

Public

Code Administrator Meeting

Summary

Workgroup Meeting 15: CMP417 Extending principles of CUSC Section 15 to all Users

Date: 10 March 2026

Contact Details

Chair: Robert Hughes, Robert.Hughes@neso.energy

Proposer: Martin Cahill, Martin.Cahill@neso.energy

Key areas of discussion

The Chair outlined the agenda of the meeting which included an update of the Actions and a page turn of the Workgroup Report.

Click [here](#) to view the slidepack.

Actions

The Proposer provided an update on Actions 15 and 21 in the slidepack. However, the Chair agreed to close off all Actions in Workgroup 16 before carrying out the Workgroup Vote.

Workgroup Report

The Chair took the Workgroup through the Workgroup Report page by page and requested feedback.

A Workgroup member queried how abortive work charges would be explained to customers where a lower element of a hybrid site is cancelled. They also queried why such charges sit outside the user commitment and security framework, noting the difficulty of providing certainty on whether a charge would apply or its likely size.

A Workgroup member responded that securities apply only on BCA termination, not where a User changes scope while the BCA continues.

The Proposer agreed, confirming that existing processes allow abortive works to be removed from the security statement and charged via a reduction fee. However, they were uncertain whether advance notice to Users was needed but would check with the Connections Team and feedback **(Action 22)**.

Public

Proposer’s Update

Proposer’s timeline and G2TWQ Interaction (Action 15)

The Proposer took the Workgroup through the updated slides following feedback to include DNOs to the process. The timeline provides clarity on dependencies, coordination and practical delivery.

Contract Changes – Proposal

The Workgroup discussed the applicability of proposed security and contractual updates where projects are operating under transitional offers. It was noted that transitional offers may not include defined construction works which could limit the ability to calculate securities under the proposed approach. The Proposer acknowledged this and confirmed that the issue would be considered further and that such projects may need to progress to a subsequent offer stage before the proposed changes could be applied.

The Workgroup also discussed whether transitional arrangements may be required within the STC to align with the proposed approach under CMP417. A query was raised as to whether an equivalent mechanism would be needed to manage risks where TOCOs may not be updated in time. The Proposer took an Action to discuss with the Proposer of CM093 and consider whether similar transitional arrangements may be required in the STC as part of legal text development. **(Action 23)**

TO Implementation

The Proposer updated the Workgroup on considerations that had been taken for TO’s minimum timeframes for implementation. The Workgroup discussed the importance of clearly identifying these minimum lead times within the implementation timeline to ensure feasibility and to inform the decision point required to align with the January security run. It was also noted that this information would continue to be refined through ongoing discussion with TOs and reflected clearly in the final modification report

A Workgroup member queried whether TOs would be required to provide attributable data for demand as current requirements apply only to generation. The Proposer confirmed that the CMP417 legal text aligned with CMP93 and extends the definition of attributable works to include demand connections.

Public

Hybrid Sites Update

The Proposer provided an update with scenarios where a lower capacity technology is cancelled while the overall connection agreement remains in place. It is proposed that where a cancellation of the lower capacity element results in abortive works, costs are recovered through an existing contract or reduction mechanisms rather than through security. Where no works are rendered abortive, no cancellation charge would apply. This approach is intended to balance protection against abortive costs with proportional treatment of User behaviour and that the position would be monitored post implementation.

A Workgroup member highlighted that security arrangements are designed to address termination of a Bilateral Connection Agreement, rather than changes to a User's requirements where the agreement continues. If a User modifies their requirements and this results in abortive works, this should be treated as a contract modification, with costs recovered accordingly, rather than through security.

The Chair noted the point and observation.

SIF (Action 21)

The Proposer confirmed consideration was given following concerns where using the dominant use (Generation or Demand) to calculate SIF could lead to under or over securing works. It was proposed that NESO position is still that no scaling should be applied to SIF as part of CMP417 due to interaction with generation securities, however this issue could be considered in a future mod.

A Workgroup member highlighted the potential future change, observing that demand customers could otherwise be subject to two rounds of changes to securities arrangements if a further modification were brought forward later.

A Workgroup member raised their concerns that current SIF and LARF application can result in 'over-securitisation', potentially requiring customers to provide security in excess of scheme costs. They highlighted this as a financial burden not fully aligned with the original intent of capping customer exposure.

The Proposer acknowledged the concern, confirmed it is reflected in the Workgroup Report and noted that no changes are proposed under CMP417.

Legal Text Update

The Proposer presented the draft legal and requested feedback from the Workgroup.

A Workgroup member highlighted a potential drafting ambiguity in clause 6.30.4.4, which appears to limit the application of cancellation charges for reductions in demand

Public

capacity to Users who signed agreements before CMP417 implementation. The Proposer explained this was intended to avoid retrospectively applying demand capacity concepts to legacy agreements where demand data may not exist. They agreed the wording needs to be clarified to distinguish between *signed* and *commissioned* sites and to ensure the intent is accurately reflected and took this as an Action (**Action 24**).

AOB & Next Steps

The Chair advised that the next Workgroup will be on 31 March when the final comments will be completed within the Workgroup Report and draft Legal Text. Following this, the Workgroup will vote on the Original solution against the Baseline. The Workgroup Report will then be presented to the CUSC Panel on 24 April to vote that CMP417 may proceed to the Code Administrator Consultation.

Actions

To review the full action log (post hiatus) click [here](#)

Action Number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
15	WG11	MC	Develop a detailed implementation plan for reissuing Construction Agreements	Ongoing	Open
20	WG13	Workgroup members	Workgroup to review how modification impacts DNO's contracts.	WG15	Open
21	WG14	MC	Confirm process for Hybrid Site	WG15	Open
22	WG15	MC	Confirm with Connections practical arrangements for abortive works charges in hybrid site scenarios. Such as how and when Users are informed that such charges may arise following a change in scope and how advance visibility of potential charges is provided.	WG16	Open

Public

23	WG15	MC	Discuss with Proposer for CM093 and Consider whether similar transitional arrangements may be required in the STC as part of legal text development.	WG16	Open
24	WG15	MC	Action to look at wording in Section 6 (clause 6.30.4.4) to distinguish between <i>signed</i> and <i>commissioned</i> sites to ensure the intent is accurately reflected	WG16	Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Robert Hughes	RH	NESO	Chair
Tametha Meek	TM	NESO	Technical Secretary
Martin Cahill	MC	NESO	Proposer
Sean Nugent	SN	NESO	Proposer Alternate
Charles Deacon	CD	Eclipse Power	Workgroup Member
Dayna Rodger	DR	NESO	Subject Matter Expert
Folashade Popoola	FP	NESO	Observer
Gareth Williams	GW	SPT	Workgroup Member
Greg Stevenson	GS	Green Cat Renewables	Observer
Harriet Eckweiler	HE	SHET	Workgroup Member
Jonathan Clark	JC	SHET	Workgroup Member Alternate
Kirsty Dawson	KD	Statkraft	Workgroup Member
Matthew Paige-Stimson	MPS	NGET	Workgroup Member

Public

Mustafa Cevik	MC	UK Power Networks	Observer
Natalija Zaiceva	NZ	UKPN	Observer
Ollie Easterbrook	OE	NGED	Workgroup Member
Pete Aston	PA	Statkraft UK	Workgroup Member Alternate
Syed Nadir	SN	UK Power Networks	Observer