

Public

Code Administrator Meeting

Summary

Workgroup Meeting 3 – CMP471: Interim Connection Date Delay Process Ahead of CMP434 Gated Application Window

Date: 17/06/2026

Contact Details

Chair: Teri Puddefoot, Terri.Puddefoot@neso.energy

Proposer: Matthew Dowds, matthew.dowds@muirhallenergy.co.uk

Key areas of discussion

Discussion focused on Actions review, refining the legal text and drafting of the Workgroup Consultation. The group also debated User scope (transmission, demand, DNOs) and whether certain elements (e.g. milestones) should be explicitly captured or left implicit.

Action Log Review

Actions 1 and 2 – Closed. Ofgem and TOs provided statements to the Workgroup.

Action 5 and 6 – Open

Action 6 – Open

Action 7 Open, JC shared [NGET Webinar](#) – RW to send slides and Scottish TO's to review.

Action 8 – Closed. Slides shared to Workgroup.

Action 9 – Open

Action 10 – To be closed, Gate 2 agreement must be signed before a gated /non-gated modification can be submitted, however RM needs to look at other options and so a new Action was taken (Action 18).

Action 11 – Open

Action12 – Open

Action 13 – Closed, STCP to be shared with the Workgroup.

Action 14 – Open

Public

Actions Discussion

The Workgroup reviewed actions relating to **NESO’s role and existing regulatory framework (Actions 1, 2, 6 and 9)**. Discussion highlighted ongoing uncertainty around how connection date changes should be facilitated, including NESO and TO obligations, alignment of connection dates, and whether existing arrangements are sufficient or require regulatory clarification. It was recognised that a clear and consistent position is still required, with NESO confirming further internal consideration is needed before providing definitive guidance.

Actions relating to the **treatment of demand and DNO users (Action 14)** were discussed in significant detail, including whether these users should fall within scope and how existing arrangements would support changes to milestones, costs and liabilities. The Workgroup explored practical complexities such as differences in payment structures, the absence of a user commitment model for demand, and challenges associated with bundled DNO applications, with concerns raised around how these scenarios could be accommodated without creating unintended impacts on other users.

The Workgroup also reviewed actions concerning the **interaction with queue management milestones and existing processes (Action 12 and links to Action 10)**, debating whether this should be explicitly captured within the legal text or remain implicit within existing arrangements. Views differed on whether additional drafting would provide necessary clarity or risk overcomplicating the modification, particularly where existing processes already allow for some flexibility.

Actions relating to the **overall scope and applicable users (Action 12)** were also considered, including how best to define relevant users (e.g. generators, transmission users, or those in receipt of Gate 2 offers) to ensure clarity without unintentionally excluding relevant parties. This included discussion on whether defining scope through reference to Gate 2 modification offers would provide a clearer and more consistent approach.

Finally, the Workgroup discussed actions relating to **supporting evidence, stakeholder engagement and supporting material (Actions 3, 5, 7, 8, 11 and 13)**, noting that additional input from TOs, DNOs, Ofgem and wider stakeholders is required to validate assumptions and resolve outstanding uncertainties. It was also recognised that supporting material (including consolidated guidance and interaction with existing CUSC provisions) will be required alongside the legal text to ensure the process is clear and workable, with several actions to be progressed offline or through follow-up sessions.

Legal Text Discussion

The Workgroup reviewed **Section 17** drafting, focusing on improving clarity and structure of the process for connection date changes. Discussion centred on ensuring the timelines were clearly defined (including the application window and submission period) and that drafting avoided

Public

unnecessary or duplicative wording. There was also agreement that the text should clearly reflect the intended limited application of the process without overcomplicating the legal drafting.

The Workgroup then considered **Section 18**, with feedback that the drafting should align closely with Section 17 to ensure consistency in approach. It was suggested that, once finalised, the Section 17 drafting should largely be replicated in Section 18 with updated defined terms, rather than introducing a different narrative. Some existing text (including detailed bullet points) was considered unnecessary and potentially duplicative, with a preference to streamline the section and rely on the core process set out elsewhere.

Discussion also covered specific drafting points across Sections 17 and 18, including whether to explicitly reference queue management milestone changes or rely on existing processes. Views were mixed, with some members favouring explicit clarity, while others considered this unnecessary and potentially overcomplicating the text. The Workgroup agreed that this could be refined further and, if needed, tested through consultation to gather wider industry feedback.

The Workgroup reviewed supporting definitions and terminology, including the use of defined terms (e.g. “existing agreement” and “relevant transmission licensee”) and ensuring consistency across sections. **Section 11** was referenced to confirm existing definitions, with agreement that these should be applied consistently throughout the legal text to avoid ambiguity.

Finally, the Workgroup discussed the time-limited nature of the process, clarifying that the limitation is driven by the application window and timing provisions within the legal text, rather than the legal text itself being temporary. It was agreed that drafting should be updated to reflect this more accurately and remove any implication that the code change itself is time-limited.

Workgroup Consultation Discussion

The Workgroup reviewed the approach to the workgroup consultation, noting that the initial sections had been carried over from the proposal and could be refined where appropriate, while remaining at the proposer’s discretion. Discussion focused on the opportunity to include targeted consultation questions to help resolve areas of uncertainty identified during the workgroup, including scope, treatment of different user groups, and specific legal text drafting points. It was agreed that questions should be used to gather wider industry feedback where the Workgroup had not reached a clear position.

The Workgroup also noted the need to ensure consistency throughout the document (e.g. removing references to timing assumptions such as application windows) and to update drafting accordingly. In terms of next steps, actions were agreed to finalise the document offline, incorporate comments and additional questions, and circulate a near-final version to the workgroup for review ahead of publication, with a follow-up session to complete the review prior to issuing the consultation.

Public

Next Steps

A series of next steps were agreed by the Workgroup to progress the modification and consultation document. It was noted that further work is required to address outstanding comments, refine the legal text, and incorporate additional consultation questions. A follow-up workgroup session on 18th June 2026 has been in an aim to complete the review, with availability to be coordinated across members.

In the interim, workgroup members were encouraged to provide further comments offline, particularly on areas of uncertainty and proposed consultation questions. Once updated, a near-final version of the workgroup consultation document will be circulated to the Workgroup for final review before being issued for consultation, with the aim of publishing later in the week.

Actions

For the full action log, click [here](#).

Action	Workgroup	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
Number Raised					
1	WG1	Ofgem	To provide clarification on the current interpretation of the CUSC and NESO and TO licence obligations, specifically whether TOs and NESO are required to offer the earliest possible connection date when issuing CMP435 offers (including where this may result in a project having a non-firm position for a period when this was not the case with their Existing Agreement) and whether changes to connection dates as a result of delays to transmission infrastructure can already be accommodated under existing arrangements, ie reflected in updated offers.	WG2	Closed
2	WG1	TP and TO Workgroup members	As per Action 1 and including: To provide a clear statement of their interpretation and current	WG2	closed

Public

			approach, including any regulatory or statutory basis for offering the earliest possible connection date, and to confirm how they are currently handling delay requests in practice.		
3	WG1	MD	Proposer to consider whether any supporting evidence or examples from TO engagement can be shared with the Workgroup to support understanding of the issue.	WG2	Closed
4	WG1	TP/MD	TP to share up to date baselines with MD. MD to add legal text to these.	WG2	Closed
5	WG1	TOs/RW	TOs to provide a qualitative impact assessment to help the workgroup understand how this modification could impact the Joint Industry Plan (JIP) AKA Existing Agreement Timeline. Related action - NGET to support by engaging with Ofgem/DESNZ.		Open
6	WG2	RM	Confirm - What ability do NESO have to ensure TOs are aligning connection dates and to change the earliest customer connection dates in Scheme Briefing Notes (SBN) after a TO has issued a TOCO to NESO.		Open
7	WG2	TOs	TOs to consider whether a high-level description of the assessment process can be provided to the workgroup. If not feasible, TOs will confirm this and the action may be closed.		Open
8	WG2	IV	Slides to be shared within the workgroup to support understanding of impacts (from Action 2)		Closed

Public

9	WG2	Ofgem	Ofgem to consider whether changes or clarification to licence conditions are required to enable connection date delays without requiring a full modification application, or to avoid penalising TOs for accommodating such delays.	Open
10	WG2	RM	Confirm the correct position on whether a Gate 2 agreement must be signed before a gated / non-gated modification can be submitted, given conflicting guidance. (The action arose when IV raised a point about NESO guidance on whether a Gate 2 offer must be signed before a modification (or delay request) can be submitted.)	Closed
11	WG2	MD	A summary slide or section that brings together all relevant inputs and references, including NESO guidance and relevant CUSC provisions (e.g. milestones, exceptions processes), to show how they interact with the CMP471 proposal. To improve clarity and traceability across: NESO guidance (e.g. milestone extensions due to reform delays). Existing CUSC provisions (e.g. Section 16.5 exceptions). The proposed CMP471 legal text. To help the workgroup understand how the different mechanisms work together in practice.	Open
12	WG2	RM	Confirm whether it is preferable (and feasible) for connection date delay requests and associated milestone/exception	Open

Public

			<p>requests to be handled together as a single process, or continue being managed separately across different NESO teams. In the workgroup it was highlighted that:</p> <p>Connection date delay requests go through one route (applications → TOs → contracts)</p> <p>Milestone exceptions (e.g. QM milestones) are handled by a different team/process.</p> <p>There was concern this could create inefficiency and misalignment if requests are assessed separately.</p>	
13	WG2	TP/NESO	<p>Consider STCP Modification process and impacts.</p>	Closed
14	WG2	MD/RM	<p>Consider impact on DNOs and embedded generations. NESO to take away and confirm how the process works for DNO/embedded projects, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How connection date delay requests are handled in practice • How Appendix G updates feed through the process • Whether and how this impacts S-curves, securities, and liabilities. 	Open
15	WG3	TP/RB/RM	<p>Set up cross-party alignment session (Ofgem / TOs / NESO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal action to bring parties together to align interpretation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CUSC and Licence interpretation 	Open

Public

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Connection date flexibility ○ Process approach 	
16	WG3	NESO	<p>Confirm ownership and update route for guidance. Clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who owns Queue Management (QM) guidance ○ Who owns Gated Modification Guidance ○ How updates will be managed alongside the mod 	Open
17	WG3	TP	Follow-up session with proposer and NESO to review legal text and Gated Modification Guidance updates.	Open
18	WG3	RM	As a follow up to Action 10 – RM to confirm potential options/changes to current position (Changes can only be made once the connection offer is signed.)	Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Teri Puddefoot	TP	NESO	Chair
Ryan Baldwin	RB	NESO	Technical Secretary
Matthew Dowds	MD	Muir Hall Energy	Proposer
Terry Baldwin	TB	NESO	NESO Rep
Ruth Matthew	RM	NESO	NESO Rep

Public

Rob Smith	RS	Enso Green Holdings	Workgroup Member
Catriona Glennie	CG	SP Manweb Plc Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Member
Khamun Ward	KW	Voltwise Power	Workgroup Member (alt)
Richard Woodward	RW	NGET	Workgroup Member (alt)
Gareth Williams	GW	Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Member
Martin Hardwick	MH	Northern Powergrid	Workgroup Member
Andrew Allan	AA	RWE	Workgroup Member (alt)
Lamin Saidy Vulart	LSV	Qair UK	Workgroup Member
Ciaran Fitzgerald	CF	Scottish Power Renewables	Workgroup Member
Rosemary McInnes	RI	Scottish Power Renewables	Workgroup Member (alt)
Joe Colebrook	JC	Innova	Workgroup Member
Harriet Eckweiler	HE	SSE Transmission	Workgroup Member
Philip Pateman	PP	Aukera Energy	Workgroup Member (alt)
Claire Hynes	CH	RWE	Workgroup Member (alt)
Andrew Colley	AC	SSE	Workgroup Member (alt)
Fiona Casey	FC	SSE Transmission	Workgroup Member (alt)
Ben Clarke	BC	Bute Energy Ltd	Workgroup Observer
Fiona Ewart	FE	Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Observer
David Barber	DB	GridLink Interconnector Ltd	Workgroup Observer
Emma Webster	EW	Bute Energy	Workgroup Observer (alt)