandatory and where there is more than one technology within the Project Site, the User will not be required to provide an Original Red Line Boundary for each technology.	Not currently specified in methodology.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	4.1b	18	Clarity that it is the total acreage secured within the Original Red Line Boundary in respect of the Project Site that we need listed on the Original Red Line Boundary and not the minimum land acreage for each technology.	Clarification change, to reflect original intent.

## Public

C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	4.1c	22	Remove "Any proposed exception should be supported with a project development and construction plan" as we have agreed this is not required.	Clarification change, to reflect original intent.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	4.1c and 5.1	24, 31	Clarifying that in the rare circumstance where a User wishes to follow the "Other planning consent routes (in exceptional circumstances)" alternative route to readiness, this needs to be pre-agreed ahead of the Gate 2 Application Window.	Not currently specified in methodology.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	5.2	32	Users seeking to meet the Gate 2 Readiness Criteria through the planning readiness route that have met Queue Management Milestone M2 at the time of submitting the Readiness Declaration (or where they meet it prior to signature of the Gate 2 Modification Offer) only need to provide the Original Red Line Boundary, installed capacity and evidence of minimum acreage requirements upon their signature of the Gate 2 Modification Offer.	To address an unintended consequence of the drafting in a way which delivers on the original intent of the arrangements.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	6.1	34	Explicitly state that if part of a project (staged, or hybrid) meets the strategic alignment criteria and another part does not, then the part that does meet	Clarification change, to reflect original intent.

## Public

	CNDM	5.7.11	33	Gate 2 will still receive a Gate 2 offer. The part that does not meet Gate 2 will receive a Gate 1 offer.	
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	6.1, 6.2, 8.8	34, 36, 56	No longer require evidence of technology types (although Users still need to confirm technology type).	To simplify evidence provision and checking requirements in relation to technology types (except for LDES).
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	6.2	37	Reflect there may be cases where a project has a contracted connection date of 2026 or earlier as of 20 December 2024 but does not meet this requirement at the time of application in the CMP435 Gated Application Window, due to their contracted connection date being delayed via a network company driven change to the contract. In these cases, the contracted connection date as of 20 December 2024 will be used to determine eligibility for Protection 1.	To extend the protection to cover an unlikely circumstance, which would not be aligned with the underlying intent of this protection.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	6.2	38, 39, 41, 42, 43 and 56	Added 'holding a live contract with NESO awarded through their 'Network Services' (previously referred to as 'NOA Pathfinders') processes e.g. Voltage Network Services, Stability Network Services or Constraint Management Intertrip Services' to Protection clauses 2a and 2b and extended footnote. P41 and p56 have	Clarification change - an oversight from 20 December version. We consider that these contracts should be treated equally to competitively awarded CfD or CM contracts for

## Public

				been updated to remove reference to 'government' as Network Services contracts are with NESO. The summary of evidence tables on p42 and p43 have also been updated to reflect this change.	the purposes of strategic alignment and queue formation.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	6.2	38, 39,	Expanded footnote to clarify how this clause will apply to reservations.	Clarification change, to reflect original intent.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	6.2	38, 42	Clarify that for Protection 2a the planning application submitted on or before 20 December also needs to be subsequently validated.	Clarification change, to reflect original intent.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	6.2	40, 43	Clarify that for Protection 3, the planning application needs to have been submitted and validated.	Clarification change, to reflect original intent
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	6.2	41	Include 'non-determination' as a valid appeal type, alongside rejection.	To provide additional details on the application of this protection.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	6.2	41	Clarify acceptable non-determination scenarios. A project must have exceeded its statutory determination period to be considered eligible. It does not have to have submitted an appeal by the closure of the CMP435 Gated Application Window. It does however have to submit an appeal within the relevant statutory timescales.	To provide additional details on the application of this protection.



Public

C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	6.2	42 and 43	<p>For Protection Clause 2a - added clarification in the summary of evidence required table that where statutory consent is not required, the User needs to provide a signed letter from the company's Director stating that no statutory consent is required and also M7.</p> <p>This summary table now spreads over 2 pages with page 42 summarising evidence requirements for CMP435 protections and page 43 doing likewise for CMP434 protections. This also means the numbering of all the section 6.2 title slides (36-43 inclusive) has changed.</p>	Clarification change, to reflect original intent.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	6.2	43	<p>Added that where a User is not seeking protections under Strategic Alignment Criteria (a), there is then a need to understand, through the Readiness Declaration, the project status (either "planning application submitted" or "land rights obtained") for the purpose of queue formation. Where evidence is required and provided, verification will be undertaken by NESO for Transmission connected projects and large embedded generation, and by DNOs and Transmission connected iDNOs for small and medium embedded generation.</p>	Clarification change, to reflect original intent.

## Public

C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	8.3, 8.4	51, 52	Added that DNOs/Transmission Connected iDNOs only provide the actual Original Red Line Boundary upon request from NESO.	To simplify the process whilst continuing to deliver on the intent of the underlying arrangements.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	8.3, 8.4	51, 52	Added that Readiness Declarations only provided upon request from NESO but note that the data submission(s) (which includes data from the Readiness Declarations), that is provided by the DNO/Transmission Connected IDNO to NESO associated with the Gated Application Window, is considered to meet the CUSC requirement for DNO/Transmission Connected IDNOs to provide the Readiness Declarations.	To simplify the process whilst continuing to deliver on the intent of the underlying arrangements.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	8.6	54	Cross referred to definitions of "Competent" and "Effective" in CUSC Section 11 so additional text removed.	Clarification change, to avoid code duplication.
C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	8.8	56	Clarify that DNOs/Transmission connected iDNOs check the Government 'support contract' protections evidence (e.g. Contracts for Difference, Capacity Market Agreement) for Small and Medium Embedded Generation and not NESO.	Clarification change, to reflect original intent.

## Public

C	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	9	66 to 74	Updated to remove a large part of the Readiness Declaration section within the Gate 2 Criteria Methodology as we are publishing the final form of Readiness Declaration shortly and will confirm what Users need to provide to seek to meet Gate 2 Criteria.	Clarification change – to ensure no unintended contradiction between the Gate 2 Criteria Methodology and the Readiness Declaration.
C	CNDM	5.7, 5.8, 5.11, 7.3, 7.6, 7.8	32, 34, 36, 71, 74, 75	Clarifying that TEC or Developer Capacity (as appropriate) will be used to determine capacity allocations against the CP30 Action Plan, rather than installed capacity.	Not currently specified in methodology.
C	CNDM	5.14, 7.12	37, 78	Stating that rebalancing is also subject to the same criteria as substitutions (e.g. same technology, region, no significantly worse impact on constraints).	Clarification that policy for substitutions extends to rebalancing as well, as these processes have the same principles.
C	CNDM	7.3	71	Addition of date support contract signed as a metric to determine queue position, as an equivalent for having obtained planning.	Clarification of metric for cases where a project qualifies for protection by virtue of holding a support contract.
C	CNDM	9.4, 9.5	96, 97	Specifying which strategic alignment criteria DNOs and Transmission connected IDNOs will and will not conduct checks against.	To clarify alignment with position in the Gate 2 Criteria Methodology that NESO will

Public

					make ultimate queue formation decisions. However, DNOs and transmission-connected IDNOs will conduct the checks for strategic alignment criteria a), Protections.
C	Project Designation Methodology	4.2	30	Timeline has been updated to include where NESO may be required to ask supplementary questions in order to make a designation decision.	Not currently specified in the methodology.
D	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	1.1	5	Updated word which should have been plural and was singular.	Typographical change.
D	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	2.4	10	Updated erroneous references in the Section of Methodology column. Section 4.9 should read 4.1c and title of Section 9 should read "Readiness Declaration" and not "Templates".	Typographical change.
D	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	4.1	14, 19, 27	For evidence of ownership, references to "HM" not needed.	Typographical change.
D	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	4.1c	21	Updated erroneous reference to a section 4.9. Changed from "exceptions in section 4.9 of this Gate 2	Typographical change.

## Public

				Criteria Methodology" to "exceptions in this section of this Gate 2 Criteria Methodology".	
D	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	4.1c	23	Replaced "the Option agreement itself" with "evidence of secured land rights" as an Option Agreement is only one of the routes to meeting land readiness.	Typographical change.
D	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	6.3	44	Final line should read: "Any technologies not listed in this table will only be able to meet the Gate 2 Strategic Alignment Criteria by meeting Strategic Alignment Criteria (a) or (c).".	Typographical change.
D	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	8.1, 8.2	49, 50	Linked Original Red Line Boundary requirement to "as per 4.1b" rather than replicate requirements.	Typographical change.
D	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	8.4	52	Added 'there is a' to complete two sentences.	Typographical change.
D	Gate 2 Criteria Methodology	8.5	53	In the pink box it should say "to" rather than "so".	Typographical change.
D	CNDM	7.14	79	Correction to reference the (CMP434) Gated Design Process rather than the (CMP435) Existing Agreement Gated Design Process.	Typographical change.

## Public

D	CNDM	Appendix 1	100	Correction to reference Existing Agreement rather than Existing Application	Typographical change.
D	CNDM	Appendix 1	103/104	Phase 2 of diagram updated to correct the final ordering of projects. This now shows Green/Amber/Red ordering.	Change to align with queue formation process outlined in Section 5.7.
D	Project Designation Methodology	2.2 (E)	13	Erroneous apostrophe included in "its" in limb (a).	Typographical change.
D	Project Designation Methodology	3.2	16	Removed erroneous extra 'to' from title so it is now "Critical to Security of Supply".	Typographical change.
D	Project Designation Methodology	4.2.2	29	Missing "readiness or" has been added in.	Typographical change.