

Public

Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma

CMP446: Increasing the lower threshold in England and Wales for Evaluation of Transmission Impact Assessment (TIA)

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@nationalenergyiso.com by **5pm** on **13 February 2025**. 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 milly.lewis@nationalenergyiso.com or cusc.team@nationalenergyiso.com

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
Respondent name:	Martin Cahill	
Company name:	NESO	
Email address:	Martin.cahill1@nationalenergyiso.com	
Phone number:	07840722302	
Which best describes your organisation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer body <input type="checkbox"/> Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator <input type="checkbox"/> Generator <input type="checkbox"/> Industry body <input type="checkbox"/> Interconnector	<input type="checkbox"/> Storage <input type="checkbox"/> Supplier <input checked="" 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)

Public

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 by this 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.*

* See Electricity System Operator Licence

**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 and/or any potential alternatives better facilitate the Applicable Objectives?	Mark the Objectives which you believe each solution better facilitates:
		Original <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D
		Alternative Request 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
		Both Original and Alternative Request 1 provide quicker connections for viable projects needed to deliver Net Zero by increasing the threshold for Evaluation of Transmission Impact in England and Wales. This will help facilitate effective competition. Both also provide a more efficient Transmission/Distribution interface which will help the efficient discharge of network licence obligations (NESO, NGET and DNOs). With thresholds in Scotland under review, we do not believe that codifying a limit in Scotland at this point in time would promote efficiency in the implementation of CUSC arrangements, due to the potential need to change in CUSC again in the near future. This could also have the potential to delay any benefit to generators if any increases to thresholds are agreed.
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		The approach is to implement before the Gate 2 window opens, which would release around 852MW/390 DG projects from having to

Public

		demonstrate gate 2 compliance or alignment with Clean Power 2030 targets. If implementation was not before this date, the benefit of the modification would be significantly reduced.
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.
5	Does the draft legal text satisfy the intent of the modification?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.
6	Do you agree with the Workgroup's assessment that the modification does not impact the European Electricity Balancing Regulation (EBR) Article 18 terms and conditions held within the Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.

Specific Workgroup Consultation questions

7	Do you believe that a codification of Scotland threshold is required for CMP446?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No The defect for CMP446 is clear in that it applies to England & Wales, where an assessment has already identified the opportunity to increase the threshold in England and Wales. Codifying a limit in Scotland could potentially delay the implementation of any threshold changes if any are identified following review in Scotland. The aim of this modification is to speed up connection for smaller generators,
---	--	---

Public

		and codifying in Scotland could be addressed through a separate modification.
8	Is it clear that the change in threshold is cumulative not incremental?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No This is clear in line with the definition of Registered Capacity.
9	Do you believe 5MW is the correct threshold and if not why and to what threshold level should it be? (Providing rationale and justification for any alternative MW threshold)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 5MW strikes a balance between a significant increase which will benefit many generators, and managing the risk to the transmission system.
10	Are there any other generic scenarios (over and above those shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3 (Annex 7) that need to be considered by the Workgroup, please provide details of them and explain why they are relevant?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.
11	It is intended that where there is a fault level headroom that is less than 1kA or zero as stated by NGET at a GSP, then a project is required to go through the TIA irrespective of the change in threshold (from 1MW to 5MW) – do you agree with this and if not, why?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Fault Level Headroom is a safety concern and as such the impact of connecting at low/zero fault level headroom GSPs must be fully risk assessed.

Public

12	Do you agree that the Workgroup has identified the relevant risks if CMP446 is approved. If not, what further risks haven't been identified yet, and why are they relevant?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		Click or tap here to enter text.
13	Do you believe that as consequence of CMP446 there will be an increase in <5MW projects which is likely to have an impact on the Transmission Network? If so, what kind of projects could drive this?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
		There will clearly be an increase in the number of <5MW projects if this change is approved, however based on the current number of generators in the connections queue and within the 5-10MW range (around 1.68GW) we do not believe there will be a significant impact on the Transmission Network.
14	Do you have any suggestions for any additional mitigation measures for the identified risk?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
		N/A (although noted that the threshold can be changed by a future modification if the risk has increased.
15	Do you understand that as a consequence of CMP446 that the curtailment assumptions for an accepted Technical Limits offer could be impacted?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		Click or tap here to enter text.
16	Is the timeline of interactions understood?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		Click or tap here to enter text.

Public

17	Do you believe it is appropriate/ within scope of CMP446 for the Workgroup to consider this further, and if so why?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
		This is a consideration for DNO processes and should not be defined by the CUSC.