

Public

Code Administrator Meeting

Summary

Workgroup Meeting 3: Improving Transmission Connection Asset Charging

Date: 17 December 2025

Contact Details

Chair: Catia Gomes, catia.gomes@neso.energy

Proposer: Joe Colebrook, Joe@innova.co.uk

Key areas of discussion

The aim of Workgroup 3 was to agree the amended Terms of Reference and for the Proposer to present worked examples of the different options being considered.

Action Log Review

The Chair led the Workgroup through the status of outstanding action items, with input from Workgroup members and action owners, resulting in the closure of several actions, clarification of responsibilities, and the assignment of new actions for the next meeting.

Action 1 (Action closed) – An email has been provided to the Proposer and the Chair to clarify with NGET how Grid Park assets are classified (Connection vs Infrastructure Assets).

Action 6 (Action closed) – The data collection requirements for Impact Assessment were included in the Workgroup Meeting 3 papers.

Action 8 (Action to remain open) – The Workgroup agreed amendments to Terms of Reference b) and f). The Chair confirmed the amended Terms of Reference will be presented to the January CUSC Panel.

Action 9 (Action closed) – The consideration of retrospectivity issues was included in the Workgroup Meeting 3 papers.

Action 10 (Action to remain open) – Still ongoing

Action 11 (Action to remain open) – DCP 461 consultation closed. BH to provide an update to the Workgroup in January on the options being taken forward by DCP 461 was added to the action.

Action 12 (Action closed) – The updated worked examples were presented during Workgroup 3 with the final pack being circulated post Workgroup meeting 3.

Action 13 (Action closed) – Ofgem's open letter was circulated to the Workgroup with the Workgroup Meeting 3 papers ahead of the Workgroup 3 meeting.

Action 14 (Action to remain open) – Ongoing

Public

Action 15 (Closed) – The updated worked examples were presented during Workgroup 3 with the final pack being circulated post Workgroup meeting 3.

Action 16 (Action to remain open) – Ongoing

Action 17 (Action to remain open) – The agenda item on retrospectivity was deferred to the next Workgroup meeting.

Action 18 (New) – Circulate the response to Action 1 to all Workgroup members.

Action 19 (New) – Review [CMP417](#) for the introduction of a tech equivalent for final demand and report findings to the Workgroup

Action 20 (New) – Update the worked example slides with additional labels, glossary entries, numbering, and a content page, and circulate the revised slides to the group.

Terms of Reference (ToR)

The Workgroup agreed amendments to Terms of Reference b) and f). The Chair confirmed the amended Terms of Reference will be presented to the January CUSC Panel.

Workbooks

The Proposer presented detailed worked examples comparing the baseline and three proposed options for asset classification and cost allocation. The Proposer explained the structure of the worked examples, including the addition of ownership boundaries, a glossary, and colour-coded diagrams, and clarified that the baseline assumes air insulated switchgear, with variations for gas insulated switchgear noted. Several Workgroup members suggested further enhancements such as labelling diagrams, numbering examples, and expanding the glossary. The Proposer agreed with the suggestions. The Workgroup noted the importance of clarity for non-engineers and future Consultation readers.

Technical Discussion on Asset Classification

The Workgroup discussed the classification of assets in various scenarios, including grid parks, tertiary connections, and final demand users, providing technical insights and raising questions about cost apportionment, user definitions, and the treatment of shared assets.

- **Option 1: Shareable Assets as Infrastructure:** The Proposer outlined Option 1, where shareable assets are classified as infrastructure, and the group discussed the implications for Distribution Network Operators (DNOs), grid parks, and final demand Users, including the need for clear definitions of 'shareable' and the potential requirement for changes to Section 11 of the code.
- **Option 2: All Works as Connection Assets:** Option 2 was presented as a model where all works triggered by customers are treated as connection assets, with the Workgroup identifying challenges in cost apportionment, the treatment of shared assets, and the complexity of retrospective application, leading to questions about practicality and fairness.

Public

- **Option 3: Proportional Cost Sharing:** The Proposer described Option 3, which involves charging users proportionally based on their use of assets, prompting discussion about the calculation methodology, handling of multiple users, second comer rules, and the impact of User withdrawals or capacity changes.

Clarification of User Definitions and Legal Implications

The Workgroup clarified the definition of 'User' for the purposes of the examples and discussed the need for early engagement with Legal teams to ensure that proposed changes are appropriately reflected in the CUSC without unintended consequences.

Data Request Strategy and Impact Assessment

The Proposer and Workgroup members discussed the approach for requesting data from NESO, Transmission Operators, and Distribution Network Operators to quantify the financial impact of the proposed options, focusing on the practicality, timing, and aggregation of data. The Proposer explained the intent to gather aggregated data on asset costs and numbers to support impact assessment for the modification, seeking group input on the feasibility and appropriateness of the proposed data points. NESO confirmed they would begin compiling available data, noting that some information may only be available at a high level and that the process would require coordination across teams, with an update expected at the next meeting. Several Workgroup members highlighted the importance of aligning the data request with the timing of connection offer re-issuance and related code modifications, balancing the need for timely information with the risk of using outdated or incomplete data. Several Workgroup members recommended focusing on high-level, aggregated cost data rather than asset-level details, and suggested leveraging NESO's existing data collection mechanisms to streamline the process and avoid unnecessary complexity.

Next Steps

The agenda item on retrospectivity was deferred to the next meeting. The Proposer agreed to present a preferred solution at the next meeting.

Actions

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

Action Number Raised	Workgroup	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
1	WG1	MPS	Clarify with NGET how Grid Park assets are classified (Connection vs Infrastructure Assets).	WG3	Closed

Public

6	WG1	JC	Formalise the data collection requirements for Impact Assessment.	WG3	Closed
8	WG1	JR	Amend Terms of Reference b) and f) and take back to CUSC Panel.	WG2	Open
9	WG1	JC	Consider retrospectivity issue.	WG3	Closed
10	WG2	JC	Review DCP 464 for relevance and report back to the next Workgroup.	WG3	Open
11	WG2	BH	Provide an update on DCP 461 and report back to the next Workgroup. Provide an update to the Workgroup in January on the options being taken forward by DCP 461	WG3	Open
12	WG2	JC	Update the worked example slides, including colour adjustments and clarifications, and circulate them for review.	WG3	Closed
13	WG2	JR	Email OFGEM's open letter to all Workgroup members	WG3	Closed
14	WG2	JC/AH	Review potential changes to Legal Text with legal team (possibly Section 3 or 11)	WG3	Open
15	WG2	JC	Prepare a workbook for options 1, 2, and 3 against the baseline for the next meeting.	WG3	Closed
16	WG2	JC	Review DCP392	WG3	Open
17	WG2	All	Comment on the retrospectivity slide before the next meeting.	WG3	Open
18	WG3	JR	Circulate the response to Action 1 to all Workgroup members.	WG4	Open

Public

19	WG3	JC	Review CMP417 for the introduction of a TEC equivalent for final demand and report findings to the Workgroup	WG4	Open
20	WG3	JC	Update the worked example slides with additional labels, glossary entries, numbering, and a content page, and circulate the revised slides to the group.	WG4	Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Catia Gomes	CG	NESO	Chair
Andrew Hemus	AH	NESO	Technical Secretary
Joe Colebrook	JC	Innova Capital Ltd	Proposer
Aishwarya Harsure	AH	NESO	NESO Representative
Brian Hoy	BH	SP Electricity North West	Workgroup Member
Christopher Patrick	CP	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Damian Clough	DC	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member
Dimitrios Terzis	DT	SSEN Transmission	Workgroup Member
Drew Johnstone	DJ	Northern Power Grid	Workgroup Member
Edda Dirks	ED	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member Alternate
Grahame Neale	GN	LightsourceBP	Workgroup Member
Greg Stevenson	GS	Green Cat Renewables	Observer
Hector Perez	HP	ScottishPower Renewables	Workgroup Member Alternate
Helen Stack	HS	Centrica	Workgroup member
Jack Purchase	JP	NGED	Workgroup Member

Public

Jonathan Oguntona	JO	BayWa r.e. UK Limited	Observer
Karl Wilkins	KW	National Grid	Observer
Kyran Hanks	KH	Waters Wye Associates	Observer
Leon Stafford	LS	UKPN	Observer
Lina Apostoli	LA	ESB	Workgroup Member
Mark O'Connor	LA	EDF Power Solutions	Workgroup Member
Meghan Hughes	MH	SSEN Transmission	Workgroup Member
Natalija Zaiceva	NZ	UKPN	Observer
Ollie Easterbrook	OE	NGED	Workgroup Member Alternate
Patrick O'Mahony	PO	Osted	Observer
Paul Mott	PM	NESO	Workgroup Member Alternate
Philip Bale	PB	Roadnight Taylor	Observer
Rob Smith	RS	Enso Green Holdings Limited	Workgroup Member
Will Bowen	WB	UKPN	Observer