

Public

Code Administrator Meeting

Summary

Workgroup Meeting 1 – CMP471: Interim Connection Date Delay Process Ahead of CMP434 Gated Application Window

Date: 11/06/2026

Contact Details

Chair: Teri Puddefoot, Terri.Puddefoot@neso.energy

Proposer: Matthew Dowds, matthew.dowds@muirhallenergy.co.uk

Key areas of discussion

The Chair introduced the meeting and outlined the agenda of CMP471 – Workgroup 1 which included reviewing the modification process, workgroup expectations, objectives and timeline, and to consider the proposed CMP471 legal text and wider impacts of the proposal before agreeing the Terms of Reference.

Terms of Reference (ToR)

The Chair led the review of the Terms of Reference for the Workgroup, inviting members comments. No Workgroup members had any objections to the current Terms of Reference, and all were in unanimous agreement.

Workgroup Discussion

The proposer introduced CMP471 by outlining the defect, highlighting that current processes do not allow users to delay connection dates in line with realistic delivery timelines. This results in misalignment between contractual positions and project delivery, leading to inefficiencies, increased administrative burden, and exposing users to unnecessary costs and liabilities. Early discussion focused on the interpretation of the current CUSC requirements, particularly whether TOs and NESO are obligated to offer the earliest possible connection date and whether existing processes already allow delays. Workgroup members questioned whether this reflects a true gap in the code or a potential misinterpretation of existing rules. It was agreed that clarification from Ofgem (**Action 1**) and Tos (**Action 2**) is critical, as this issue underpins whether a modification is required.

Public

This led into a broader discussion on the nature of the defect versus the root cause. Members noted the risk that the proposal may be addressing symptoms rather than the underlying problem, suggesting that improved guidance, process changes, or more consistent engagement between developers and TOs could potentially resolve aspects of the issue without a code change.

The proposer then set out the design of the proposed solution, describing a targeted, time-limited mechanism to allow connection date delays through a bespoke CMP471 process. This included a short window following Gate 2 offers and a one-off catch-up window. Discussion focused on whether this should remain a temporary solution or evolve into an enduring change, and whether it should be implemented through Section 17 (gated process) or Section 6 (non-gated approach). No firm position was reached, with both approaches requiring further consideration.

Legal Text

The Proposer presented Draft legal text to the Workgroup. There was discussion on the legal text, with concern that the current drafting could unintentionally allow changes beyond connection date delays. In particular, references to technology changes were flagged as inappropriate and outside the intended scope of the modification. There was also discussion on the treatment of milestones and contractual terms, with a clear expectation that queue management milestones should not automatically change. Further refinement of the legal drafting was identified as a priority.

Section 11 – Interpretation and Definitions

The Workgroup focused on the need to introduce clear and tightly defined terminology to support the CMP471 mechanism, including definitions such as the “connection date delay window” and “connection date delay request.” Members emphasised that any new definitions must be precise and limited in scope to avoid unintended interpretation or overlap with existing processes, particularly ensuring the modification remains clearly targeted and non-enduring.

Section 17 – Gated Application and Offer Process

Discussion on Section 17 centred on how the proposal interacts with the existing gated application process, particularly the introduction of a short window for users to request connection date delays following receipt of a Gate 2 offer. Key points included ensuring that the process remains limited to connection date changes only, does not conflict with existing allowable changes, and provides a fair

Public

mechanism for users at different Gate 2 stages. There was also debate over whether this approach should remain a temporary addition within Section 17 or be addressed more broadly through alternative sections of the CUSC.

Section 18 – Gated Process for Projects with Existing Agreements

The Workgroup went on to consider Section 18, with discussion focused on how approved connection date delays would be implemented within existing agreements. Members highlighted the need for clarity on how contractual elements such as liabilities, securities, and cancellation charges would be updated, while ensuring that queue management milestones are not automatically altered. It was agreed that the legal text must clearly set out how revised connection dates are incorporated into existing agreements without creating ambiguity or unintended contractual impacts.

Further Workgroup Discussion

The discussion then turned to queue management and behavioural impacts. It was recognised that queue management milestones would act as a constraint on the extent of delays; however, concerns were raised about the potential for unintended behavioural responses, including the risk of users seeking to delay projects strategically. The distinction between user-led and network-driven delays was noted as an important consideration for the solution design.

This was followed by discussion on network and operational impacts, where TOs highlighted potential implications for local network planning. While the proposal focuses on date changes, members noted that these could still affect sequencing at substations, queue ordering, outages, and engineering delivery, meaning impacts may not be limited in practice.

A key concern raised was the scale, volume, and resourcing uncertainty associated with the proposal. The number of potential requests is currently unknown, making it difficult for TOs and NESO to assess resource requirements and deliverability. There was concern that a high volume of requests could place significant pressure on existing processes and timelines.

The workgroup also considered the potential impact on Connections Reform and Joint Industry Plan (JIP) timelines. Members highlighted the risk that large-scale date changes could affect delivery of reform milestones, noting the importance of understanding whether this would be acceptable within the wider regulatory and policy context. It was agreed that Ofgem input will be essential in assessing these impacts.

Finally, the discussion addressed evidence and consistency of current practice, with members noting variability in how TOs are engaging with developers and managing connection dates. This reinforced the need for a clearer, evidence-based understanding of current behaviours. The

Public

group also confirmed that the proposal is primarily focused on transmission-connected users, with distribution and embedded projects likely out of scope, and that this should be clearly communicated to avoid ambiguity.

Next Steps

The next steps from CMP471 Workgroup 1 were to circulate the meeting summary, actions, and materials to the group, while formally issuing actions to both workgroup members and Ofgem. Key actions include seeking clarification from Ofgem and TOs on whether the CUSC requires the earliest connection date to be offered and whether delays are already permissible under existing arrangements.

The proposer will update the legal drafting in line with feedback and begin aligning it to the CUSC baseline (**Action 4**), with further input to be gathered from TOs and Ofgem on interpretation, impacts, and deliverability.

Updated papers will be issued ahead of the next Workgroup meeting, with a specific focus on securing Ofgem representation to address key outstanding questions.

Actions

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

Action Number Raised	Workgroup	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
1	WG1	Ofgem	To provide clarification on the current interpretation of the CUSC and NESO and TO licence obligations, specifically whether TOs and NESO are required to offer the earliest possible connection date when issuing CMP435 offers (including where this may result in a project having a non-firm position for a period when this was not the case with their Existing Agreement) and whether changes to connection dates as a result of delays to transmission infrastructure can already be accommodated under	WG2	Open

Public

			existing arrangements, ie reflected in updated offers.		
2	WG1	TP and TO Workgroup members	As per Action 1 and including: To provide a clear statement of their interpretation and current approach, including any regulatory or statutory basis for offering the earliest possible connection date, and to confirm how they are currently handling delay requests in practice.	WG2	Open
3	WG1	MD	Proposer to consider whether any supporting evidence or examples from TO engagement can be shared with the Workgroup to support understanding of the issue.	WG2	Open
4	WG1	TP/MD	TP to share up to date baselines with MD. MD to add legal text to these.	WG2	Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Teri Puddefoot	TP	NESO	Chair
Ryan Baldwin	RB	NESO	Technical Secretary
Matthew Dowds	MD	Muir Hall Energy	Proposer
Terry Baldwin	TB	NESO	NESO Rep
Ruth Matthew	RM	NESO	NESO Rep
Rob Smith	RS	Enso Green Holdings	Workgroup Member
Catriona Glennie	CG	SP Manweb Plc Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Member

Public

Henry McDonald	HD	Voltwise Power	Workgroup Member
Kirsty Dawson	KD	Statkraft	Workgroup Member
Isabelle Eleanor Vasko	IEV	NGET	Workgroup Member
Gareth Williams	GW	Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Member
Niall Stuart	NS	Hutcheson Associates	Workgroup Member
Martin Hardwick	MH	Northern Powergrid	Workgroup Member
Kimbrah Hiorns	KH	EDF Energy Renewables Limited	Workgroup Member (alt)
Lamin Saily Vulart	LSV	Qair UK	Workgroup Member
Ciaran Fitzgerald	CF	Scottish Power Renewables	Workgroup Member
Sam Aitchison	SA	Island Green Power	Workgroup Member
Alastair Southworth	AS	Harmony Energy	Workgroup Member
Joe Colebrook	JC	Innova	Workgroup Member
Rosemary McInnes	RI	Scottish Power Renewables	Workgroup Member (alt)
Fiona Casey	FC	SSE Transmission	Workgroup Member (alt)
Harriet Eckweiler	HE	SSE Transmission	Workgroup Member
Garth Graham	GG	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member
Ben Clarke	BC	Bute Energy Ltd	Workgroup Observer
Patrick O'Mahony	PO	Perigus Energy	Workgroup Observer

Public

Fiona Ewart	FE	Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Observer
Tony Hanlan	TH	GridLink Interconnector Ltd	Workgroup Observer (alt)
Toby Evans	TE	Atlantic Green	Workgroup Observer