

Public

Code Administrator Meeting

Summary

Workgroup Meeting 10: CMP414 - CMP330/CMP374 Consequential Modification

Date: 28 May 2026

Contact Details

Chair: Robert Hughes, robert.hughes3@neso.energy

Proposer: Neil Dewar, neil.dewar@neso.energy

Key areas of discussion

The Chair set out the agenda, with the focus on considering the timeline and reviewing the Workgroup Consultation response.

Timeline

Ofgem confirmed that the modification is now being taken forward through wider Demand Connections Reform using PIA powers, which significantly changes the expected pathway and indicates that this is likely the final Workgroup meeting.

The Workgroup discussed the need to formally confirm this position, noting that if the modification were not absorbed into Ofgem’s programme, a revised timeline would be required to complete outstanding consultation and evidence work.

It was also highlighted that, regardless of the route, the Workgroup should still complete its governance obligations, including producing a Workgroup report to Panel.

Overall, the discussion reflected a transition from ongoing Workgroup activity to closure, with the timeline now dependent on Governance decisions and a likely shift to Panel and Ofgem-led processes rather than further Workgroup meetings.

Workgroup Consultation Responses

The Workgroup discussed the consultation responses in detail, noting that 7 non-confidential and 2 confidential responses were received, with a majority (5 out of 7) indicating support for the proposed approach in principle.

Public

However, there was a mixed response when assessing whether the Workgroup had met Ofgem’s send-back requirements: 1 respondent agreed, 4 disagreed, and 2 provided no response, indicating that many stakeholders did not consider the evidence sufficient.

The responses themselves were noted to be substantive and detailed, with some submissions reaching 15–18 pages, and representing a broad cross-section of stakeholder groups, adding weight to the qualitative feedback despite the relatively small number of responses.

Across both the responses and Workgroup discussion, there was consistent support for key principles such as contestability, customer choice, flexibility, and potential cost reductions, with references to established success at distribution level. However, some respondents and Workgroup members believed that these benefits were not supported by sufficiently robust quantitative evidence and were instead largely based on assumptions and limited case studies.

A central theme was the lack of transmission-level evidence, with respondents noting limited real-world experience, particularly in areas such as Scotland, and a lack of data on delivery costs, system integration, and overall benefits, making it difficult to demonstrate a strong business case.

The Workgroup also discussed that, while contestability is seen as a useful enabling tool, it is only one component of a wider reform package, with respondents highlighting dependencies on broader changes such as demand connections reform and other market developments.

Significant concerns and risks were explored in detail, including:

- Complexity and interaction with wider reforms, with concern that this could add burden without clear benefit
- Unclear roles, responsibilities, and safeguards between users and Transmission Owners
- Cost and risk allocation challenges, particularly over the asset lifecycle
- System impacts and coordination risks, including potential misalignment of incentives and impacts on whole system efficiency

There was also focused discussion on connection timelines, where some Transmission Owners strongly challenged the assumption that contestability would accelerate delivery. They emphasised that wider enabling works are the primary driver of connection dates, meaning that changes to sole use assets alone would not necessarily improve timelines.

Public

Further technical discussion considered asset classification and transition from sole use to shared use, with differing views across stakeholders on how frequently this occurs and the implications for design, cost allocation, and system operation.

Overall, the Workgroup concluded that the consultation responses demonstrate support in principle (5/7) but there was some concern on evidence with 4/7 not satisfied. This resulted in a mixed conclusion, where potential benefits are recognised but delivery, evidence, and system impacts remain unresolved for some stakeholders.

Terms of Reference

The Workgroup discussed the Terms of Reference, noting that these reflected the original Ofgem send-back requirements and had provided a framework for the group’s work. However, it was acknowledged that the context has evolved, with Ofgem now progressing the issue through wider Demand Connections Reform, meaning the original terms of reference, though relevant, were becoming less central.

The Workgroup recognised that, based on both the consultation responses and their own discussions, the evidence and analysis remain incomplete, with some feedback indicating that the Workgroup had not fully addressed the send-back points and that further work would have been required should the Workgroup continue to meet.

The discussion concluded that the Terms of Reference remain valid as a framework, but the modification is now effectively being taken forward through Ofgem’s broader programme, limiting the need for further Workgroup-led development against those original points.

Next steps

The Chair confirmed that the next steps were to produce a Workgroup Report setting out the Workgroup Consultation responses and discussions, and to clarify the governance route and required communications with Panel. It was also stated that Workgroup meetings would be suspended following this session, with an update to be provided to members once the approach and next steps are confirmed.

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Robert Hughes	RH	Code Administrator, NESO	Chair
Sarah Williams	SW	Code Administrator, NESO	Tec Sec

Public

Neil Dewar	ND	NESO	Proposer
Andy Colley	AC	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member Alternate
Ben Sayah		NGET	Workgroup Member Alternate
Dimitrios Terzis	DT	SSENT	Workgroup Member Alternate
Jonathan Oguntona	JO	BayWa r.e UK Ltd	Workgroup Member
Lamin Vulart	LV	Qair UK	Workgroup Member
Megan Hughes		SSENT	Workgroup Member
Neil Geddes	NG	SP Energy Networks	Workgroup Member
Phoebe Finn	PF	Statera Energy Limited	Workgroup Member
Ruth Macdonald	RM	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Tim Ellingham	TE	RWE	Workgroup Member