

Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma

CMP435: Application of Gate 2 Criteria to existing contracted background

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:	Duncan Hughes	
Company name:	Zenobe Energy	
Email address:	Duncan.hughes@zenobe.com	
Phone number:	07788143015	
Which best describes your organisation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer body <input type="checkbox"/> Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator <input 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*

- 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.

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: <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="622 674 858 734">Original</td> <td data-bbox="863 674 1455 734"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>D </td> </tr> </table>	Original	<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			
The proposed process offers an improved way of allowing projects that are ready to build to progress in the connections queue.				
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach? (See page- 57-58)	<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	<p>Do you agree with the elements of the proposed solution for CMP435? <i>Please note that the application of these elements may be different to CMP434, therefore please answer the questions in respect to CMP435.</i></p> <p>Elements 2,4,6,7,12,15,17 and 18 are not part of the CMP435 Proposal and is only part of the CMP434 Proposal. Element 10 is proposed to be codified within the STC through modification CM095.</p> <p>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 Page 8-10,29)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
We agree that specific guidance does not have to be codified. However, it is vital that this guidance, particularly that related to Gate 2 requirements for developers and ESO's proposed discriminatory powers under Elements 9, 11. And 16) are unambiguous and consulted on appropriately.	
Element 3: Clarifying which projects go through the Primary Process (See pages 10-11,29-31)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
It should be possible to submit Mod apps for existing connections or projects that have already passed Gate 2 at any time to avoid unnecessary delays in M&A transactions.	
Element 5: Clarifying any Primary Process differences for customer groups (See pages 11-12,32)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
We have no materials comments to make on this element.	
Element 8: Longstop Date for Gate 1 Agreements (See pages 12-13, 32-33)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
We support the implementation of a long-stop date and view 3-years as reasonable.	
Element 9: Project Designation (See pages 14-15, 33-34)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
While we support this element in principle, this support is dependent on there being strict guidance as to when a project would qualify for "designation". There should be minimal opportunity for ESO to designate projects on any subjectively basis. We believe ESO should not use this approach as a first option for bringing forward specific project types. Rather, ESO should continue their use of more transparent processes such as Pathfinders.	
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 16-21, 34-39)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Generally, we support this Element. However, we do not believe the forward timescales mechanism to be appropriate given some projects could pass Gate 2 whilst still having a connection date in the far future. We propose the back-calculated mechanism is retained.	
Element 13: Gate 2 Criteria Evidence Assessment (See pages 22-23, 39-40)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
We support the proposal.	
Element 14: Gate 2 Offer and Project Site Location Change (See pages 23-24, 40-41)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Generally we support this element. However, we note that the 12-month period is challenging and is not likely to result in 100% success rate. We are concerned that developers could have to spend material sums to achieve Gate 2 and then be required to pay again in order to benefit from having passed the Gate.	

	Element 16: Introducing the proposed Connections Network Design Methodology (CNDM) (See pages 24-25, 41-42)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	We support this Element but note the importance of ensuring this is developed and consulted upon ASAP to allow industry to provide fully informed feedback on the overall connection process.	
	Element 19: Contractual changes (See pages 26-28, 43-46)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
	Element 20: Cut Over arrangements (See page 28, 47)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
6	Are there any elements of the proposed CMP435 solution - as per Q5 - which you believe are not appropriate to include when you consider how to most effectively implement TMO4+ to projects in the existing contracted background (as opposed to the process for new applicants via CMP434)? If yes, please provide supporting justification.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
7	In relation to Q6, are there any features which you believe are missing in the proposed CMP435 solution that would more effectively facilitate implementation of TMO4+ to the existing contracted background. If yes, please provide details and justification.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
8	Do you believe any groups of projects should be exempt from the scope of CMP435 or from some elements of the proposed solution? If so, please advise on which groups and elements and provide rationale to why.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
9	Do you believe that the proposed solution could duly or unduly discriminate against any particular 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.	