

Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma

CMP434: Implementing Connections Reform

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@nationalgrideso.com by **5pm on 06 August 2024**. 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 cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
Respondent name:	Ravinder Shan	
Company name:	FRV Powertek Limited	
Email address:	ravinder@frvpowertek.com	
Phone number:	07340498332	
Which best describes your organisation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer body <input type="checkbox"/> Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Generator <input type="checkbox"/> Industry body <input type="checkbox"/> Interconnector	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Storage <input type="checkbox"/> Supplier <input 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)

For reference the Applicable CUSC (non-charging) Objectives are:

- The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence;
- 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;
- Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency *; and
- Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements.

*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 better facilitates the Applicable Objectives?	Mark the Objectives which you believe the Original solution better facilitates: Original <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D Click or tap here to enter text.
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach? (see pages 59-61)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.
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.

Specific Workgroup Consultation questions		
5	Do you agree with the elements of the proposed solution? Element 7 has been de-scoped and Element 10 is proposed to be codified within the STC through modification CM095 . Please provide rationale for your answer and any suggestions for improvement to each element?	
	Element 1: Proposed Authority approved methodologies and ESO guidance (see pages 9-10, 55)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
We agree with the approach and the license obligation on the ESO to consult and requirement of the Authority for approval of these methodologies.		

Element 2: Introducing an annual application window and two formal gates, which are known as Gate 1 and Gate 2 (i.e. the Primary Process) (see pages 11, 35-36)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.	
Element 3: Clarifying which projects go through the Primary Process (see pages 11-12, 35-36)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.	
Element 4: Significant Modification Applications concept, including the proposed criteria and the proposed level of codification (see pages 12-13, 36-39)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.	
Element 5: Clarifying any Primary Process differences for customer groups (see pages 13-14, 35-36)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.	
Element 6: Setting out the process and criteria in relation to Application Windows and Gate 1, including introducing an offshore Letter of Authority equivalent as a Gate 1 application window entry requirement for offshore projects (see pages 15-16, 39-40)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.	
Element 7: Fast Track Disagreement Resolution Process (de scoped from this modification – see pages 16, 58)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.	
Element 8: Longstop Date for Gate 1 Agreements (see pages 16, 40-41)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.	
Element 9: Project Designation (see pages 17-18, 48-49)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Approve the element in principle but need to understand how it will work? How will a project be designated, what will be application process to be designated? Will this favour certain technologies over others? Will this favour certain locations over others?	
Element 10: Connection Point and Capacity Reservation (proposed to not be codified within the CUSC, but is intended to be codified within the STC through modification CM095 – see pages 18-20 and the CM095 Workgroup Consultation , pages 6-10)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.	

Element 11: Setting out the criteria for demonstrating Gate 2 has been achieved and setting out the obligations imposed once Gate 2 has been achieved (see pages 20-24, 42-46)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Support the element. For Planning compliance, Milestone 1 should be aligned with Workgroup recommendations as it is hard to envisage that planning activities can commence in parallel till the Gate 2 offer with firm POC is received. Also propose that M1 should be calculated back from connection date for projects where connection date is more than 6 years from the Gate 2 offer date.	
Element 12: Setting out the general arrangements in relation to Gate 2 (see pages 25-26, 47)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Support the element, prefer if the frequency of Gate 2 windows is 3 (proposed) or 4, not less.	
Element 13: Gate 2 Criteria Evidence Assessment (see pages 26-27, 47-48)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Should add 'Requested Point of Connection:' to capture the requested POC if it is different to the one offered in Gate 1, as this is allowable change as per Annexure 5 – Significant Changes guidance.	
Element 14: Gate 2 Offer and Project Site Location Change (see pages 28, 46)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
We do not think that this element is aligned with 'First Ready, First Connect' objective and does not meet the MVP criteria. There should be a more robust pre-app process and better assessment for Gate 1 offer to ensure change of point of connection does not happen. In case it happens then the developer should go back to Gate 1 and reapply whenever ready for Gate 2 at the new location. It is unfair to hold the queue position for 12 months as there might be other projects at this new POC who have met Gate 2 criteria later but are ready to progress.	
Element 15: Changing the offer and acceptance timescales to align with the Primary Process timescales (e.g. a move away from three months for making licenced offers) (see pages 29, 42-46)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.	
Element 16: Introducing the proposed Connections Network Design Methodology (CNDM) (see pages 29, 53-55)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
We agree with the approach but need to see the CNDM document to assess that methodology aligns with the objectives.	
Element 17: Introducing the concept of a Distribution Forecasted Transmission Capacity (DFTC) submission process for Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) and transmission connected Independent Distribution Network Operators (iDNOs) to forecast capacity on an	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

	anticipatory basis for Relevant Embedded Small Power Stations or Relevant Embedded Medium Power Stations aligned to the Gate 1 Application Window (see pages 30-33, 51-53)	
Support in principle but do not understand how it will align with actual capacity requested by small and medium embedded generators. Need more information.		
	Element 18: Set out the process for how DNOs and transmission connected iDNOs notify the ESO of Relevant Embedded Small Power Stations or Relevant Embedded Medium Power Stations which meet Gate 2 criteria (see pages 33-34, 51-53)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		
6	Are there any elements of the proposal which you believe should not be included as part of this proposed solution, which the Proposer believes represents the 'Minimum Viable Product' reforms required to the connections process? If not, why not? (Please note the element number in each of your responses if applicable)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Element 14 as mentioned above		
7	As per question 6, are there any additional features which you believe should be included as part of Minimum Viable Product reform to the connections process?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		
8	Do you agree that the Gate 1 process should be a mandatory process step, or do you think Gate 1 should be an optional process step with projects being able to apply straight into the Gate 2 process if the project meets both the relevant Gate 2 and Gate 1 criteria?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
We think that projects should be able to progress directly to Gate 2 process and Gate 1 should be optional for projects that meet Gate 1 and Gate 2 criteria. There is a risk for a		

	developer associated with applying directly to Gate 2 in terms of ongoing compliance and red line boundary changes. If a developer is willing to take the risk there is no reason to force them to go through the Gate 1 process which occurs once a year. Developer should be able to apply directly to Gate 2 window, which is proposed to open 3 times a year.	
9	Do you believe that the proposed Gate 1 and Gate 2 process could duly or unduly discriminate against any types of projects? If so, do you believe this is justified?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		
10	Please provide your views on the proposed options ((a) to (e) on page 45) to mitigate the risk of requiring a developer to submit their application for planning consent earlier than they would in their development cycle (with the risk this consent could expire and any extension from the Planning Authority is not automatic).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
We support the forward looking M1 milestone but think that it should be applicable only if the connection date is within 6 years of the offer date as this will mitigate the risk for consent expiration. For connection date that is more than 6 years, M1 as per QM CMP 376 should apply. Other option is to add 1 year to forward looking M1 for every year that is above 6 years. So, for connection date that is 7 years from offer date, M1 can be 2 years from offer acceptance, if the connection date is 8 years from offer date than M1 can be 3 years and so on. A principle similar to what is currently used for calculating M1 dates as per QM CMP 376.		
11	Do you agree that DFTC should be included as part of CMP434? If not, do you believe that the reformed connections process can function without DFTC? Please justify your answer. (see pages 30-34, 51-53)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		
12	The Proposer intends to set out supporting arrangements for TMO4+ via a combination of guidance and	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<p>methodologies (e.g. DFTC, CNDM, Project Designation, Gate 2 Criteria). Do you anticipate any issues with having these outside of Code Governance? (see Pages 9-10, 55)</p>	
<p>We understand the need for flexibility by ESO but require that these methodologies are published as soon as possible so that they can be approved in time as their approval is contingent on implementation of Connection Reform.</p>	