

Public

Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma

CMP446: Increasing the lower threshold in England and Wales for Evaluation of Transmission Impact Assessment (TIA)

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** on **13 February 2025**. 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 milly.lewis@nationalenergyso.com or cusc.team@nationalenergyso.com

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
Respondent name:	Paul Munday	
Company name:	Ethical Power	
Email address:	Paul.munday@ethical-power.com	
Phone number:	07729 073916	
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)

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 by this 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.*

* See Electricity System Operator Licence

**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 and/or any potential alternatives better facilitate the Applicable Objectives?	<p>Mark the Objectives which you believe each solution better facilitates:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Original</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>A</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>B</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>C</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/>D</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Alternative Request 1</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>A</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>B</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>C</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>D</td> </tr> </table> <p>We agree with Alternative Request 1 with EXPORT being the capacity considered, otherwise the benefit of this amendment will be reduced.</p>	Original	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	Alternative Request 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D
Original	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D								
Alternative Request 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D								
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>No</p> <p>We believe the urgency to implement this is right and should remain even if implementation of CMP435 and CMP434 were to be delayed.</p>										
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?	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Yes (the request form can be found in the Workgroup Consultation Section)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>No</p>										

Public

		Click or tap here to enter text.
5	Does the draft legal text satisfy the intent of the modification?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.
6	Do you agree with the Workgroup's assessment that the modification does not impact the European Electricity Balancing Regulation (EBR) Article 18 terms and conditions held within the Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.

Specific Workgroup Consultation questions

7	Do you believe that a codification of Scotland threshold is required for CMP446?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.
8	Is it clear that the change in threshold is cumulative not incremental?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.
9	Do you believe 5MW is the correct threshold and if not why and to what threshold level should it be?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Public

	(Providing rationale and justification for any alternative MW threshold)	Click or tap here to enter text.
10	Are there any other generic scenarios (over and above those shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3 (Annex 7) that need to be considered by the Workgroup, please provide details of them and explain why they are relevant?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.
11	It is intended that where there is a fault level headroom that is less than 1kA or zero as stated by NGET at a GSP, then a project is required to go through the TIA irrespective of the change in threshold (from 1MW to 5MW) – do you agree with this and if not, why?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No We do not believe a default position of a TIA requirement in this case is the best option. If there is limited fault level headroom the TO and DNO should complete a review to determine if a TIA will be required or if other mitigation/agreement can be found. A default position could severely limit the benefit of this modification.
12	Do you agree that the Workgroup has identified the relevant risks if CMP446 is approved. If not, what further risks haven't been identified yet, and why are they relevant?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.
13	Do you believe that as consequence of CMP446 there will be an increase in <5MW projects which is likely to have an impact on the Transmission Network? If so, what kind of projects could drive this?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No We expect there will be an increase in projects but doubt there will be an impact on the Transmission Network as they are likely to be well dispersed solar generation projects which

Public

		DNO and TO forecasts should account for and the network be upgraded in line with growth in Solar generation
14	Do you have any suggestions for any additional mitigation measures for the identified risk?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.
15	Do you understand that as a consequence of CMP446 that the curtailment assumptions for an accepted Technical Limits offer could be impacted?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No We expect the impact of technical limits curtailment will be reduced following connections reform implementation, with this mod having minimal affect in comparison.
16	Is the timeline of interactions understood?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.
17	Do you believe it is appropriate/ within scope of CMP446 for the Workgroup to consider this further, and if so why?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.