

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status	Workgroup Closed
1	WG1	CG	Due to the compressed timelines, please coordinate with the appropriate parties to proactively facilitate the Workgroup consultation (OTF/Regen/SEUK)	The Chair has contacted representatives of Regen and SEUK and reached out to the OTF organiser to share the consultation details in the next two meetings before the consultation launch	WG2	Closed	Workgroup 2
2	WG1	CG	Create a query log and add Workgroup Queries and concerns from Workgroup meeting 2.	Query log created, copy shared with members and added to the collaboration site.	WG2	Closed	Workgroup 2
3	WG1	AE/AD	Develop a graphical matrix or overview showing how commitments, liabilities, securities under CMP192, PCF under CMP448, and OTCF interact, including when each kicks in, overlaps, and their impacts	Draft notes : PCF and OTCF should not interact as they should not be applied at the same time. Securities are applied based on individual project timelines and project location. OTCF will be applied twice yearly, but there is no link between project securities and OTCF securities.	TBC	Closed	Workgroup 6
4	WG1	AE/AD	Calculate and share a worked example of the quantum of money likely to be involved from the industry if the OTCF proposal is approved, using current queue sizes and developer portfolios	the detailed results document gives data on how many batteries are G2 and how much oversupply there is per zone / GB (make sure to also count the built/operational batteries figures that are at the end of the doc as they also contribute to available capacity, even though built projects would not pay the security). #	TBC	Closed	Workgroup 9
5	WG2	AE	Consideration of phased connections	Proposer to bring a suggestion to next Workgroup - 8 May	TBC	Closed	Workgroup 6
6	WG2	AE	Consult with distribution network companies to confirm whether the mechanics of the PCF can be applied to the OTCF without requiring additional code changes and update the Workgroup if this changes.	Proposer engaged with a few DNO's on this. The mechanics of the PCF are different because NESO needs information from the DNOs to inform the PCF which NESO doesn't already have. That is not the case for the OTCF where NESO already has all of the data - 8 May	TBC	Closed	Workgroup 6
7	WG2	AE	Check the terms of procurement for consultant market models to determine if they can be shared with Ofgem (confidentially) or the Workgroup and provide the names of the consultants if possible.	Complete these were shared in the WG consultation- 8 May	TBC	Closed	Workgroup 6
8	WG2	AE/NESO	Please could NESO provide data on project cancellations. There is little know on the quantity of projects that have been cancelled and also whether the cancellation charge (in its entirety) is successfully retrieved from the cancelling party. For all relevant cancelled projects, please could	To discuss in WG. There has been a lot of external factors that may force or encourage projects to cancel, which mean that the dataset may not be representative. Proposer suggest this is an action for NESO and is part of the dataset which was due to be proied ahead	TBC	Closed	Workgroup 6
9	WG2	AE/AD	Coordinate with NESO to estimate the minimum time required for implementation of the OTCF proposal after an Ofgem decision, once the solution is more defined.	NESO are in the process of replacing their securities tool. Estimated at circa 12 months effort. CMP470 functionality is estimated at circa 6 months effort and will need to be built in the legacy or replacement tool. In addition there is a significant amount of work ongoing in Connections. This will need clear	TBC	Closed	Workgroup 9
10	WG2	All	Review and consider whether OTCF should apply to co-located projects where the battery element does not contribute to additional attributable works or network redesign and clarify the subset of projects to which this may apply.	Propose to close WG9	TBC	Closed	Workgroup 9
11	WG3	TO's/GW	As per the open letter from DESNZ, what constitutes a 'pragmatic approach'. Confirm and communicate the definitive delivery date for all requested battery securities and liabilities data to the Workgroup before their first post-consultation meeting.	Discussed at WG 4	WG4	Closed	Workgroup 4
12	WG4	DS	Confirm and communicate the definitive delivery date for all requested battery securities and liabilities data to the Workgroup before their first post-consultation meeting.	08/05/2026 - NESO is still undergoing quality and security checks before releasing this data. Propose to close WG9	WG5	Closed	Workgroup 9
13	WG4	DS	Check and confirm whether any customer has ever defaulted on termination (cancellation) charges and report back to the Workgroup	See action 19. Propose to close WG9	WG5	Closed	Workgroup 9
14	WG4	DS	Once the necessary data is available, provide an example estimating the amount of money industry participants would contribute if the OTCF proposal is approved.	Is this a duplicate of 4? Propose to close this one and work on 4?	TBC	Closed	Duplicate of action 4
15	WG4	AD	Verify if the OTCF can be applied to 2026-2027 projects with pre-Ofgem connection agreements and outline how to update their securities statements.	Propose to close WG9	TBC	Closed	Workgroup 13
16	WG4	SL	Update the alternative proposal to clarify "natural queue attrition" as projects unsold, add a footnote distinguishing "urgency" from Ofgem's criteria, and share the revision with the Workgroup.		WG5	Closed	Workgroup 5
17	WG4	DG	Update the OTCF, CMP192, & Alternative Request 1 and 2 Comparison table for the consultation.		WG5	Closed	Workgroup 7
18	WG5	CG	Clarify whether Transmission Owners can vote on alternatives as Workgroup members.	Yes they can, WG to be upated at WG 6	WG6	Closed	Workgroup 6
19	WG5	AD	Write out and circulate in bullet points the detailed requirements for the analysis to be delivered to the Workgroup, ensuring alignment with members' expectations.	As discussed with proposer the intention is to supply the following data:- Please could NESO provide data on project cancellations. There is little know on the quantity of projects that have been cancelled and also whether the cancellation charge (in its entirety) is successfully retrieved	WG6	Closed	Workgroup 8
20	WG5	AD	Add the outline of the analysis requirements to the actions log and ensure it is shared in a forum accessible after the meeting.	As above, and shared in this document.	WG6	Closed	Workgroup 8
21	WG5	CG	Check and correct the accuracy of the consultation response numbers and summaries and communicate any errors or updates to the Workgroup.		WG6	Closed	Workgroup 7
22	WG5	CG	Highlight which Consultation responses provide quantitative or specific evidence and collate these into an annex for the Workgroup Report.	Chair has shared with WG members . Action to be closed after WG 6	WG6	Closed	Workgroup 6
23	WG5	CG	Obtain and circulate a definitive response from NESO, code admin, and legal regarding whether the modification impacts EBR, and include an explanation in the Workgroup Report.	Chair added to report but requires NESO legal response required to be put into report. EBR Article 18 refers to the T&C of supplying balancing services. There has been passionate comments from some workgroup members that CMP470 unfairly treats some developers and /or that it may be discriminatory, however that	WG6	Closed	Workgroup 14
24	WG5	AD	Investigate and clarify whether force majeure provisions apply to cancellation charges (including PCF and CMP192) and report back to the Workgroup.	Section 16 and Schedule 2 Exhibit 3 of the CUSC refers to force majeure in the context of connections. - NESO SME to update in Workgroup 6 Propose to close WG8	WG6	Closed	Workgroup 9
25	WG5	CG/AP	Update and circulate the comparison table showing how each alternative request differs from the Original proposal, ensuring all alternatives are correctly numbered and described.	Chair has circulated for Alternative Proposer (AP) to respond	WG6	Closed	Workgroup 6
26	WG6	DS	Add a clear written explanation to the data set specifying what is included in "current securities," "current liabilities," "maximum liabilities," and "maximum securities," and ensure the data set is tightly defined for new users.	Propose to close WG8 Workgroup member agreed during WG12 this ction has been completed	WG7	Closed	Workgroup 12

27	WG6	DS	Assess and provide information on the distribution of liabilities between projects in phase one and phase two, and confirm what level of detail can be shared with the Workgroup. There was also a request to document precisely what the data set includes for future reference.	Compile and share data splitting queue projects between phase one and phase two, including securities and liabilities, to support further analysis and reporting. - this was requested again in WG 7. AD. I am not sure that this has been resolved. Deepak is on leave. I will share original dataset and ask	WG7	Closed	Workgroup 14
28	WG6	CG	Prepare and share a summary of the data set discussion points for Deepak to review and tweak as needed		WG7	Closed	Workgroup 7
29	WG6	Tos/DN Os	Gather and provide views from all Transmission Owners (TOs) and Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) on whether there is a negative network impact from having more battery energy storage (BESS) than needed, even if BESS is behind a co-located project, and articulate these impacts in writing	Can this action be achieved on the timeline?	WG7	Closed	Workgroup 9
30	WG6	DG	Draft and propose a definition or criteria for "minimal attributable works or connection costs" for co-located projects to improve the carve-out wording, and share with Andrew Enzor for consideration.		WG7	Closed	Workgroup 9
31	WG6	AD	Confirm and clarify how NESO models batteries in relation to their impact on network capacity and attributable works, and share this information with the Workgroup.	Some information given in WG8 – does this need further clarification? SS – think Mark W will now provide this AD – Mark will attend WG10 to discuss this.	WG7	Closed	Workgroup 8
32	WG7	TO/DNO/NESO	Provide quantitative data and analysis on the impacts and costs of co-located battery projects, including information from TOs and DNOs, to support decision-making on OTCF exemption criteria	Can this action be achieved on the timeline?	TBC	Closed	Workgroup 14
33	WG7	AE	Conduct and share analysis comparing the distribution of securities and liabilities between transmission and embedded projects, and include findings in the work group report		WG7	Closed	Workgroup 8
34	WG7	RS	Prepare and circulate worked examples illustrating the mechanics and impact of the liabilities floor proposal (Alternative 7) for clearer understanding by the Workgroup	Should this be an action for all WACMS? Workgroup members agreed during WG12 this action had been completed,	WG8	Closed	Workgroup 12
35	WG8	AD/NESO SMEs	Provide a clear, written explanation of how NESO currently models batteries, particularly in relation to wider reinforcement and co-located projects, to address outstanding Workgroup questions.	Duplicate of 31. Close this and use 31?	WG9	Closed	Duplicate
36	WG8	AD/NESO SMEs	Produce and share a data set showing the number and megawatts of hybrid projects that would meet the exemption criteria in the original solution (battery connects later, no tech increase, <£250k attributable works/connection costs).	AD - I have raised the data request. Note whether this will be delivered in time.	WG9	Closed	Workgroup 14
37	WG8	Workgroup members	Submit in writing any outstanding questions or evidence requirements related to the new work group alternative (WACOM 4) to the chair by close of play today for NESO SME follow-up	Workgroup members agreed during WG12 this action was completed and can be closed.	WG9	Closed	Workgroup 12
38	WG8	NESO SMEs	Confirm with NESO when Gate 2 Phase 1 (non-2026/27 protected) offers are expected to be issued, or if any TOCOs have been received, to inform the urgency and length of the requested timeline extension.	NESO will not release the information requested. We have referred the WG to the ENA website. We have discussed this with the proposer. Propose to close? SS – yes close, nothing more to share here	WG9	Closed	Workgroup 12
39	WG8	NESO SMEs/AD/Prop	Arrange and conduct an offline meeting (including Ofgem) to agree on the timeline and process for calculating oversubscription and applying the OTCF, to inform the legal text update	We met 20/05. In principle we have agreed a timeline. It needs confirmation from Ofgem and NESO that this is achievable. Workgroup members agreed during WG12 this action was completed and can be closed	WG9	Closed	Workgroup 12
40	WG8	Workgroup members	Review the draft Workgroup Report, focusing on whether all Terms of Reference (especially F, H, and I) have been adequately considered and provide feedback or additional evidence as needed		WG9	Closed	Workgroup 15
41	WG8	NESO SME	Can NESO supply the list of technologies to which the OTCF will apply.	Propose to close? Info below:- The OTCF will apply to any technology in the connections queue with a permitted capacity. At time of	WG9	Closed	Workgroup 15
42	WG9	Workgroup members	Provide feedback to the Proposer on the two proposed options for applying OTCF to co-located sites, including any alternative suggestions	Workgroup members agreed during WG12 this action was completed and can be closed.	WG10	Closed	Workgroup 12
43	WG9	AD	Review and provide feedback on the latest legal text revisions for WACMs, and coordinate with WACM owners to finalise text before the 28th May meeting.	Completed	WG10	Closed	Workgroup 10
44	WG9	Workgroup members	Review and ensure the Workgroup Report is accurate, comprehensive, and covers all meeting discussions, providing comments or amendments by midday on 27th May.	Completed	WG10	Closed	Workgroup 11
45	WG9	Workgroup members	Provide feedback on the proposed cap and floor values for OTCF, including views on whether a new alternative should be raised and what the appropriate numbers should be.	Workgroup members agreed during WG12 this action was completed and can be closed.	WG10	Closed	Workgroup 12