

Public

Code Administrator 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@nationalenergyso.com by **5pm GMT on 26 November 2024**. Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address will not be accepted.

If you have any queries on the content of this consultation, please contact cusc.team@nationalenergyso.com

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
Respondent name:	Richard Knights	
Company name:	Evolution Power Limited (EPL)	
Email address:	Richard.knights@evolutionpower.co.uk	
Phone number:	07808682050	
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 Panel or the industry for further consideration)

Public

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

- a) *The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence;*
- b) *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;*
- c) *Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency *; and*
- d) *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 Code Administrator Consultation questions																		
1	Please provide your assessment for the proposed solutions against the Applicable Objectives?	<p>Mark the Objectives which you believe the proposed solutions better facilitate:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Original</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>d</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WACM1</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>d</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WACM2</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>d</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WACM3</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>d</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WACM4</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>d</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WACM5</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>d</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WACM6</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>d</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WACM7</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>d</td> </tr> </table> <p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>	Original	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d	WACM1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d	WACM2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d	WACM3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d	WACM4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d	WACM5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d	WACM6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d	WACM7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d
Original	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d																	
WACM1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d																	
WACM2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d																	
WACM3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d																	
WACM4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d																	
WACM5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d																	
WACM6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d																	
WACM7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d																	
2	Do you have a preferred proposed solution?	<input type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> WACM1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WACM2																

Public

		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WACM3 <input type="checkbox"/> WACM4 <input type="checkbox"/> WACM5 <input type="checkbox"/> WACM6 <input type="checkbox"/> WACM7 <input type="checkbox"/> Baseline <input type="checkbox"/> No preference
		<p>WACM1 – No Comment.</p> <p>WACM2 – We are supportive. However, a distribution connected scheme is reliant upon the DNO/iDNO to represent it accurately to NESO. We are aware of (and could provide confidential evidence) of occasions where DNOs have not followed current Statement of Work/Project Progression process in a timely manner to the detriment of the developer and the developer's scheme. After implementation of CMP434 this reliance is greater.</p> <p>We would like to understand what remedy a developer would have in the occurrence of a DNO/iDNO not representing a developer correctly in its Gate 2 Application.</p> <p>WACM3 – We are supportive. Given the flexibility NESO has in Project Designation, and Connection Point and Capacity Reservation, it should not have the added opportunity to use Capacity Reallocation for such schemes.</p> <p>WACM4 – No Comment.</p> <p>WACM5 – We do not support this modification. We consider that there is a need for certainty of project designation.</p> <p>WACM6 – No Comment.</p> <p>WACM7 – We do not support this modification. We do not consider this matter to be of general relevance to</p>

Public

		the ongoing connections process beyond its application to the current existing queue. CMP435 which has a similar clause directly relates to the application to the existing queue and that it is within CMP435 this matter should be resolved.
3	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.
4	Do you have any other comments?	<p>Elements 2 and 5</p> <p>Two points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Distribution connected developers will be reliant on a third party, DNO/iDNO for their Gate 2 criteria submissions. There needs to be some GB wide definitions of the duties of both developers and DNO/iDNO with timescales and deadlines. These need to be consistent across all DNO/iDNOs. NESO needs to use its influence to ensure ENA on another party draws up duties and timescales and consults, otherwise distribution connected developers could be disadvantaged as there is little or no recourse should a DNO/iDNO fail to undertake its regulatory duty. We have experience of a DNO not meeting its milestone commitment to submit projects for Statement of Works/Project Progression which has caused developers' projects to stall, at significant expense but at no fault to the developers (details can be provided on a confidential basis). 2. It is unclear how NESO will co-ordinate with DNO/iDNOs regarding connection date. Clearly a developer will have received and accepted a connection offer from the DNO/iDNO which will have a connection date and an export date subject to Project Progression, and in the future to Gate 2. However the DNO/iDNO offer may not have been able to take account of the cumulative impact of

Public

		<p>Gate 2 acceptance upon its network reinforcement. Will the Gate 2 offer just relate to transmission or will it take account of any DNO/iDNO reinforcement too (e.g. distribution work associated with a new GSP)?</p> <p>Element 4</p> <p>When will the definition of “Significant Modification Application” be provided. Early indication is needed for developers to plan ahead.</p> <p>Element 11</p> <p>Three points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We welcome the changes to queue management. However, there needs to be a consistency between transmission and distribution regarding the timeframes and base date. This is particularly important with there being both a Gate 2 offer and a DNO/iDNO offer for distribution connected developments, and in particular if the Gate 2 offer subsequently changes the DNO/iDNO connection date. Projects that progress to planning through local planning authorities have to commence construction within three years of receiving consent, so DNO/iDNOs should have discretion to ensure a developer is allowed to time planning applications appropriately as NESO proposes for transmission connections. 2. We welcome the proposal on land requirements for Gate 2. We are extremely concerned that CMP435 indicates that changes to TEC and/or technologies can occur without the normally requisite changes to Bilateral Connection Agreement through Mod Apps. We do not expect the Gate 2 process to be a means for a developer who has speculated with a technology mix or TEC to be allowed to change that mix without a Mod App to change the Bilateral Connection Agreement.
--	--	--

Public

		<p>3. We consider that the Red Line Boundary should provide certainty over the land for the scheme. We disagree with the proposed allowance of the use of any land outside the Original Red Line Boundary for generation. However, we do accept that NESO can apply discretion as described; we would like to see the results of such discretion decisions published in a timely manner.</p> <p>We do not expect NESO's discretion to be applied in situations where a developer has not undertaken sufficient due diligence on the suitability of the land it has obtained, or on its obtaining of land rights.</p> <p>Should the use of land outside of the Original Red Line Boundary concept be retained, we consider that the proportion of generation outside of the Original Red Line Boundary that can be used for generation should be drastically reduced.</p>
5	Do you agree with the Workgroup's assessment that the modification does not impact the Electricity Balancing Regulation (EBR) Article 18 terms and conditions held within the CUSC?	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>