

## Workgroup Terms of Reference and Membership

### CMP448: Introducing a Progression Commitment Fee to the Gate 2 Connections Queue

#### Responsibilities

1. The Workgroup is responsible for assisting the CUSC Modification Panel in the evaluation of CUSC Modification Proposal **CMP448 Introducing a Progression Commitment Fee to the Gate 2 Connections Queue** raised by **NESO** at the Modifications Panel meeting on **14 February 2025**. The proposal must be evaluated to consider whether it better facilitates achievement of the Applicable CUSC Objectives.

#### Applicable CUSC (Connection charging) Objectives

Means the Use of System Charging Objectives, as if references therein to the Use of System Charging Methodology were to the Connection Charging Methodology and in addition, the objective (where consistent with the other objectives) of facilitating competition in the carrying out of works for connection to the National Electricity Transmission System.

#### Applicable CUSC (non-charging) Objectives

- i) The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and by this licence\*;
- ii) 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;
- iii) Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency \*\*; and
- iv) Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements.

\* See Electricity System Operator Licence

\*\*The Electricity Regulation referred to in objective (iii) is Regulation (EU) 2019/943 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 June 2019 on the internal

## Public

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.

2. It should be noted that additional provisions apply where it is proposed to modify the CUSC Modification provisions, and generally reference should be made to the Electricity System Operator Licence for the full definition of the term.

## Scope of work

3. The Workgroup must consider the issues raised by the Modification Proposal and consider if the proposal identified better facilitates achievement of the Applicable CUSC Objectives.
4. In addition, the Workgroup shall consider and report on the following specific issues:

Workgroup Term of Reference	Location in Workgroup Report (to be completed at Workgroup Report stage)
a) Consider EBR implications	Page 16
b) Consider the scope of work identified and whether this is achievable within the timeframe outlined in the Ofgem Urgency decision letter.	Page 16
c) Consider the metric that will best reflect queue health.	Pages 20–26
d) Consider the trigger threshold that will best reflect queue health.	Pages 27–30 and 47–49
e) Consider the expected impact on connection timelines.	Pages 30–33 and 59
f) Consider whether the period that the Progression Commitment Fee applies to, Gate 2 entry to Milestone 1, is appropriate.	Pages 17–20

## Public

g) Consider whether not applying the fee to all users will be duly or unduly discriminatory.	Pages 23–26
h) Consider the impacts to distribution connected, embedded and directly connected projects of the implementation of a PCF	Pages 9; 24–27; 45–52; and 72
i) Consider whether the PCF would or would not incentivise efficient behaviours within the GB Connections Process	Throughout the report
j) Consider the form, value and operation of the PCF to ensure that the PCF best responds to the defect identified	Throughout the report
k) Consider whether the PCF should or should not take into account technology types and/or or regions in relation to queue health (in the context of ToR (c) and (d)); and which part of the whole GB Connections queue the PCF should or should not apply to	Pages 24–27; 45–52; and 72

5. The Workgroup is responsible for the formulation and evaluation of any Workgroup Alternative CUSC Modifications (WACMs) arising from Group discussions which would, as compared with the Modification Proposal or the current version of the CUSC, better facilitate achieving the Applicable CUSC Objectives in relation to the issue or defect identified.
6. The Workgroup should become conversant with the definition of Workgroup Alternative CUSC Modification which appears in Section 11 (Interpretation and Definitions) of the CUSC. The definition entitles the Group and/or an individual member of the Workgroup to put forward a WACM if the

## Public

member(s) genuinely believes the WACM would better facilitate the achievement of the Applicable CUSC Objectives as compared with the Modification Proposal. The extent of the support for the Modification Proposal or any WACM arising from the Workgroup's discussions should be clearly described in the final Workgroup Report to the CUSC Modifications Panel.

7. Workgroup members should be mindful of efficiency and propose the fewest number of WACMs possible.
8. All proposed WACMs should include the Proposer(s)'s details within the final Workgroup report, for the avoidance of doubt this includes WACMs which are proposed by the entire Workgroup or subset of members.
9. There is an obligation on the Workgroup to undertake a period of Consultation in accordance with CUSC 8.20. The Workgroup Consultation period shall be for a period of 15 working days as determined by the Modifications Panel.
10. Following the Consultation period, the Workgroup is required to consider all responses including any WG Consultation Alternative Requests. In undertaking an assessment of any WG Consultation Alternative Request, the Workgroup should consider whether it better facilitates the Applicable CUSC Objectives than the current version of the CUSC.

As appropriate, the Workgroup will be required to undertake any further analysis and update the original Modification Proposal and/or WACMs. All responses including any WG Consultation Alternative Requests shall be included within the final report including a summary of the Workgroup's deliberations and conclusions. The report should make it clear where and why the Workgroup chairperson has exercised their right under the CUSC to progress a WG Consultation Alternative Request or a WACM against the majority views of Workgroup members. It should also be explicitly stated where, under these circumstances, the Workgroup chairperson is employed

## Public

by the same organisation who submitted the WG Consultation Alternative Request.

11. The Workgroup is to submit its final Workgroup Report to the Modifications Panel Secretary on **03 June 2025** for circulation to Panel Members. The final Workgroup Report conclusions will be presented to the CUSC Modifications Panel meeting on **09 June 2025**.

## Membership

12. It is recommended that the Workgroup has the following members:

Role	Name	Representing
Chair	Joe Henry	NESO Code Administrator
Technical Secretary	Ren Walker	NESO Code Administrator
Proposer	Ash Adams*	NESO
Workgroup Member	Alex Ikonic*	Ørsted
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	James Jackson*	Ørsted
Workgroup Member	Amy-Isabella Wells*	NGET
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Richard Woodward*	NGET
Workgroup Member	Andrew Allan*	RWE Supply & Trading GmbH
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Claire Hynes*	RWE Supply & Trading GmbH
Workgroup Member	Andrew Enzor*	Field Devco Ltd

## Public

Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Damian Jackman*	Field Devco Ltd
Workgroup Member	Andrew Yates*	Stakcraft
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Kirsty Dawson*	Stakcraft
Workgroup Member	Barney Cowin*	BlueFloat Energy   Nadara Partnership
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Catherine Spiers*	BlueFloat Energy   Nadara Partnership
Workgroup Member	Brian Hoy*	Electricity North West
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Hannah Sharratt*	Electricity North West
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Steffan Jones*	Electricity North West
Workgroup Member	Catherine Cleary*	Roadnight Taylor
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Kyle Murchie*	Roadnight Taylor
Workgroup Member	Ciaran Fitzgerald*	ScottishPower Renewables
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Rosemary McInnes*	ScottishPower Renewables
Workgroup Member	Darshak Shah*	BP
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Umer Ameen*	BP
Workgroup Member	Dennis Gowland*	Research Relay Ltd
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Chris White*	Research Relay Ltd

## Public

Workgroup Member	Donald Fu*	Nat Power UK
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Daniel Sanderson*	Nat Power UK
Workgroup Member	Garth Graham*	SSE Generation
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Andrew Colley*	SSE Generation
Workgroup Member	Grahame Neale*	Lightsource bp
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Mireia Barenys*	Lightsource bp
Workgroup Member	Grant Rogers*	Qualitas Energy UK
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Isabel Holmes*	Qualitas Energy UK
Workgroup Member	Helen Stack*	Centrica
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Sam Railton*	Centrica
Workgroup Member	Jack Purchase*	National Grid
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Cuan Rowlands*	National Grid
Workgroup Member	James Stoney*	One Planet Developments Ltd
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Michael Campbell*	One Planet Developments Ltd
Workgroup Member	James Wylie*	EDF Renewables
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Kimbrah Hiorns*	EDF Renewables

## Public

Workgroup Member	Jamie McDougall*	SP Distribution/MANWEB SP Energy Networks
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Claire Witty*	SP Distribution/MANWEB SP Energy Networks
Workgroup Member	Jingchao Deng*	EDP Renewables
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	George Saliagopoulos*	EDP Renewables
Workgroup Member	Joe Colebrook*	Innova
Workgroup Member	Jonathan Boateng*	Greenfield Energy Developments Ltd
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Edward Shuttleworth*	Greenfield Energy Developments Ltd
Workgroup Member	Jonathan Whitaker*	SSEN Transmission
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Neil Bennett*	SSEN Transmission
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Emily Fare*	SSEN Transmission
Workgroup Member	Jonathan Wood*	CIP
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Alex Murley*	CIP
Workgroup Member	Khush Patel*	National Grid Ventures
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Andy Dekany*	National Grid Ventures
Workgroup Member	Mpumelelo Hlophe*	Fred Olsen Renewables
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Helen Snodin*	Fred Olsen Renewables



## Public

Workgroup Member	Nina Sharman*	Drax
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Paul Youngman*	Drax
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Nina Sanghera*	Drax
Workgroup Member	Paul Smillie*	SP Transmission –SP Energy Networks
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Gareth Williams*	SP Transmission –SP Energy Networks
Workgroup Member	Rob Smith*	ENSO Energy
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Duncan Pomeroy *	ENSO Energy
Workgroup Member	Robin Prince*	Island Green Power
Workgroup Member (Alternate)	Sam Aitchison*	Island Green Power
Authority Representative	Daniel Ffrench-Mullen	Ofgem

NB: A Workgroup must comprise at least 5 members (who may be Panel Members). The roles identified with an asterisk (\*) in the table above contribute toward the required quorum, determined in accordance with paragraph 14 below.

- The Chairperson of the Workgroup and the Modifications Panel Chairperson must agree a number that will be quorum for each Workgroup meeting. The agreed figure for this modification is that at least 5 Workgroup members must participate in a meeting for quorum to be met.

## Public

14. A vote is to take place by all eligible Workgroup members on the Modification Proposal and each WACM. The vote shall be decided by simple majority of those present at the meeting at which the vote takes place (whether in person or by teleconference). The Workgroup chairperson shall not have a vote, casting or otherwise. There may be up to three rounds of voting, as follows:

**Vote 1:** whether each proposal better facilitates the Applicable CUSC Objectives;

**Vote 2:** where one or more WACMs exist, whether each WACM better facilitates the Applicable CUSC Objectives than the original Modification Proposal;

**Vote 3:** which option is considered to BEST facilitate achievement of the Applicable CUSC Objectives. For the avoidance of doubt, this vote should include the existing CUSC baseline as an option.

The results from the vote and the reasons for such voting shall be recorded in the Workgroup report in as much detail as practicable.

15. It is expected that Workgroup members would only abstain from voting under limited circumstances, for example where a member feels that a proposal has been insufficiently developed. Where a member has such concerns, they should raise these with the Workgroup chairperson at the earliest possible opportunity and certainly before the Workgroup vote takes place. Where abstention occurs, the reason should be recorded in the Workgroup report.
16. Workgroup members or their appointed alternate are required to attend a minimum of 50% of the Workgroup meetings to be eligible to participate in the Workgroup vote.

## Public

17. The Technical Secretary shall keep an Attendance Record for the Workgroup meetings and circulate the Attendance Record with the Action Notes after each meeting. This will be attached to the final Workgroup report.
18. The Workgroup membership can be amended from time to time by the CUSC Modifications Panel.

### Terms of Reference Version Control

Issue	Date	Summary of Changes / Reasons	Panel Approval Date
1	14/02/2025	Panel approved Terms of Reference ahead of nominations	14/02/2025
2	07/03/2025	Panel approved amendments and additional Terms of Reference following the CMP448 Workgroup meetings.	07/03/2025