

Public

Code Administrator Meeting

Summary

Workgroup Meeting 5: CMP470 – Introducing an Oversubscribed Technologies Commitment Fee (OTCF)

Date: 06 May 2026

Contact Details

Chair: Claire Goult, Claire.goult@neso.energy

Proposer: Andrew Enzor, Andrew.enzor@field.energy

Key areas of discussion

The Workgroup convened to review and discuss the responses to the Workgroup consultation, as well as to consider the Alternative Requests submitted to date.

Work Group Membership and Voting Rights Clarification

The Chair clarified that two Transmission Owners (TOs) have joined the CMP470 Workgroup as members. The Chair explained that, as NESO is a Party to both the CUSC (acting as the counterparty to Schedule 1 Users) and the BSC, it is allowable for NESO to nominate TOs as Workgroup members, provided they possess relevant experience pertaining to a modification. TOs have been invited to join the CMP470 modification Workgroup owing to their relevant expertise in the connections space.

Timeline Extension Discussion

The Workgroup discussed whether to extend the timeline for CMP470. Members considered the ongoing efforts by DESNZ, NESO, and Ofgem, and emphasised the importance of the Workgroup continuing to develop credible solutions alongside these initiatives. The Chair stated that no decision on timeline extension would be made during this meeting, inviting written feedback and confirming that the topic would be revisited in the next session.

Workgroup Consultation Responses Discussion

The Chair delivered a comprehensive summary of the 55 non-confidential consultation responses, outlining the principal themes, points of consensus and divergence, and sought member input to confirm the accuracy and relevance of the summary for inclusion in the Workgroup Report.

The consultation responses revealed a clear divergence of views. Supporters highlighted the benefits of enhanced queue management, increased competition, and more effective network

Public

planning. In contrast, those opposed raised concerns about potential anti-competitive effects, increased financial obligations, and added administrative complexity.

The Proposer and several Workgroup members observed that certain negative consultation responses appeared to stem from misunderstandings regarding the proposed implementation approach. Consequently, the Workgroup reached consensus to incorporate a dedicated section within the Workgroup Report that clearly addresses and clarifies prevalent misinterpretations, ensuring readers are accurately informed about the intended methodology and rationale.

The Workgroup members discussed the need to highlight and annex any quantitative evidence provided in responses, with the Chair agreeing to flag and collate such evidence for easier review. The Workgroup debated the use of terms like 'unviable' versus 'uninvestable,' with consensus to clarify and possibly distinguish these in the Workgroup Report.

Alternative Requests Discussion

Alternative Request 1 (Staged Implementation): The first alternative, raised by Route Power, proposed a staged and proportionate implementation to reduce premature attrition and align with market developments, but received mixed feedback regarding its impact on uncertainty and network investment.

Alternative Request 2 (Proportional Fee Structure): The Alternative Proposer presented an alternative focused on fairness and proportionality, with feedback indicating that while some appreciated its simplicity, others felt the fee level was insufficient and lacked dynamic incentives.

Alternative Request 3 (Exit Auction Mechanism): The proposal for an exit auction mechanism was discussed, with members raising concerns about complexity, funding, and alignment with the modification's objectives, and consensus that it may be better suited as a separate initiative.

The Chair highlighted that the Proposer of this alternative was not a CUSC Party member and therefore a Workgroup member would need to adopt this proposal for it to progress any further.

Alternative Request 4 (Dynamic OTCF Adjustment): This alternative seeks to adjust the OTCF value incrementally based on oversubscription levels, aiming to avoid cliff-edge effects, with Original proposer clarifying differences from their proposal and members discussing the implications for project behavior.

Alternative Request 5 (OTCF Cap and Floor): The alternative Proposer presented an alternative to cap the OTCF at the maximum-security liability for each project, aiming to preserve competition and proportionality, with questions raised about application to hybrid projects and the refresh mechanism.

Public

Discussion on TEC Amnesty

Workgroup members discussed the concept of a TEC amnesty as a complementary measure to the main proposal, debating its effectiveness, timing, and whether it requires a formal modification.

The TEC amnesty was described as allowing developers to exit the queue without penalty, with past experiences showing limited impact on overall queue size due to ongoing high application rates. The Workgroup agreed that a TEC amnesty could complement the main modification by encouraging earlier exits, especially if implemented alongside the OTCF as a 'stick,' but would not replace the need for the main proposal.

Further discussions clarified that a TEC amnesty could potentially be implemented by NESO and Ofgem without a formal CUSC modification, as was done previously, and NESO agreed to investigate this further.

Voting Eligibility and Process

The Chair clarified that only Workgroup members who have attended at least 50% of the meetings will be eligible to participate in the vote. Attendance records will be circulated in advance to allow members to verify their eligibility before the voting process.

The Workgroup will vote on both the Original proposal and all Workgroup Alternative CUSC modifications (WACMs). A best-option preference vote will be conducted to determine the recommendation that will be presented to Ofgem in the Workgroup Report. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday 12 May, with the intention to vote on alternatives if members are ready, and a request for any additional alternatives to be submitted promptly.

EBR Impact and Legal Clarification

The Chair and several Workgroup members discussed whether CMP470 impacts EBR sections of the CUSC, the implications for consultation duration, and the need for a definitive legal view from NESO and code administration.

Evidence and Quantitative Data in Consultation Responses

The Workgroup discussed the importance of identifying and annexing quantitative evidence from consultation responses to support the Workgroup's evaluation and reporting with the Chair agreeing to highlight and annex any consultation responses containing quantitative evidence, such as graphs or tables, to facilitate review by Workgroup members.

Public

The Workgroup agreed on the importance of clearly differentiating between general statements and actionable quantitative data, with the objective of enhancing the usefulness and transparency of the Workgroup Report.

Actions

For the full Actions Log, click [here](#).

Action Number Raised	Workgroup	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
18	WG5	CG	Clarify whether Transmission Owners can vote on alternatives as Workgroup members.	WG6	Closed
19	WG5	AD	Write out and circulate in bullet points the detailed requirements for the analysis to be delivered to the Workgroup, ensuring alignment with members' expectations.	WG6	Open
20	WG5	AD	Add the outline of the analysis requirements to the actions log and ensure it is shared in a forum accessible after the meeting.	WG6	Open
21	WG5	CG	Check and correct the accuracy of the Consultation response numbers and summaries and communicate any errors or updates to the Workgroup.	WG6	Closed
22	WG5	CG	Highlight which Consultation responses provide quantitative or specific evidence and collate these into an annex for the Workgroup Report.	WG6	Closed
23	WG5	CG	Obtain and circulate a definitive response from NESO, code admin, and legal regarding whether the modification impacts EBR, and	WG6	Open

Public

			include an explanation in the Workgroup Report.		
24	WG5	AD	Investigate and clarify whether force majeure provisions apply to cancellation charges (including PCF and CMP192) and report back to the Workgroup.	WG6	Open
25	WG5	CG	Update and circulate the comparison table showing how each alternative request differs from the Original proposal, ensuring all alternatives are correctly numbered and described.	WG6	Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Claire Goult	CG	NESO	Chair
Deborah Spencer	DSp	NESO	Technical Secretary
Andrew Enzor	AE	Field Energy	Proposer
Alasdair McMillan	AM	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Alastair Southworth	AA	Harmony Energy	Workgroup Alternate
Alex Lupu	AL	Root Power	Workgroup Alternate
Alex Mannhardt	AM	Voltwise Power Holdings Limited	Workgroup Alternate
Alex Temple	AT	Regen	Workgroup Observer
Andrew Dudkowsky	AD	NESO	NESO Representative
Andrew Colley	AC	SSE Generation	Workgroup Alternate
Ash Adams	AA	NESO	NESO Representative
Bethany Garry	BG	DESNZ	Government Observer
Charles Saywell	CS	Aputura Energy	Workgroup Member

Public

Chris Terry	CT	Fidra Energy	Workgroup Member
Chris White	CW	Research Relay Ltd	Workgroup Alternate
Ciaran Fitzgerald	CF	ScottishPower Renewables	Workgroup Member
Claire Hynes	CH	RWE	Workgroup Member
Dan Milne	DM	On Path Energy	Workgroup Alternate
Dennis Gowland	DG	Research Relay Ltd	Workgroup Member
Gary Camplejohn	GC	Harmony Energy Ltd	Workgroup Member
George Radcliffe	GR	Econergy	Workgroup Member
Gerrad Mckillen	GM	Eden Renewables	Workgroup Alternate
Grahame Neale	GN	LightsourceBP	Workgroup Member
Grant Rogers	GR	Q Energy	Workgroup Member
Hafiz Milhan	HM	Zenobe	Workgroup Alternate
Helen Stack	HS	Centrica	Workgroup Member
Jack Purchase	JP	NGED	Workgroup Alternate
Kimbrah Hiorns	JK	EDF Power Solutions	Workgroup Alternate
Kim Dawson	KD	SPEN	Workgroup Observer
Kyran Hanks	KH	Waters Wye	Workgroup Member
Lamin Saidy	LS	Qair UK	Workgroup Member
Mark Lawrence	ML	Conrad Energy	Workgroup Observer
Mattew Paige-Stimson	MPS	NGET	Workgroup Member
Mithun Suresh	MS	Masdar	Workgroup Member
Nathan Stevenson	NS	First Ways Energy	Workgroup Alternate
Navdeep Singh Gora	NSG	Northern Powergrid	Workgroup Member
Ollie Frankland	OF	Regent	Workgroup Observer

Public

Paul Smillie	PS	Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Observer
Paul Youngman	PY	Drax	Workgroup Member
Pete Aston	PA	Road Night Taylor	Workgroup Alternate
Philip Patrick	PP	First Ways Energy	Workgroup Member
Ravinder Shan	RS	FRV Powertek Limited	Workgroup Member
Rob Smith	RS	ENSO Green Holdings Limited (EGHL)	Workgroup Member
Ross O Hare	ROH	SSEN	Workgroup Member
Sam Aitchison	SA	Island Green Power	Workgroup Member
Simon Wragg	SW	Ethos Green Energy Solutions Ltd	Workgroup Member
Yuan Gao	YG	BW ESS	Workgroup Observer