

Public

# Code Administrator Meeting

## Summary

### Workgroup Meeting 14: CMP448 Introducing a Progression Commitment Fee to the Gate 2 Connections Queue

**Date:** 30/05/2025

#### Contact Details

Chair: Joseph Henry, [joseph.henry2@nationalenergyso.com](mailto:joseph.henry2@nationalenergyso.com)

Proposer: Ash Adams, [ashley.adams2@nationalenergyso.com](mailto:ashley.adams2@nationalenergyso.com)

#### Key areas of discussion

The Chair outlined the meeting agenda, which included a review of WACM2 and legal text review, Workgroup Report changes and the Workgroup vote.

#### WACM2 Review

The Workgroup reviewed WACM2 proposal and discussed and agreed the following points:

- **Capacity Reduction Process:** A Workgroup member raised concerns about the capacity reduction process and its implications for the progression commitment fee (PCF), highlighting potential issues if the developer does not sign the modification application (Mod app) after initiating the process. The NESO legal SME clarified that the legal text requires the formal process to be initiated before the 90-day period and that the discount would not apply if the process is discontinued, ensuring the developer must follow through with the reduction to receive the discount.
- **Legal Text Clarification:** The NESO legal SME explained that the legal text related to the PCF specifies that the discount applies only if the process to reduce capacity is initiated before the 90-day period and remains in train, ensuring developers must commit to the reduction process to benefit from the discount. The Proposer discussed various scenarios where the developer does not sign the modification application (Mod app) and its impact on the discount, highlighting the importance of completing the process to receive the discount.
- **Developer Intent and Discount:** A Workgroup member raised concerns about the wording around the developer's intent to reduce capacity and its impact on the

## Public

discount, questioning whether intent alone would suffice without completing the process. The Proposer clarified that the PCF becomes payable only if the project is terminated before M1, and the discount applies if the Mod app process is initiated before the 90-day period, ensuring developers must start the process early to benefit from the discount.

## Legal Text Review

The NESO Legal SME presented the legal text for WACM2, explaining the scenarios for termination and reduction of capacity, including the conditions under which the progression commitment fee (PCF) would be applicable and how the discount would be calculated. A Workgroup member raised questions about specific scenarios, seeking clarification on the implications of different actions by developers on the PCF and the discount. The Proposer provided detailed clarifications on the formulas and processes involved, ensuring that the legal text addresses different scenarios and applies the PCF and discount correctly based on the developer's actions.

## Workgroup Report Updates

The Workgroup reviewed the updates to the Workgroup report, highlighting changes to terminology and tables to ensure the report accurately reflected the discussions and decisions made during the Workgroup meetings.

## Workgroup Vote

The Chair outlined the voting process for the Workgroup vote, explaining that it consists of two parts: assessment against the objectives and the Workgroup vote. The Workgroup could not reach a consensus on which option was best. There were minority preferences for the Original solution and the Baseline CUSC. 8 Workgroup Members thought the Original solution better facilitated the Applicable Objectives better than the Baseline. 8 workgroup Members believed that the Baseline better facilitated the Applicable Objectives.

## Next Steps

The outlined the next steps for the modification process, which include completing the report, holding a Special CUSC panel meeting on 09 June , and the Code Administrator Consultation.

The Chair expressed appreciation to the Workgroup members for their contributions and support throughout the process, acknowledging their efforts in ensuring a thorough and collaborative discussion on the modification. Workgroup members also took this opportunity to express thanks to the Workgroup Chair.

## Public

### Actions

For the full action log, click [here](#).

### Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Joe Henry	JH	NESO	Chair
Ren Walker	RW	NESO	Tech Sec
Ash Adams	AA	NESO	Proposer
Andrew Allan	AAL	RWE	Workgroup
			Member
Amy - Isabella Wells	AIW	NGET	Workgroup
			Member
Andrew Yates	AY	Statkraft	Workgroup
			Member
Barney Cowin	BC	Bluefloat Energy/Nadara Partnership	Workgroup
			Member
Brian Hoy	BH	ENWL	Workgroup
			Member
Catherine Cleary	CC	Roadnight Taylor	Workgroup
			Member
Claire Hynes	CH	RWE Supply and Trading GmbH	Workgroup
			Member
Rosemary McInness	RMI	ScottishPower Renewables	Workgroup
			Alternate
Dennis Gowland	DG	Research Relay Ltd	Workgroup
			Member
Andy Colley	AC	SSE Generation	Workgroup
			Alternate
Gareth Williams	GW	SP Energy Networks	Workgroup
			Member
Grahame Neale	GN	Lightsource BP	Workgroup
			Member
Grant Rogers	GR	Qualitas Energy	Workgroup
			Member
Jack Purchase	JP	NGED	Workgroup
			Member

## Public

Jamie McDougall	JMD	SP Energy Networks	Workgroup Member
James Jackson	JJ	Orsted	Workgroup Member
Joe Colebrook	JC	Innova	Workgroup Member
Kimbrah Hiorns	KH	EDF Renewables	Workgroup Alternate
Nina Sanghera	NS	Drax	Workgroup Member
Robin Prince	RP	Island Green Power	Workgroup Member
Rob Smith	RS	ENSO Energy	Workgroup Member
Charles Williams	CW	Wind2	Workgroup Observer
Euan Norrington	EN	SSE Renewables	Workgroup Observer
Kyle Smith	KS	Energy Networks	Workgroup Observer
Jamie Hardy	JH	Accenture	SME
	DFM	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Daniel Ffrench Mullen			