

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:	Nina Brundage	
Company name:	Ocean Winds	
Email address:	Nina.brundage@oceanwinds.com	
Phone number:	+44 7768227297	
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 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?	<p>Mark the Objectives which you believe the Original solution better facilitates:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Original</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>B <input type="checkbox"/>C <input type="checkbox"/>D</td> </tr> </table>	Original	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
Original	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D			
<p>The Original Proposal set out in the consultation document has the potential to better facilitate the Applicable Objectives when compared to the present approach. However, Ocean Winds is concerned that there are challenges to some of the elements proposed and that significant aspects (such as the Gate 2 Criteria Methodology and Connections Network Design Methodology (CNDM)) have not been addressed in CMP434. Ocean Winds believes that the Gate 2 Criteria Methodology and CNDM form part of the Minimum Viable Product and should be provided to the industry for consultation ahead of the Authority's decision on CMP434.</p> <p>Ocean Winds believes that the Original Solution has the following impact against the Applicable Objectives:</p> <p>A – Positive: Increasing the requirements to enter the connections queue and be provided with a confirmed connection date and location will reduce the number of speculative applications entering the queue. This should have the wider consequence of removing barriers to entry and enhancing market efficiency by allowing first ready projects greater market access. Facilitating access to the market should bring positive benefits in the more efficient delivery of Government policies related to Net Zero, national security of energy supplies and should ultimately facilitate tangible reductions in costs to electricity bill payers. This solution will therefore enable the ESO to more effectively discharge its obligations. However, Ocean Winds remains to be convinced that the introduction of application windows is consistent with allowing a coordinated network design and will have the desired effect of facilitating anticipatory investment. This concern stems there being no evidence of the Holistic Network Design (HND) process undertaken by the ESO delivering 2030 connection dates for in-scope projects, and that coordinated network design presented in the HND has subsequently been modified to radial connections.</p> <p>B – Positive: Delivering quicker connections and removing barriers to market entry for viable projects will help to facilitate competition in generation of electricity.</p> <p>C – Neutral.</p> <p>D – Negative: The Original Proposal relies significantly on methodology documents for implementation that will sit outside of the CUSC. This dilutes the content of the CUSC and means that key processes that will have a significant</p>				

	<p>impact on Users (such as the proposed “capacity reallocation” process) remain unclear and will sit outside of the CUSC governance process. This is of concern for Ocean Winds, and we suggest that the contents of these documents are brought before industry for input once the information is available.</p>	
2	<p>Do you support the proposed implementation approach? (see pages 59-61)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>
	<p>Ocean Winds appreciates the need for connections reform and for the reform to be implemented at pace. However, this process seems extremely rushed and runs the risk of implementing a solution that is not fully developed and/or has unintended consequences that will need to be remedied in the future. The Workgroup consultation document presents the Proposed Solution without full details confirmed and with no legal text for review. The Proposed Solution is reliant on two key methodologies (the Gate 2 Criteria Methodology and the Connections Network Design Methodology) that have not yet been prepared and circulated to CUSC parties for review and comment. Ocean Winds believes there is a considerable risk of impacting investor confidence if connections reform is implemented before being properly developed which can have a significant impact on the timely deployment of clean technologies in line with Government Net Zero targets. Premature implementation will likely result in the need for further code changes to remedy defects and resolve unintended consequences, creating ongoing uncertainty in the connections process.</p> <p>Ocean Winds thinks that the first application window for new applicants should be delayed until Gate 2 offers have been issued to the existing queue. This is to manage workload and resourcing availability within the TOs and the ESO. It would also be a more efficient way of undertaking the exercise as the confirmed connection dates and enabling works for existing queue will be understood, and they can be used as the basis for Construction Planning Assumptions before any new applications are assessed.</p>	
3	<p>Do you have any other comments?</p> <p>As part of the TMO4+ proposal, it is important to provide greater transparency around the ESO’s activities and the publication of the connections queue. Obligations on the ESO should be codified to define how the ESO determines queue positions, assesses dates and enabling works, and maintains the register and queue order of projects post-Gate 2. This information should be publicly available. Additionally, there should be more transparency of the queue across transmission and distribution, including consolidation into one queue for all post-Gate 2 connections.</p> <p>There should be a mechanism to specifically link the future Strategic Spatial Energy Plan (SSEP) to the new connections process and queue. As the details of the SSEP are still forthcoming, it is difficult to recommend specific pathways to achieve this coordination. However, there is the potential to align connections with targets based on generation and the optimal energy mix as defined by the SSEP.</p>	

	This should include consideration of connections that are positioned to deliver large, GW-scale projects that will contribute to meeting the UK's 2030 and Net Zero targets.	
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	<p>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?</p>	
	Element 1: Proposed Authority approved methodologies and ESO guidance (see pages 9-10, 55)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>It appears that the Proposer has included the use of Authority-approved methodologies and ESO guidance to minimise the changes that need to be included in CMP434 and implemented through the CUSC modification process. While Ocean Winds can appreciate that having methodology sit outside the CUSC allows it to be revised in shorter timescales, Ocean Winds considers that the Gate 2 criteria and elements of the Connections Network Design Methodology (CNDM) (for example the new “capacity reallocation” process) will have such a significant impact on Users they should be codified and subject to standard CUSC governance.</p> <p>If the Authority agrees with the Authority-approved methodologies approach, it is critical that a formal governance process is applied to ensure that Users are adequately consulted. The governance process should allow Users to provide suggested modifications to the ESO/TOs for improvements to the methodologies.</p>		
	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
<p>Ocean Winds remains to be convinced of the benefit of Gate 1 and whether it will allow the ESO to strategically plan the NETS and consider anticipatory investment. The ESO completed the Holistic Network Design (HND) exercise to define a holistic plan for connecting offshore wind generation to the NETS. Many of the recommendations presented in the HND have been superseded by detailed network design undertaken by TOs. This has resulted in changes to connection locations, connection dates, and some of the coordinated offshore designs have been revised to radial connections through the HND Impact Assessment process.</p>		

<p>This suggests that, although Gate 1 seems good in theory, it may simply result in adding confusion to Users as connection locations may change between Gate 1 and Gate 2. The purpose of a User signing a Gate 1 offer is unclear since every aspect of it can be updated at Gate 2.</p>	
<p>Element 3: Clarifying which projects go through the Primary Process (see pages 11-12, 35-36)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>The application of Gate 1 criteria to offshore wind farms is not clear since the option of the Crown Estate or Crown Estate Scotland submitting the Gate 1 application has been removed from the proposed solution. The proposed solution does not make it clear how an offshore wind farm developer can submit a Gate 1 application because details of the “Letter of Authority (LoA) equivalent” for offshore have not been provided.</p>	
<p>Element 4: Significant Modification Applications concept, including the proposed criteria and the proposed level of codification (see pages 12-13, 36-39)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>Element 1 page 9 states, “The ESO expects to publish the following guidance documents (<u>subject to change and not necessarily required by the CUSC</u>):” (emphasis added). Ocean Winds thinks that it should be a requirement of the CUSC that the ESO publishes a guidance document that states what constitutes a Significant Modification Application as it is important for all Users to understand this to allow Users to determine the risk associated with potential future changes to their project plans.</p>	
<p>Element 5: Clarifying any Primary Process differences for customer groups (see pages 13-14, 35-36)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>“Yes” answered on the basis that the proposed “Letter of Authority (LoA) equivalent” is an acceptable solution. Details of this have not been provided in the consultation document. An explanation of the proposed “Letter of Authority (LoA) equivalent” should be provided in the final Workgroup report to allow industry to comment on the proposals.</p> <p>Additionally, this element does not appear to consider any mechanism for the Crown Estate/ Crown Estate Scotland to request provisions for future offshore leasing rounds to be considered under Gate 1. This appears short-sighted as for future offshore leasing rounds it will either lead to multiple individual prospective projects submitting Gate 1 applications for a single potential lease area (as has happened in the past) or would prevent any offshore projects being considered in the Gate 1 coordinated design exercise.</p>	
<p>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)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<p>Ocean Winds thinks that the first application window for new applicants should be delayed until Gate 2 offers have been issued to the existing queue. This is to manage workload and resourcing availability within the TOs and the ESO. It would also be a more efficient way of undertaking the exercise as the confirmed connection dates and enabling works for existing queue will be understood and can be used as the basis for Construction Planning Assumptions before any new applications are assessed.</p> <p>Details of the “offshore Letter of Authority equivalent” have not been provided in the consultation document. Explanation of this should be provided in the final workgroup report to allow industry to comment on the proposals.</p>	
Element 7: Fast Track Disagreement Resolution Process (de scoped from this modification – see pages 16, 58)	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>The Project Designation Methodology has not been written and consulted upon therefore it is not possible to provide a considered view on this.</p> <p>The Project Designation Methodology should include an obligation on the ESO to publish a list of all designated projects providing justification for the designation.</p>	
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 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>While Ocean Winds broadly supports the introduction of a forward-looking milestone for planning consent application submission (M1), there is not sufficient detail provided in the Workgroup consultation to allow us to comment on the potential impact of the proposed changes on offshore wind farm development, as the consultation says, “No definitive timescale provided for Offshore at this stage within the Proposal.”</p> <p>One key challenge identified in relation to the Gate 2 criteria process is that an offshore wind farm developer would need to trigger Gate 2 prior to knowing its</p>	

<p>confirmed connection date and would therefore be committing to submitting its planning consent application within X years (yet to be defined by the Proposer). For example, if the confirmed connection date is 10 years in the future, it may therefore not be practical for the developer to submit its planning consent application within X years because planning consent may then expire before construction would commence to meet the connection date.</p> <p>The consultation document on page 37 states, “The Proposer confirmed that the connection dates offered, at Gate 2, to developers may be later than the indicative connection dates that were provided, at Gate 1, to those same developers.” This means that the developer has limited information on which it can commit to timescales for submitting its planning consent application. This results in a stalemated situation for offshore wind and potentially other technologies with long delivery programmes. The developer needs to know its confirmed connection date to determine when it should commence environmental surveys and define its planning consent application submission date. This reality is misaligned with the proposed solution, which seeks to require the developer to commit to a planning consent application submission date before knowing its confirmed connection date.</p> <p>To resolve this, a potential solution would be to define the standard timescales for a forward-looking M1 milestone for offshore in the Gate 2 Criteria Methodology but then allow the ESO and User to bilaterally negotiate the forward-looking M1 milestone if the confirmed connection date is more than Y years in the future. The date for the forward-looking M1 milestone would then be negotiated and agreed during the “Gate 2 Customer Acceptances” period prior to the offer being accepted/rejected.</p>	
<p>Element 12: Setting out the general arrangements in relation to Gate 2 (see pages 25-26, 47)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Ocean Winds considers that as a minimum, there should be three Gate 2 application windows per year to ensure that Users who are ready to progress can get a confirmed connection date and location as soon as possible.</p> <p>It is not clear from the consultation document how Users submitting applications within the same Gate 2 application window will be considered in relation to “queue” order. If the two Users apply in the same Gate 2 application window, have secured land on the same date and want to connect to the same part of the NETS, which User gets priority and the earlier confirmed connection date? Will their Gate 2 applications be considered to be interactive?</p>	
<p>Element 13: Gate 2 Criteria Evidence Assessment (see pages 26-27, 47-48)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>The Gate 2 Criteria Evidence Assessment will be set out in the Gate 2 Criteria Methodology, which has not been presented for consultation, therefore it is not possible to provide a considered view on this.</p> <p>The criteria listed in the consultation document is onshore-focused. It would be helpful if the final Workgroup report explains what offshore projects are required to provide to fulfil the evidence assessment.</p>	

<p>It would seem reasonable that the ESO should be able to undertake duplication checks for 100% of red line boundaries. The Gate 2 Criteria Methodology can require all Users to submit their red line boundaries in shapefile (or other format suitable for use in a geographical information system) so that the ESO (or party that it nominates) can undertake duplication checks.</p>	
<p>Element 14: Gate 2 Offer and Project Site Location Change (see pages 28, 46)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
<p>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)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	
<p>Element 16: Introducing the proposed Connections Network Design Methodology (CNDM) (see pages 29, 53-55)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>It appears that the Proposer has included the use of Authority-approved methodologies, such as the Connections Network Design Methodology, to minimise the changes that need to be included in CMP434 and implemented through the CUSC modification process. While Ocean Winds can appreciate that having methodology sit outside the CUSC allows it to be revised in shorter timescales, Ocean Winds consider that elements of the Connections Network Design Methodology (for example the new “capacity reallocation” process) will have such a significant impact on Users they should be codified and subject to standard CUSC governance.</p> <p>If the Authority agrees with the Authority-approved methodologies approach it is critical that a formal governance process is followed to ensure that Users are consulted and can raise proposed modifications when deficiencies are identified. The interactivity policy may need to be updated to reflect the potential for interactivity at Gate 2. From the information presented in the consultation document it is not clear how Users submitting applications within the same Gate 2 application window will be considered in relation to “queue” order. If the two Users apply in the same Gate 2 application window, have secured land on the same date and want to connect to the same part of the NETS, which User gets priority and the earlier confirmed connection date? Will their Gate 2 applications be considered to be interactive?</p>	
<p>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 anticipatory basis for Relevant Embedded Small Power Stations or Relevant Embedded Medium Power Stations</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

	aligned to the Gate 1 Application Window (see pages 30-33, 51-53)	
	No comment.	
	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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	No comment.	
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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	<p>The Minimum Viable Product should include details of the Gate 2 Criteria Methodology and Connections Network Design Methodology (CNDM), rather than only defining that these are the required methodologies. Ocean Winds believes that the Gate 2 Criteria Methodology and CNDM should be provided to the industry for consultation ahead of the Authority's decision on CMP434.</p> <p>The Minimum Viable Product should detail the application fees associated with Gate 1 and Gate 2 applications to allow Users to fully respond to the suitability of the approach in Element 2.</p> <p>The consultation document appears to suggest there is an application fee associated with a Gate 1 application and also states "The Workgroup queried whether there would be an application fee for Gate 2; the Proposer confirmed there would continue to be application fees associated with the application but advised the details of this are out of scope of CMP434." It is not clear why this would be out of scope because the Gate 2 application fee is a key aspect of the impact on Users of introducing the Gate 2 criteria.</p>	

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
<p>Providing a Yes or No answer to this question does not make sense because it is an either / or question.</p> <p>Ocean Winds has answered No to “Do you agree that the Gate 1 process should be a mandatory process step.” If a User applying has already met Gate 1 and Gate 2 criteria, it makes sense for the User to apply directly to Gate 2 to reduce administrative burden and to allow the project to develop as quickly as possible, rather than being slowed down by a connections application process.</p> <p>The consultation provides limited information in relation to application fees. If a User applies directly to Gate 2, they should only have to pay a Gate 2 application fee and not a Gate 1 and Gate 2 fee.</p> <p>Ocean Winds remains to be convinced of the benefit of Gate 1 and whether it will allow the ESO to strategically plan the NETS and consider anticipatory investment. The ESO completed the Holistic Network Design (HND) exercise to define a holistic plan for connecting offshore wind generation to the NETS. Many of the recommendations presented in the HND have been superseded by detailed network design undertaken by TOs. This has resulted in changes to connection locations, connection dates, and some of the coordinated offshore designs have been revised to radial connections through the HND Impact Assessment process. This suggests that, although Gate 1 seems good in theory, it may simply result in adding confusion to Users as connection locations may change between Gate 1 and Gate 2. The purpose of a User signing a Gate 1 offer is unclear since every aspect of it can be updated at Gate 2.</p>		
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>From the level of information provided in the consultation document, it is not possible to provide a definitive answer to this. However, the proposal to offer Interconnectors and Hybrid Assets a firm connection point and connection date (reserved for up to 3 years – the long-stop date) could unfairly distort the offshore wind development market in favour of Hybrid Assets. Ocean Winds thinks that it</p>		

	would be fairer to allow the Crown Estate to also obtain firm Gate 1 offers in advance of a specific leasing round to allow Hybrid Assets and standalone offshore wind farms to compete on level footing for seabed leases.	
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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No This is not a yes or no question.
<p>Ocean Winds provides the following view on options (a) to (e):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) – we do not see the benefit of this proposed approach as this appears similar to the backward-looking approach in option (d), but with the added complication that someone has to provide a view on decision timelines and when planning conditions would be discharged. (b) – this option appears complex because what would the 10% spend be measured against? Many developers seek to limit expenditure prior to securing planning consent and reaching Final Investment Decision (FID). The spend profile for each project will be different depending on its connection date (which is unknown at the point of applying for Gate 2) and when it plans to take FID, so it would be challenging to define a forward-looking milestone on this basis that could be applied to all Users. (c) – this appears a reasonable approach. However, as noted in the consultation document, this is more applicable to England and Wales than Scotland. (d) – this is Ocean Winds preferred approach from the five options listed. Offshore wind developers typically structure their project development and construction programme from the contracted date of connection to the NETS, so this would be a more logical approach. (e) – Ocean Winds disagrees with this approach because the proposed solution should not place additional planning burden on the Users. Users should not be liable for additional time, effort and cost because the ESO requires the User to submit its planning consent application earlier than is required by the project programme simply to meet an administrative milestone. <p>As noted in response to Element 11, for offshore wind (and potentially other technologies with long delivery programmes), the developer needs to know its confirmed connection date to determine when it should commence environmental surveys and define its planning consent application submission date; whereas the proposed solution seeks to require the developer to commit to a planning consent application submission date before knowing its confirmed connection date. To resolve this, a potential solution would be to define the standard timescales for a</p>		

	forward-looking M1 milestone for offshore in the Gate 2 Criteria Methodology but then allow the ESO and User to bilaterally negotiate the forward-looking M1 milestone if the confirmed connection date is more than Y years in the future. The date for the forward-looking M1 milestone would then be negotiated and agreed during the “Gate 2 Customer Acceptances” period prior to the offer being accepted/rejected.	
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 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 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)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>Ocean Winds considers that there may be issues with having the Gate 2 criteria and elements of the Connections Network Design Methodology (for example the new “capacity reallocation” process) outside of Code Governance as it could be interpreted that the requirements contained within the methodologies are at the ESO’s discretion. These methodologies will have such a significant impact on Users that they should be subject to standard CUSC governance.</p> <p>It appears that the Proposer has included the use of Authority approved methodologies and ESO guidance to minimise the changes that need to be included in CMP434 and implemented through the CUSC modification process. While Ocean Winds can appreciate that having methodology sit outside the CUSC allows it to be revised in shorter timescales, Ocean Winds consider that methodologies mentioned above will have such a significant impact on Users they should be codified and subject to standard CUSC governance.</p> <p>If the Authority agrees with the Authority approved methodologies approach it is critical that a formal governance process is applied to the methodologies to ensure that Users are consulted and can raise proposed modifications when deficiencies are identified.</p>		