

Connections Process Advisory Group

Meeting 7 Minutes

Date: 09/05/2024

Location: MS Teams

Participants

Attendee	Attend/Regrets	Attendee	Attend/Regrets
Merlin Hyman, Regen, CHAIR	Attend	Freddie Saunders, Department for Energy Security and Net Zero	Attend
Neil Bennett, SSEN Transmission	Attend	Andrew Scott, SSE Distribution	Regrets
David Boyer, ENA	Attend	Annette Sloan, SSENT	Attend
Lynne Bryceland, SPT	Regrets	Patrick Smart, RES Group	Attend
Matt Chatfield, Department for Energy Security and Net Zero	Attend	Kyle Smith, ENA	Attend
Chris Clark, Emtec Group	Attend	Ian Thel, Department for Energy Security and Net Zero	Attend
Daniel Clarke, NGET	Attend	Spencer Thompson, INA	Attend
Catherine Cleary, Roadnight Taylor	Attend	David Tuffery, NGED	Attend
Liam Cullen, Ofgem	Attend	Matt White, UKPN	Attend
Arjan Geveke, EIUG	Regrets	Lee Wilkinson, Ofgem	Attend
Paul Glendinning, Northern Powergrid	Attend	Michelle Young, Scottish Government	Attend
Ben Godfrey, National Grid Electricity Distribution	Attend	Salvatore Zingale, Ofgem	Attend
Garth Graham, SSE Generation	Attend	Camille Gilsean, ESO	Regrets
Paul Hawker, Department for Energy Security and Net Zero	Regrets	Robyn Jenkins, ESO	Regrets
Claire Hynes, RWE	Attend	Laura Henry, ESO	Attend
Jade Ison, National Grid Electricity Transmission	Attend	James Norman, ESO	Attend
Steffan Jones, ENW	Attend	Mike Oxenham, ESO	Regrets
Allan Love, SPT	Attend	Folashade Popoola, ESO	Attend
James Macauley, Ofgem	Attend	Mike Robey, ESO (Tech Sec to CPAG)	Attend
Holly Macdonald, Transmission Investment	Attend	Djaved Rostom, ESO	Attend
Alasdair MacMillan, Ofgem	Attend	Neil Copeland, ESO	Attend
Deborah, MacPherson, ScottishPower Renewables	Attend	Sabrina Gao, ESO	Observe
Susana Neves e Brooks, SSEND	Attend	Richard Paterson, ESO	Observe
Graham Parnell, BayWa r.e.	Attend	Sonia Poonian, ESO	Observe
Jennifer Pride, Welsh Government	Regrets	Alison Price, ESO	Observe
Grant Rodgers	Regrets	Will Kirk-Wilson, ESO	Observe

Agenda

1.	Welcome and introductions	Merlin Hyman, Regen
2.	Minutes and actions from meeting 6	Mike Robey, ESO
3.	TMO4+ progress update	James Norman, ESO
4.	Embedded projects within TMO4+	Ben Godfrey, NGED
5.	Distribution projects - raising entry requirements	Paul Glendinning, NPg
6.	Package 2 - Enabling Works	Djaved Rostom, ESO
7.	Transitional arrangements	Laura Henry, ESO
8.	Substation bays - progress update	Shadé Popoola, ESO
9.	Update on longer term strategy	Neil Copeland, ESO
10.	Next steps	James Norman
11.	Any Other Business	Merlin Hyman

Discussion and details

Minutes from meeting, including online meeting group text chat during meeting, where referenced as “[From online chat]”

1. Welcome and Matters arising

2. Minutes and actions from meeting 6

- **Decision 7.2.1:** CPAG approved the meeting 6 minutes.
- **Action 7.2.1:** ESO to publish meeting 6 minutes.

3. TMO4+ progress update

- Since the April CPAG meeting, ESO had submitted code modification proposals to the CUSC and STC panels and subsequently Ofgem has granted applying the urgency process.
- ESO noted one change to the timeline, with Ofgem advising that their decision on the code modifications will be made no later than 06 November. Ofgem noted a need to align the codes decision-making process with licence changes that will also be required for reform to go live. Ofgem further noted that 06 November is the deadline for a decision and that it is hoped a decision can be reached earlier than this.
- ESO noted that the Codes function within ESO are the proposer of the code modifications and will be running the process, with ESO’s connections reform and change delivery colleagues providing specialist input to the workgroups where required.
- ESO noted that it was mindful that code modification governance now applied and therefore CPAG was not the group driving this now code workgroups are established. ESO will still provide updates on progress to CPAG members and ensure feedback from CPAG is also shared.
 - [From online chat: A member queried whether iDNOs were represented within the code modification work groups and another member confirmed one iDNO was present.]
- A member raised the need to clarify the transition period through to go-live, particularly for the existing queue and their need to provide evidence of achieving Gate 2. They further noted that uncertainty on what’s required will persist because of potential WACMs during the code modification process, making it harder for developers to get ready until the code modification decision is made.
- A member asked ESO to share a more detailed timeline.
- A member asked whether queue management would be suspended until Gate 2.
- **Action: 7.3.1** ESO to share a timeline with CPAG.

- ESO intends to write to the existing queue with a Request For Information for non-contractual details of the progress of their project to help understand the approximate status of the queue.
- A member expressed surprise that ESO was writing to the queue about this so soon after publishing the summary of TMO4+.
- A member asked for clarification on what ESO would do with the RFI responses.
 - ESO advised the intention would be to inform thinking on the potential impact of adopting Gate 2 on the scale of the connections queue. ESO noted that the status of each project could change between the RFI being responded to and any Gate 2 process being launched for projects in the existing queue.
- ESO summarised that it had set out the current status. They highlighted risks of delay to the process and decision-making and risk of change of scope from the code modification workgroups. ESO noted its' awareness that industry will need time to respond.
- **Action 7.3.2** ESO to share the draft RFI with CPAG members for comment.
- A member asked whether DCUSA mods were being progressed.
- A member asked about the status of CMP376 queue management implementation, with 27 May the published deadline for affected projects in the existing queue to decide which implementation option it wished to pursue. In particular, how might the transition period before TMO4+ goes live affect this.
 - ESO advised that the Mod App process will not change (it follows a prescribed licence timetable) and that it is in discussion with Ofgem on options for customers that have chosen the Agreement to Vary route to implement queue management milestones to their contract.
 - A member expressed concern that the current lack of clarity might drive projects to follow the Mod App approach.
 - Ofgem noted the distinction that CMP376 implementation was a live activity, whilst TMO4+ is a proposed change.
 - The member suggested the administrative process could cost a developer £40,000. They suggested if there was no action on a Mod App, the charge should be refunded or held to part-offset the Gate 2 fee; and to ensure not paying twice.
 - [From online chat: A member noted the volume of projects in the existing queue and their need to gather and submit evidence before 01 January 2025, on the presented timeline. They encouraged ESO to engage stakeholders on the draft RFI, such as the code modification work group members, to ensure that the right questions are asked.]
- **Action 7.3.3** ESO to continue discussion with Ofgem and to confirm if / how queue management implementation will be affected through the transition towards TMO4+.
- [From online chat: a member suggested a formal decision from Gas and Electricity Markets Authority (GEMA) may be required for the approach to be taken, rather than a letter of comfort.]

Charging

- SCG is reviewing transmission charging reform for embedded projects. They noted that it is not always consistent. They presented short- and long-term options to the Connections Delivery Board (CDB). CDB provided a steer to look at short-term options that do not require a code change and report back to CDB.
- SCG has identified few options that do not require code modifications which will be taken to CDB and shared at a future CPAG. Longer-term options are still being considered and would be further discussed with Ofgem.
- The Chair noted that he understood a different Ofgem governance group would be overseeing this.
- A member highlighted charging as a burning issue for developers and expressed the view that it will take a long time for DNOs to standardise their approach.
- **Action 7.3.4** SCG to return to CPAG to share details after options have been presented to CDB.

4. Embedded projects within TMO4+

- The Chair asked for details of why it had been determined that the originally proposed approach to Distribution Forecasted Transmission Capacity (DFTC) would not work with the TMO4+ reform model.

-
- SCG clarified that DFTC applies at Gate 1, but within TMO4+ the connections queue is only firmed up at Gate 2.
 - A member raised whether a similar approach to that proposed for offshore projects (where it is proposed that Crown Estate & Crown Estate Scotland hold capacity up to Gate 2) could also be applied to embedded projects (with DNOs holding the capacity).
 - SCG and ESO noted that alternative approaches such as this could be raised as a WACM through the code modification process. ESO noted that it would shift the risk profile, but is worth considering.
 - ESO noted that DFTC in the original reform proposal (without Gate 2 being applied to the existing queue), would have provided firm dates and locations to embedded projects at Gate 1, but these would still be sitting behind the 500GW existing queue. The new approach means dates are not firm until Gate 2, but the existing queue also has to demonstrate they have reached Gate 2, and therefore we can't say that the connection date offered for embedded projects that are progressing would be worse.
 - SCG noted that final calibration of the approach for embedded projects with Gate 2 will need to be resolved once Gate 2 is locked down. They stressed that they felt the DFTC proposal is reasonable to both transmission and distribution connected projects and that SCG will engage stakeholders on this jointly with ESO at the 20 May Connections Forum.
 - SCG noted that the proposal sees all projects with a capacity of 1MW or more would follow the main TMO4+ process.
 - [From online chat: A member raised that the current 1MW threshold only applies to England & Wales and not Scotland.]
 - [From online chat: Another member noted that Type B (1-10MW) definition applies across Great Britain.]
 - A member raised the deadline date for providing evidence of achieving Gate 2 for projects within the existing queue; particularly whether embedded projects would have the same deadline as directly connected transmission projects.
 - SCG agreed that the deadline should be the same.
 - From online chat: Further clarification was provided that it is the intention that DNOs will have the same time as the ESO to confirm Gate 2 evidence to ensure alignment between T&D. I.e. DNO checks Distribution, ESO checks transmission in parallel and not necessarily asking DNOs to meet the Gate 2 window deadline with other T applicants.]
 - A member suggested this should be codified.
 - [From online chat: A member asked ENA to clarify whether its' view was that A DCUSA mod was not required to facilitate TMO4+ for embedded projects.]
 - [From online chat: a member highlighted reference to 'all relevant embedded projects will be required to go through Gate 2' and they presumed that this means a DCUSA mod would be required and asked if this was the case.]
 - SCG reported that DNOs had considered whether DCUSA changes are required. Their view is that if this is covered within CUSC, it does not also need a DCUSA modification, as it would be a pass-through approach.
 - [From online chat: SCG confirmed that DNO members current stance on the code modifications is that they have not identified any DCUSA changes which will be required. They will keep this under review as the CUSC and STC mods progress and ensure that they identify any which may be required if we see a change to the CUSC & STC mod through a WACM.]
 - A member asked how Gate 2 will be policed, would it be the DNOs or ESO and will there be a Service Level Agreement setting our required review and response times?
 - SCG confirmed that the proposal is for DNOs to administer and to provide embedded projects evidence that Gate 2 had been achieved to ESO to enable ESO to form a combined transmission and distribution queue.
 - Another member expressed a firm view that DNO responding to ESO in time for ESO to include embedded projects within Gate 2 batches needs codifying. They stressed that there is a gap that needs addressing in DCUSA or CUSC and that there was a risk that this issues falls between the two and is not addressed.
-

- SCG noted that DNOs were committed to passing through evidence that embedded projects had achieved Gate 2 to ESO as soon as possible. SCG agreed that this needs codifying.
- [From online chat: a member asked when exactly will existing distribution-connected projects that need transmission capacity need to evidence they had met the Gate 2 requirements.]
- The Chair noted this and asked whether this would now be taken through code modification.
- SCG noted that there were some issues still to resolve, such as regarding red line boundaries for projects.
- A member raised the need to align definitions of small and medium-sized generators.
 - [From online chat: A member raised that there was an opportunity through DFTC to set the system up for the future / for success by having a level playing field across the 14 DNOs by using 'Type C' or 'Type D' sizes instead of the legacy 'small' and 'medium' approach.]
 - SCG confirmed this is being looked at.
- **Action 7.4.1** SCG will share the DFTC rulebook at the next CPAG meeting.

5. Raising entry requirements for embedded projects

- SCG presented a paper setting out proposals raise entry requirements for embedded projects which seeks to improve the quality of connection applications as a result of projects applying later in their development cycle. SCG noted that they had ruled out a £/MW application fee approach.
- DNOs are committing to provide developers with high quality budget estimates, which developers should then build into their due diligence.
- A member asked if this is effectively a pre-Gate 1 milestone.
 - SCG responded that it was similar to Gate 1.
- A member asked for clarification if this would only apply to new applications from a certain date.
 - SCG confirmed this was focussed on new applications.
- A member queried whether this proposal changes the requirements (i.e. the terms and conditions, rather than guidance), as they thought that may require legislation.
 - SCG will review this. SCG noted that the data request is at the initial application stage for TMO4+, so it is minimal information. They noted that the DNO licence includes reference to 'any other relevant information' or similar text.
- A member raised why this proposal was necessary. They reflected that currently when developers apply nothing happens for 2-3 years whilst a transmission works review is undertaken. They reported that developers were frustrated, they wanted to get on, but were stuck behind transmission delays / the transmission queue; and TMO4+ should alleviate this.
- SCG emphasised the objective was to weed out speculative bids and support real projects.
- Members queried how it could be demonstrated that a project was real?
- A member expressed the view that the proposal in the paper were poor; they felt budget quotes were no good and they felt that better access to data was needed, as highlighted in the Connections Action Plan. They highlighted that some of the data requested would not work, for example details on the technology to be installed, when with the delay to connection dates, the technology to be deployed may not yet be on the market. Other data could be considered, such as a credible design, suitable environmental approach and so on. They supported the principle within the paper, but not the proposed ideas.
- [From online chat: a member agreed with the previous contribution and emphasised that developers need certainty on time, scope and costs at Gate 2 from DNOs as customers will be close to financial close.]
- Another member felt technology, layout and design could be requested from developers, but they highlighted that developers would not have committed to particular equipment at this stage. They encouraged SCH to reconsider what data is reasonable to ask developers for.
- [From online chat: A member offered to participate in further discussion. They suggested useful approaches might include projects being required to provide a project programme, the proposed

credible design solution or project stage approaches to determining whether a project is viable; all these might be useful as a solution.]

- SCG noted that DNOs were looking to understand what developers had allowed for grid connection costs.
- [From online chat: A member asked about possible licence changes.]
 - [From online chat: SCG responded that they had not raised a change. They wanted to confirm that the solution is looking at the initial application being deemed able to proceed in accordance to minimum scheme and additional information which is in a DNO license, if required, DNOs would need to look to ensure they adhere to DNOs current licenses and carry out any formal requirements if change is needed.]
- A member offered to support further discussion and suggested setting up an expert stakeholder discussion group on this. Several others members also volunteered.
 - SCG welcomed CPAG members proposing a stakeholder discussion.
 - [From online chat: A member asked what governance structure this new expert group would be created under. Was it SCG?]
 - The Chair concluded the discussion, supporting the scheduling of an ad hoc stakeholder meeting, including CPAG members who were interested and to report back to CPAG afterwards.
 - **Action 7.5.1** SCG to organise an ad hoc stakeholder meeting and to invite interested CPAG members and to report back to CPAG.

6. Package 2 Update

- ESO noted their return to CPAG on package 2 to follow-up on two previous questions raised at CPAG: potential changes to the definition of the MITS substation and whether CUSC changes will be required.
- ESO stated that any CUSC changes for this activity will be pursued outside of the current TMO4+ code modifications, as it was yet to be confirmed whether code modifications were required or not and that these activities are not within the minimum viable product to launch TMO4+.
- A member asked to see any CUSC change proposal for this and the impact on the contract between ESO and developer.
- ESO also noted that it was working on an action from the Connections Delivery Board to share a project plan for the package 2 activities (enabling works, fault-level assumptions, improvements to construction planning assumptions).
- A member raised that CDB had also asked ESO to consider the impact on balancing costs.
 - ESO confirmed that it was looking at this within its work to consider links to Centralised Strategic Network Planning.

7. Transitional arrangements

- ESO is in discussion on transitional arrangements with Ofgem, DESNZ and transmission owners. ESO proposes lighter-touch offers for new connection applications in 2024 until TMO4+ goes live, similar to the Gate 1 offers once TMO4+ goes live (although noting Gate 1 is not a live thing until the code modification is approved).
- The Chair noted that Transmission Owners had raised a potential moratorium at CDB. ESO advised that whilst it was not proposing this, others might.
- ESO concluded that it was working at pace to establish a transitional arrangement and that a decision may be made before the next CPAG meeting. If this is the case, ESO will circulate details to CPAG members.

8. Substation bays

- Bay sharing policy – A two-month period is proposed for developing the policy framework and ESO-TO workshops are scheduled.

- Code change requirements – the current view is that a code change is not required as forms of bay sharing already take place, but it may become necessary to review this.

9. Longer term strategy

- ESO had recently convened a workshop with DESNZ and Ofgem including representatives working on the Strategic Spatial Energy Plan, Centralised Strategic Network Plan, Review of Electricity Market Arrangements, Regional Energy Strategic Planner and Price Controls.
- ESO advised that as part of the ongoing work on the longer-term strategy it is proposed to set up a strategic stakeholder group. This was described as a ‘strategic CPAG’, but CPAG members raised concern about this working title and ESO agreed to address that.
- The Chair noted recent comments by the Secretary of State on not supporting centralised planning.
- Other members, who had participated in the workshop welcomed the discussion and noted that this positioned connections reform well in the context of longer-term strategic direction and that TMO4+ will help push the agenda along.
- A member expressed concern that TMO4+ will require investors to make significant investments this year and that it would therefore not go down well if in another year or two’s time there’s another change in approach.
- Another member gave a cautious welcome, noting that it may provide useful locational signals, although they expressed concern that some of the language may go to far.

10. Next steps

- The next CPAG meeting was scheduled for 05 June, which clashes with a TMO4+ code modification work group meeting.
 - **Action 7.10.1** ESO to reschedule June meeting.
- ESO noted that the next meeting’s agenda will include updates on:
 - TMO4+ progress
 - Embedded projects within TMO4+
 - Transitional arrangements
 - Letter of Authority Phase 2 (which is being tabled at the May CDB meeting)

Decisions and Actions

Decisions: Made at last meeting

ID	Description	Owner	Date
7.2.1	Meeting 6 minutes agreed	Merlin Hyman	09/05/2024

Action items: In progress and completed since last meeting

ID	Description	Owner	Due	Status	Date
7.2.1	ESO to publish minutes of meeting 6	Mike Robey	17/05/2024	Complete	14/05/2024
7.3.1	ESO to share a timeline for TMO4+ with CPAG	Mike Robey	19/06/2024	Share at next CPAG	
7.3.2	ESO to share the draft RFI with CPAG members for comment	Mike Robey	10/05/2024	Complete	10/05/2024
7.3.3	ESO to continue discussion with Ofgem and to confirm if/how queue	Laura Henry	19/06/2024	Ongoing	

	management implementation will be affected through the transition towards TMO4+			
7.3.4	SCG to return to CPAG to share details after options have been presented to CDB	Su Neves e Brooks	11/07/2024	Ongoing
7.4.1	SCG will share the DFTC rulebook at the next CPAG meeting	Ben Godfrey & Kyle Smith	19/06/2024	Ongoing
7.5.1	SCG to organise a stakeholder meeting and to invite interested CPAG members and to report back to CPAG	Kyle Smith & Paul Glendinning	05/06/2024	Ongoing
7.10.1	ESO to reschedule June meeting	Mike Robey	17/05/2024	Complete, moved to 19 Jun
6.5.1	ESO and TOs to develop formal bay sharing policy	ESO, TOs	28/06/2024	In progress
4.1.2	ESO to trial pre-recording some presentations to introduce topics in advance of the meeting.	Mike Robey	04/03/2024	ESO to trial

Action Item Log - Action items: Previously completed.

ID	Description	Owner	Due	Status	Date
6.2.1	The Strategic Connections Group to return to CPAG with a paper on the implications for embedded customers.	Ben Godfrey	09/05/2024	Complete	09/05/2024
6.2.2	ESO to publish minutes of meeting 5	Mike Robey	25/04/2024	Complete	14/05/2024
6.3.1	ESO to submit CUSC and STC code modifications on Friday 19 April	Paul Mullen	19/04/2024	Complete	19/04/2024
6.4.1	ESO to provide further clarification to CPAG on MITS definitions, and implication of potential impacts on Charging and User Commitment.	Djaved Rostom	09/05/2024	Complete	09/05/2024
5.2.1	ESO to publish the minutes of meeting 4	Mike Robey	21/03/2024	Complete	21/03/2024
5.3.1	The Gate 2 approach will be taken to the March CDB for their steer.	James Norman	21/03/2024	Complete	21/03/2024
5.4.1	ESO and DNO to consider the revised proposals within DFTC discussion	ESO & DNOs	25/04/2024	Ongoing and moved to DFTC updates	09/05/2024
5.4.2	ESO to take Package 3.1 recommendation to the March CDB meeting.	James Norman	21/03/2024	Complete	21/03/2024
5.5.1	DFTC to come back to CPAG to reflect how it would work if Gate 2 were applied to the whole queue.	Ben Godfrey	25/04/2024	Complete	25/04/2024
5.6.1	ESO to take its disincentivising mod apps recommendation to the March CDB meeting.	James Norman	21/03/2024	Complete	21/03/2024
5.7.1	ESO to take its paper on the single digital view CAP action to CDB for their steer	Adam Towl	21/03/2024	Complete	21/03/2024
5.8.1	ESO to schedule CPAG meetings beyond April 2024	Mike Robey	28/03/2024	Complete	28/03/2024
4.1.1	ESO to look into sending papers in more than one batch, if this allows at least some to be circulated earlier.	Mike Robey	29/02/2024	Ongoing	04/03/2024

4.2.1	ESO to publish Minutes of meeting 3	Mike Robey	29/02/2024	Complete	26/02/2024
4.3.1	ESO to return to CPAG to share its updated recommendation for Package 2.	Djaved Rostom	04/04/2024	Complete	18/04/2024
4.4.1	ESO will take forward the options Packages 3.1, 4.4 and 5 for more detailed discussion.	Mike Oxenham	07/03/2024	On agenda 07 March	07/03/2024
4.6.1	ESO to return to CPAG to discuss disincentivising mod apps	Ruth Matthew	07/03/2024	On agenda 07 March	07/03/2024
3.2.1	ESO to publish the minutes of meeting 2	Mike Robey	22/02/2024	Complete	16/02/2024
3.5.1	ESO agreed to look into holding a targeted workshop on Gate 2 to gather more views	Paul Mullen	28/02/2024	Scheduled	28/02/2024
3.7.1	ESO will bring fuller details on packages 3, 4 and 5 to the next CPAG meeting, providing clear links to the Connections Action Plan	Mike Oxenham	22/02/2024	Complete	22/02/2024
3.7.2	ESO to re-issue slides to address a typo on slide 36	Mike Robey	08/02/2024	Complete	08/02/2024
2.2.1	ESO to publish Terms of Reference	Mike Robey	08/02/2024	Complete	08/02/2024
2.2.2	ESO to publish minutes of meeting 1	Mike Robey	08/02/2024	Complete	08/02/2024
2.3.1	ESO to scope code defects and bring them to a future CPAG meeting	Paul Mullen	07/03/2024	On agenda 07 March	07/03/2024
2.4.1	ESO to bring update on queue position allocation to the 08 February CPAG meeting	Paul Mullen	08/02/2024	Complete	08/02/2024
2.5.1	ESO to bring bay re-allocation and standardisation back to CPAG	Shade Popoola	22/02/2024	Complete	22/02/2024
1.2.1	ESO to circulate the updated Terms of Reference document	Mike Robey	25/01/2024	Complete	22/01/2024
1.3.1	ESO to share its analysis of the impact of CMP376 on the existing TEC queue.	Kav Patel	08/02/2024	Quarterly updates to be provided	Ongoing
1.4.1	ESO to look at how and when details of the outcome of the ongoing transmission works review can be shared	Robyn Jenkins	08/02/2024	Update shared	08/02/2024
1.4.2	Technical secretary to follow-up liaison and co-ordination with CDB	Mike Robey	25/01/2024	In place	24/01/2024
1.4.3	ESO to confirm how much detail of code mods will be taken to CPAG before going to code mod working groups.	Paul Mullen	25/01/2024	Discussed 25 January	25/01/2024

Decision Log – Decisions previously made

ID	Description	Owner	Date
6.2.2	Minutes of meeting 5 approved for publication	Merlin Hyman	18/04/2024
5.2.1	Minutes of meeting 4 approved for publication	Merlin Hyman	07/03/2024
4.2.1	Minutes of meeting 3 approved for publication	Merlin Hyman	22/02/2024
3.2.1	Minutes of meeting 2 approved for publication	Merlin Hyman	08/02/2024
2.1.1	Terms of Reference v2 approved for publication	Mike Robey	25/01/2024
2.2.1	Minutes of meeting 1 approved for publication	Mike Robey	25/01/2024