

Public

Code Administrator Meeting

Summary

Workgroup Meeting 4 – CMP471: Interim Connection Date Delay Process Ahead of CMP434 Gated Application Window

Date: 24/06/2026

Contact Details

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

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

Key areas of discussion

Discussion focused on NESO’s information-gathering exercise and its relationship to CMP471, the status of open and closed actions, and development of the legal text and supporting guidance. The Workgroup also considered DNO and embedded generation scope, Affected Transmission Owner (TO) impacts, and whether CMP471 has any Electricity Balancing Regulation (EBR) implications.

Next: NESO and Workgroup members will progress open actions ahead of Workgroup 5, with focus on refining the consultation material, confirming process implications and finalising any required legal text or guidance updates.

Discussion on the NESO information gathering email

The Workgroup discussed NESO’s Modification Application change scoping exercise and whether it overlapped with, or reduced the need for, CMP471. Members considered the exercise to be information-gathering only, with no commitment from NESO to implement changes. The Workgroup therefore agreed that CMP471 should continue to progress. Members also noted that the email wording could create confusion about the relationship between the scoping exercise and CMP471, and agreed this should be clarified in the Workgroup consultation.

Action Log Review

Action 5 – Open.

Action 6 – Open.

Action 7 – Closed. RW shared slides with the Workgroup.

Public

Action 9 – Open.

Action 11 – Open. MD/RM. MD advised that draft legal text has been developed, but the key deliverable is updated NESO guidance to support CMP471. He is awaiting a proposal from RM/NESO and has offered to help draft the changes if needed.

Action 12 – Open.

Action 14 – Closed. MD confirmed that CMP471 will focus on transmission-connected users, as accommodating all distribution-connected generators would introduce additional complexity. Any solution for DNO-connected customers would likely need to be developed separately by DNOs.

Action 15 – Open.

Action 16 – Closed.

Action 17 – Open.

Action 18 – Open.

Action Discussion

The Workgroup reviewed actions relating to guidance and legal text development (**Actions 11, 16 and 17**). The Proposer provided an update on draft legal text and the supporting guidance needed to implement CMP471. Although draft legal text has been developed, updated guidance on Queue Management Milestones, the Gated Modification process and associated implementation arrangements is still required. These actions remain open pending further development and discussion with the NESO Representatives.

The Workgroup discussed NESO’s ongoing work (**Action 18**) to consider alternative approaches that may influence the final legal text, particularly in relation to securities and liabilities. As these options could affect the scope of CMP471 and the consultation questions, the action remains open pending further information from the NESO Representatives.

The Workgroup reviewed the action relating to DNO and embedded generation impacts (**Action 14**). The Proposer confirmed that CMP471 is intended to focus on transmission-connected users and that extending the solution to embedded generation would introduce additional complexity. The Workgroup agreed that this issue had been sufficiently considered and the action was closed.

The Workgroup also identified a potential gap relating to Affected TOs, where a change progressed by one TO could have knock-on impacts for another TO. Further work is required to determine whether additional legal text or process changes are needed to capture Affected TO involvement. A new action was raised for the Proposer to review this issue and bring a proposal back to a future Workgroup.

Legal Text Discussions

Section 11

Public

The Proposer presented revised Section 11 drafting, simplifying the definitions and clarifying the scope of CMP471. The Workgroup discussed whether additional wording was needed to define when the CMP435 process ends and concluded that the existing definitions of Gate 2 Modification Offer and Gate 2 Existing Agreement provide sufficient clarity.

Section 17

The Proposer presented the proposed Completion Date Delay Request Process for Gate 2 Existing Agreements. Discussion focused on eligibility windows, assessment criteria and how the process would apply where users had already accepted Gate 2 offers. The Workgroup considered how to avoid disadvantaging users if CMP471 is implemented during an active offer acceptance period and agreed that further drafting options should be explored.

The Workgroup also discussed how requests should be assessed, particularly what would constitute an “unreasonable adverse impact” on network planning or the Gate 2 process. Further refinement of the drafting is expected following additional feedback from the NESO Representatives.

Section 18

The Proposer presented the proposed Completion Date Delay Request Process for Gate 2 Modification Offers, focusing on how users would access the process and how requests should be assessed. Discussion centred on ensuring users have a reasonable opportunity to request a connection date delay while maintaining workable timescales for assessment and offer revisions.

The Workgroup also considered when a request could be rejected, including the need for clear and objective assessment criteria. Several drafting amendments were proposed to improve clarity, consistency and alignment with existing CUSC processes.

EBR Discussion

The group reviewed the potential Electricity Balancing Regulation (EBR) implications of CMP471 as part of the Terms of Reference. It was noted that the modification is focused on changes to CUSC Sections 11, 17 and 18 and therefore does not appear to interact with the areas of the CUSC that would typically give rise to EBR impacts.

No concerns or alternative views were raised. The current view is that CMP471 does not have EBR implications, although this will continue to be reviewed as the legal text develops and will be tested through the Workgroup consultation.

Next Steps

Workgroup 5 will focus on feedback from the NESO Representatives on alternative options under consideration, particularly where these could influence the legal text and consultation questions.

Public

In the interim, members agreed to progress open actions and continue reviewing and commenting on the draft consultation document. Updates will be made following the legal text discussion and any further NESO feedback.

The intention remains to review the consultation package at the next Workgroup meeting and, subject to agreement, issue the consultation in line with the revised timeline. The Workgroup also discussed holding a short “showstopper” session after the next meeting, if required, to finalise any remaining consultation updates.

Actions

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

Action Number Raised	Workgroup	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
5	WG1	TOs	Provide qualitative impact assessment on JIP / Existing Agreement Timeline impacts.	WG2	Open
6	WG2	RM	Confirm NESO ability to align TO connection dates and amend earliest SBN dates post-TOCO.	WG3	Open
9	WG2	Ofgem	Consider whether licence clarification or change is needed for connection date delays without full modification applications.	WG3	Open
11	WG2	MD	Prepare summary of NESO guidance, CUSC provisions and CMP471 legal text interactions.	WG3	Open
12	WG2	RM	Confirm whether delay and milestone/exception requests should be managed as one process or separately.	WG3	Open
15	WG3	TP/RB/RM	Set up Ofgem/TO/NESO alignment session on interpretation, flexibility and process approach.	WG4	Open
17	WG3	TP	Hold follow-up with proposer and NESO on legal text and Gated Modification Guidance.	WG4	Open

Public

18	WG3	RM	Confirm options or changes to the position that changes can only be made once the offer is signed.	WG4	Open
19	WG4	TB	Seek NESO clarification on the modification application change scoping exercise, including its intent, participation expectations and interaction with CMP471.	WG5	Open
20	WG4	MD/TOs	Consider TO process impacts where host TO connection date changes may affect other TOs and require coordination.	WG5	Open
21	WG4	RW	Develop minimum objective “showstopper” criteria for connection date delay requests from a TO perspective.	WG5	Open
22	WG4	TB/RW	Consider NESO operational impacts and coordination with TOs when assessing delay requests and managing partial accommodation scenarios.	WG5	Open
23	WG4	TB/RW	Review how User Commitment Methodology applies to securities freeze, including updated costs and whether securities are reissued or remain frozen.	WG5	Open
24	WG4	MDTB/RW	Consider whether transitional offers should be in scope and clarify how they are currently treated within the gated process.	WG5	Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Teri Puddefoot	TP	NESO	Chair
Mollie Griffiths	MG	NESO	Technical Secretary
Matthew Dowds	MD	Muir Hall Energy	Proposer
Terry Baldwin	TB	NESO	NESO Rep
Chiara Oppo	CO	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)
Ciaran Fitzgerald	CF	Scottish Power Renewables	Workgroup Member
Joe Colebrook	JC	Innova	Workgroup Member
Mark O'Connor	MO	EDF ENERGY RENEWABLES LIMITED	Workgroup Member
Fiona Casey	FC	SSE Transmission	Workgroup Member (alt)
Ben Clarke	BC	Bute Energy Ltd	Workgroup Observer
Fiona Ewart	FE	Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Observer