

Public

# Code Administrator Meeting

## Summary

Workgroup Meeting 5: Improving Transmission Connection Asset Charging

---

**Date: 15 January 2026**

---

### Contact Details

Chair: Jess Rivalland, [jessica.rivalland@neso.energy](mailto:jessica.rivalland@neso.energy)

Proposer: Joe Colebrook, [Joe@innova.co.uk](mailto:Joe@innova.co.uk)

---

### Key areas of discussion

The Chair confirmed that the purpose of Workgroup 5 was to review the timeline and Actions Log, discuss the alternative options, and review the draft Workgroup Consultation document.

### Timeline

The Chair noted that only two Workgroups remain before the Workgroup Consultation document is shared for comments and contributions.

### Actions Log

The following Actions were discussed:

#### Action 8

The Chair confirmed that the amended Terms of Reference are being discussed at the January 2026 CUSC Panel. The action will remain open.

#### Action 14

The Chair confirmed that the review of potential Legal Text changes is ongoing. The action will remain open.

#### Action 19

The Proposer confirmed that they had completed their review of CMP417 and provided feedback to the Workgroup. The action was closed.

## Public

### Action 21

The Workgroup member assigned this Action confirmed they were unable to complete it for this Workgroup. The Chair asked them to follow-up with the Proposer before the next Workgroup meeting. The action will remain open.

### Action 22

The Authority representative confirmed that work is ongoing, with deeper connection charges being explored, but no final decisions have been made. They will update the Workgroup as and when progress is made. The action was closed.

### Action 23

The Chair confirmed that the Proposer will provide data for the Workgroup meeting. The action will remain open.

### Action 24

The Proposer confirmed that they had shared updated worked examples with the Workgroup. The action was closed.

## **Alternative Options**

The Workgroup discussed the three options previously presented by the Proposer, with the Chair confirming that the Proposer's preferred option is Option 1. A Workgroup member raised the idea that the existing CUSC baseline may already permit DNOs to make proportional capital contributions, meaning part of the problem the modification seeks to address might already be solvable without a change. They suggested this could be viewed as a baseline-equivalent version of one of the previously discussed options. The Proposer acknowledged that this interpretation might be theoretically possible but noted that the Workgroup would need to understand why such an approach is not currently being used, suggesting that there may be practical or procedural barriers that prevent it from functioning.

The same Workgroup member then clarified that, in their view, proportional contribution arrangements belong within DNO charging methodologies rather than within CUSC, and so the baseline mechanism they described should not be treated as a CUSC solution and the idea should not be taken forward as a formal Alternative. The Proposer noted that it would be useful to record this discussion in the Workgroup Consultation, so

## Public

stakeholders can understand how the Workgroup considered the issue and why it was not progressed.

Another Workgroup member briefly sought clarification to ensure they understood both the Proposer's preferred option and the baseline-related suggestion. The Proposer confirmed that the baseline interpretation was not being proposed as an Alternative and would not be advanced as such unless a Workgroup member chose to raise it formally, which they did not. The Chair agreed that the discussion should be captured for transparency, but that it should not appear as an option being put forward.

## Workgroup Consultation

The Chair took the Workgroup through the draft Workgroup Consultation document, with the following substantive discussions:

### Options

The Chair invited views on the current structure of the draft Workgroup Consultation, explaining the flow of sections and how the preferred option (Option 1) and the options not progressed (Options 2 and 3) had been presented so far. The Proposer noted that some parts of the proposed solution description might need refining based on recent discussions and confirmed that revisions would be made as necessary. A Workgroup member noted that presenting too much information on options that were not being progressed could make the document harder for stakeholders to follow. The Proposer agreed that only the preferred solution (Option 1) should be fully described, with the other options briefly summarised and clearly marked as not being taken forward.

### Transparency and Rationale

A Workgroup member emphasised the importance of transparency, noting that stakeholders, including consumer groups, would need clarity on why each option was chosen or not progressed. Several Workgroup members agreed that discussions on each option should be captured so respondents understand what had been considered.

### Cost reflectivity

Multiple Workgroup members felt that the existing wording of the 'cost reflectivity' question was too broad and risked eliciting responses unrelated to the modification. Some argued that cost reflectivity is already addressed through the CUSC objectives

## Public

and therefore may not require a standalone question. Others noted that although the Proposer's impact assessment would touch on cost drivers, the Workgroup Consultation should ensure that respondents have the opportunity to comment clearly on how the proposal aligns with efficiency and fairness. The Workgroup agreed that the cost reflectivity question should be tightened and made more specific.

### CUSC Objectives

A Workgroup member suggested that the Workgroup Consultation should ask respondents for views on whether the preferred option better meets the relevant CUSC objectives. They felt this would allow the Workgroup to identify issues early if consultees raised concerns about alignment with the objectives. The Proposer agreed and noted that this could be reflected in the Workgroup Consultation.

### Retrospectivity

The Workgroup discussed the distinction between retrospectivity and applicability. Several Workgroup members suggested that the term 'Retrospectivity' could be misleading, as the intent was not to apply the proposal to existing connected Users but to define how it should apply to contracted, but not yet connected, projects. Some preferred using 'Applicability' or a similar term. The Proposer agreed to develop text that clearly explains how the proposal would treat each group of Users—those already connected, those contracted but not yet connected, and future applicants.

### Edge cases and single-User scenarios

Several Workgroup members discussed scenarios where a single User initially triggers an asset that could, in principle, be shared in future. They raised concerns about ensuring that the Proposal does not inadvertently allow Users to avoid charges in cases where an asset is not realistically shareable. The Proposer acknowledged these issues and agreed that the Workgroup Consultation should capture stakeholder views on these scenarios, with further detail to be developed while drafting the Legal Text.

### Worked examples and supporting material

The Chair noted the Workgroup Consultation sections containing worked examples and diagrams and encouraged Workgroup members to add comments directly into the Workgroup Consultation document saved in the collaboration space. Several Workgroup members agreed that additional examples and side-by-side illustrations

## Public

would help stakeholders understand the proposals and indicated that they would assist in their development.

## Next Steps

The Chair confirmed that they would update and share the Workgroup Consultation document, with any comments and changes provided by Workgroup members discussed during Workgroup meeting 6 on 22 January 2026. The Chair also encouraged Workgroup members who were considering raising Alternatives to do so as early as possible.

## Actions

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

Action	Workgroup	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
Number Raised					
8	WG1	JR	Amend Terms of Reference b) and f) and take back to CUSC Panel.	WG6	Open
14	WG2	JC / AH	Review potential changes to Legal Text with legal team (possibly Section 3 or 11).	WG6	Open
19	WG3	JC	Review CMP417 for the introduction of a TEC equivalent for final demand and report findings to the Workgroup.	WG4	Closed
21	WG4	NZ	Review DNO offers and provide high level consumer impact analysis.	WG6	Open
22	WG4	LS	Check the status of transmission charging reform work.	WG5	Closed
23	WG4	JC	Provide data for an impact assessment of Option 1 and seek feedback on assumptions.	WG6	Open
24	WG4	JC	Update worked examples	WG5	Closed
25	WG5	KH	Share example slides showing baseline vs Option 1 diagrams side-by-side.	WG6	Open

## Public

26	WG5	PM / AH	Work with Revenue and provide analysis of the expected increase in TDR if Option 1 moves connection costs into TNUoS.	WG6	Open
27	WG5	JC / AH	Produce first draft of Legal Text, to be reviewed by NESO Commercial Codes and Legal.	WG6	Open
28	WG5	JR	Add several new headings to the Workgroup Consultation and share with Workgroup members.	WG6	Open
29	WG5	All	Provide comments and content in Workgroup Consultation.	WG6	Open

## Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Jess Rivalland	JR	NESO	Chair
Matthew Larreta	ML	NESO	Technical Secretary
Joe Colebrook	JC	Innova Capital Ltd	Proposer
Alex Curtis	AC	NESO	Observer
Alex Pentecost	AP	Eclipse Power Solutions	Workgroup Member Alternate
Brian Hoy	BH	SP Electricity North West	Workgroup Member
Chris Patrick	CP	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Claire Hynes	CH	RWE	Workgroup Member
Damian Clough	DC	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member
Dimitrios Terzis	DT	SSEN Transmission	Workgroup Member Alternate
Drew Johnstone	DJ	Northern Power Grid	Workgroup Member
Ed Birkett	EB	Low Carbon	Workgroup Member
Edda Dirks	ED	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member Alternate

## Public

Grahame Neale	GN	LightsourceBP	Workgroup Member
Greg Stevenson	GS	SSEN Transmission	Observer
Helen Stack	HS	Centrica	Workgroup Member
Jack Purchase	JP	NGED	Workgroup Member
Jonathan Oguntona	JO	BayWa r.e. UK Limited	Observer
Kyran Hanks	KH	Waters Wye Associates	Observer
Leon Stafford	LS	UKPN	Workgroup Member Alternate
Lina Apostoli	LA	ESB	Workgroup Member
Mark O'Connor	MO	EDF Power Solutions	Workgroup Member
Matthew Paige-Stimson	MPS	NGET	Workgroup Member
Meghan Hughes	MH	SSEN Transmission	Workgroup Member
Natalija Zaiceva	NZ	UKPN	Workgroup Member
Paul Mott	PM	NESO	NESO Representative
Philip Bale	PB	Roadnight Taylor	Workgroup Member Alternate
Rob Smith	RS	Enso Green Holdings Limited (EGHL)	Workgroup Member
Will Bowen	WB	UKPN	Workgroup Member Alternate