

**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](mailto: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](mailto:cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com)

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
<b>Respondent name:</b>	Andy Ho	
<b>Company name:</b>	Field	
<b>Email address:</b>	Andy.ho@field.energy	
<b>Phone number:</b>	07743440839	
<b>Which best describes your organisation?</b>	<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: Original <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D Click or tap here to enter text.
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach? (See page- 57-58)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Partially. Field agree that the elements in CMP434 should be applied to existing/historic projects. However, fundamentally agree Gate 2 criteria should be more onerous. See element 11.
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 <a href="#">Workgroup Consultation Section</a> ) <input 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 <a href="#">CMP434</a>, 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 <a href="#">CMP434</a> Proposal. Element 10 is proposed to be codified within the STC through modification <a href="#">CM095</a>.</p> <p>Please provide rationale for your answer and any suggestions for improvement to each element?</p>

<b>Element 1:</b> Proposed Authority approved methodologies and ESO guidance (see Page 8-10,29)		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		
<b>Element 3:</b> Clarifying which projects go through the Primary Process (See pages 10-11,29-31)		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		
<b>Element 5:</b> Clarifying any Primary Process differences for customer groups (See pages 11-12,32)		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		
<b>Element 8:</b> Longstop Date for Gate 1 Agreements (See pages 12-13, 32-33)		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		
<b>Element 9:</b> Project Designation (See pages 14-15, 33-34)		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Click or tap here to enter text.		
<b>Element 11:</b> 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>Field believe that there should be a more stringent requirement to reach Gate 2. We believe that having Land rights is insufficient a hurdle to help NGESO and TOs to rationalise the queue as its not a particularly arduous endeavour to secure this (it could simply be one conversation between two parties).</p> <p>Instead, Field suggest one of 2 additions to Gate 2 criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 -Planning Consent application submitted (proof of submission)</li> <li>2 - A minimum financial outlay on planning related activities to date</li> </ol> <p>Alternatively, we considered suggesting a 'Ready to Submit Planning Consents Application' or an equivalent criteria be included in gate 2 criteria. However, realise that this will be fairly difficult in terms of resourcing (checking all planning docs of all projects).</p> <p>In any case, including a planning application driven criteria is much more likely to help rationalise the existing queue as this is a much time and resource bound activity and only those customers/developers who are serious about their projects will seriously consider the resourcing, timescales and impact on programme of these assessments.</p>		

	<b>Element 13:</b> Gate 2 Criteria Evidence Assessment (See pages 22-23, 39-40)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
	<b>Element 14:</b> Gate 2 Offer and Project Site Location Change (See pages 23-24, 40-41)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
	<b>Element 16:</b> Introducing the proposed Connections Network Design Methodology (CNDM) (See pages 24-25, 41-42)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
	<b>Element 19:</b> Contractual changes (See pages 26-28, 43-46)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	
6	<b>Element 20:</b> 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 <a href="#">CMP434</a> )? If yes, please provide supporting justification.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 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 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 type="checkbox"/> No
	Click or tap here to enter text.	