

Public

Code Administrator Meeting

Summary

Workgroup Meeting 2 – CMP471: Interim Connection Date Delay Process Ahead of CMP434 Gated Application Window

Date: 15/06/2026

Contact Details

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

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

Key areas of discussion

The meeting focused on progressing CMP471 by discussing how to enable connection date delay requests following Gate 2 offers, particularly in response to issues arising from Connections Reform. It also reviewed draft legal text and explored how the proposed process should work in practice, including interactions with existing CUSC arrangements, TO processes, and NESO responsibilities. Additionally, the workgroup also examined practical and system impacts of delays, identified key risks, and agreed next steps ahead of wider workgroup consultation.

Actions Discussion

The workgroup started with the discussion focused on reviewing the existing actions and confirming their current status, particularly where responses were still outstanding or dependent on external input.

The first action related to Ofgem remained open, as they had been unable to attend the meeting but were aware of the request and had passed it to their legal team for a view, with an expectation of an update at the next session. The group acknowledged this dependency and agreed to keep the action open pending their response. The required clarification has been raised with Ofgem’s legal team and remains critical to progressing the modification within the urgent timeline.

The second action centred on Transmission Owners (TOs) providing clarity on their approach to connection dates. Initial feedback indicated that TOs were working in the background on their responses, with further input expected. Some early commentary suggested that connection

Public

dates are typically driven by enabling works and infrastructure requirements rather than offering the earliest possible date by default, though there was recognition that a formal, consolidated response still needed to be shared with the group. This action was also kept open.

There was then a broader discussion prompted by these actions around whether TOs have discretion to align connection dates with developer readiness or whether they are bound to specific dates driven by asset delivery and submitted requests. Views varied slightly, but the general position was that while there may be limited case-by-case flexibility, the final connection date is ultimately constrained by infrastructure delivery and existing obligations, rather than allowing full discretion to delay purely for developer preference.

Overall, the early part of the meeting confirmed that most actions remained in progress and dependent on further input (particularly from Ofgem and TOs), while also surfacing a key theme that would carry into the rest of the meeting; namely the tension between operational constraints, regulatory obligations, and the extent to which connection dates can be flexibly adjusted.

NGET Presentation

A presentation by NGET emphasised that connection date delays cannot be treated as a simple administrative change, as the offered date is fundamentally driven by the timing of network infrastructure delivery. While Transmission Owners will consider requests and engage with users, the final connection date is ultimately determined by enabling works and technical constraints rather than purely user preference.

They highlighted that delays must be assessed on a case-by-case basis because connections are often tightly sequenced and interdependent at each site. Moving one project can disrupt outage planning, commissioning schedules, and the timing of other users, and Transmission Owners cannot disadvantage others. Delays can also trigger wider impacts such as changes to network design, capacity assessments, and site configuration, all of which require engineering review and resource to reassess.

The presentation also covered the cost and programme implications. If assets are built but not used due to a delay, they still need to be maintained, creating additional cost, and delay – particularly at scale – could affect delivery plans, engineering assumptions, and wider programme timelines. Overall, the key message was that some flexibility may be possible, but it is constrained, resource-intensive, and highly sensitive to the volume and scale of requests rather than something that can be applied consistently across all projects.

Public

Legal Text Discussion

Section 11 - the Workgroup identified a number of areas requiring refinement in the proposed drafting, including the need to clearly define the scope of a connection date delay request and how this should operate in practice. Consideration was given to whether additional guardrails may be required, such as limits on delay duration or defined request windows, to provide clarity and ensure consistent application of the process.

Section 17 - a substantial portion of the meeting was focused on development of the proposed solution, with detailed review of the draft legal text and process design. The Workgroup identified a number of areas requiring refinement, including defining a clear and workable process for submitting delay requests and clarifying interactions with existing processes (including modification applications, milestone adjustments and guidance).

The Workgroup highlighted that there is currently limited clarity on the end-to-end process for handling delay requests, particularly the time required for NESO coordination and TO engineering assessments. Members noted that these assessments could involve outage re-planning, network studies, and re-sequencing of connections, and without clearly defined timelines there is a risk of uncertainty for users and misalignment with delivery expectations.

Section 18 - the Workgroup emphasised the importance of ensuring alignment between connection date changes, user obligations and contractual outputs. Members noted that implementation of delay requests may require detailed engineering and operational assessment by TOs, including outage re-planning, network studies and re-sequencing of connections. In addition, concerns were raised that if delay requests are submitted in significant volumes, this could impact the timing of Phase 2 offers and require updates to planning assumptions within the Gated Implementation Plan (GIP), potentially affecting wider programme delivery. The Workgroup also noted that, for projects with existing agreements, connection date changes would likely need to be implemented through formal gated modification processes (e.g. modification applications), in line with current licence and incentive frameworks, which may limit flexibility unless regulatory arrangements are adapted.

In considering the broader policy context, the Workgroup generally agreed that the issue CMP471 seeks to address is specific to the current Connections Reform period, where delays in issuing Gate 2 offers and prolonged uncertainty have disrupted project timelines. It was acknowledged that this situation is unlikely to repeat in the same form in future cycles, as future applicants will

Public

submit more accurate connection dates with clearer delivery pathways. As such, there was support for CMP471 as a time-limited, transitional measure, rather than a permanent change to the framework, focused on resolving legacy misalignment caused by the reform process rather than creating an enduring mechanism.

Next Steps

Next steps agreed by the Workgroup were to refine the draft legal text to address key issues identified, including process clarity, timing, and alignment with existing CUSC provisions. NESO and TOs will provide further clarification on process design, timelines, and guidance interactions, while Ofgem input remains critical to progress regulatory aspects. A draft consultation document will be prepared and issued, with legal text remaining in development ahead of wider industry feedback.

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	Closed
5	WG1	TOs	TOs to provide a qualitative impact assessment to help the workgroup understand how this modification could impact the Joint Industry Plan (JIP) AKA Existing Agreement Timeline		Open
6	WG2	RM	Confirm - What ability do NESO have to ensure TOs are aligning connection dates and to change the earliest customer connection dates in Scheme Briefing Notes (SBN) after a TO has issued a TOCO to NESO.		Open
7	WG2	TOs	TOs to consider whether a high-level description of the assessment process can be		Open

Public

			provided to the workgroup.	
			If not feasible, TOs will confirm this and the action may be closed.	
8	WG2	IV	Slides to be shared within the workgroup to support understanding of impacts (from Action 2)	Open
9	WG2	Ofgem	Ofgem to consider whether changes or clarification to licence conditions are required to enable connection date delays without requiring a full modification application, or to avoid penalising TOs for accommodating such delays.	Open
10	WG2	RM	Confirm the correct position on whether a Gate 2 agreement must be signed before a gated / non-gated modification can be submitted, given conflicting guidance. (The action arose when IV raised a point about NESO guidance on whether a Gate 2 offer must be signed before a modification (or delay request) can be submitted.)	Open
11	WG2	MD	A summary slide or section that brings together all relevant inputs and references, including NESO guidance and relevant CUSC provisions (e.g. milestones, exceptions processes), to show how they interact with the CMP471 proposal. To improve clarity and traceability across:	Open

Public

			<p>NESO guidance (e.g. milestone extensions due to reform delays).</p> <p>Existing CUSC provisions (e.g. Section 16.5 exceptions).</p> <p>The proposed CMP471 legal text.</p> <p>To help the workgroup understand how the different mechanisms work together in practice.</p>	
12	WG2	RM	<p>Confirm whether it is preferable (and feasible) for connection date delay requests and associated milestone/exception requests to be handled together as a single process, or continue being managed separately across different NESO teams.</p> <p>In the workgroup it was highlighted that:</p> <p>Connection date delay requests go through one route (applications → TOs → contracts)</p> <p>Milestone exceptions (e.g. QM milestones) are handled by a different team/process.</p> <p>There was concern this could create inefficiency and misalignment is requests are assessed separately.</p>	Open
13	WG2	TP/NESO	<p>Consider STCP Modification process and impacts.</p>	Open
14	WG2	MD	<p>Consider impact on DNOs and embedded generations.</p>	Open

Public

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
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
Martin Hardwick	MH	Northern Powergrid	Workgroup Member
Andrew Allan	AA	RWE	Workgroup Member (alt)
Lamin Saidu Vulart	LSV	Qair UK	Workgroup Member
Ciaran Fitzgerald	CF	Scottish Power Renewables	Workgroup Member
Mark O'Connor	MO	EDF Energy Renewables	Workgroup Member
Alastair Southworth	AS	Harmony Energy	Workgroup Member
Joe Colebrook	JC	Innova	Workgroup Member

Public

Thomas O'Neill	TO	Qair Energy	Workgroup Member (alt)
Gary Camplejohn	GC	Harmony Energy	Workgroup Member (alt)
Harriet Eckweiler	HE	SSE Transmission	Workgroup Member
Philip Pateman	PP	Aukera Energy	Workgroup Member (alt)
Claire Hynes	CH	RWE	Workgroup Member (alt)
Andrew Colley	AC	SSE	Workgroup Member (alt)
Neil Bennett	SSE	NB	Workgroup Member (alt)
Ben Clarke	BC	Bute Energy Ltd	Workgroup Observer
Patrick O'Mahony	PO	Perigus Energy	Workgroup Observer
Fiona Ewart	FE	Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Observer
David Barber	DB	GridLink Interconnector Ltd	Workgroup Observer
Emma Webster	EW	Bute Energy	Workgroup Observer (alt)
Mithun Suresh	MS	Masdar	Workgroup Observer