

Public

Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma

CMP414: CMP330/CMP374 Consequential Modification

Industry parties are invited to respond to this consultation expressing their views and supplying the rationale for those views, particularly in respect of any specific questions detailed below.

Please send your responses to cust.team@neso.energy by **5pm** on **18 May 2026**. Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration.

If you have any queries on the content of this consultation, please contact cust.team@neso.energy

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
Respondent name:	Greg Stevenson	
Company name:	Green Cat Renewables	
Email address:	greg.stevenson@greencatrenewables.co.uk	
Phone number:	07827 236 773	
Which best describes your organisation?	☐ Consumer body ☐ Demand ☐ Distribution Network Operator ☐ Generator ☐ Industry body ☐ Interconnector	☐ Storage ☐ Supplier ☐ System Operator ☐ Transmission Owner ☐ Virtual Lead Party ☒ Other – Consultancy

I wish my response to be:

(Please mark the relevant box)

☒ **Non-Confidential** (*this will be shared with industry and the Panel for further consideration*)

☐ **Confidential** (*this will be disclosed to the Authority in full but, unless specified, will not be shared with the Panel or the industry for further consideration*)

Public

For reference the Applicable CUSC (non-charging) Objectives are:

- i. *The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and by this licence*;*
- ii. *Facilitating effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity, and (so far as consistent therewith) facilitating such competition in the sale, distribution and purchase of electricity;*
- iii. *Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency **; and*
- iv. *Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements.*

** See Electricity System Operator Licence*

***The Electricity Regulation referred to in objective (iii) is Regulation (EU) 2019/943 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 June 2019 on the internal market for electricity (recast) as it has effect immediately before IP completion day as read with the modifications set out in the SI 2020/1006.*

For reference, (for consultation questions 5) the Electricity Balancing Regulation (EBR) Article 3 Objectives and regulatory aspects are:

- a) *fostering effective competition, non-discrimination and transparency in balancing markets;*
- b) *enhancing efficiency of balancing as well as efficiency of national balancing markets;*
- c) *integrating balancing markets and promoting the possibilities for exchanges of balancing services while contributing to operational security;*
- d) *contributing to the efficient long-term operation and development of the electricity transmission system and electricity sector while facilitating the efficient and consistent functioning of day-ahead, intraday and balancing markets;*
- e) *ensuring that the procurement of balancing services is fair, objective, transparent and market-based, avoids undue barriers to entry for new entrants, fosters the liquidity of balancing markets while preventing undue market distortions;*

Public

- f) *facilitating the participation of demand response including aggregation facilities and energy storage while ensuring they compete with other balancing services at a level playing field and, where necessary, act independently when serving a single demand facility;*
- g) *facilitating the participation of renewable energy sources and supporting the achievement of any target specified in an enactment for the share of energy from renewable sources.*

What is the EBR?

The Electricity Balancing Regulation (EBR) is a European Network Code introduced by the Third Energy Package European legislation in late 2017.

The EBR regulation lays down the rules for the integration of balancing markets in Europe, with the objectives of enhancing Europe's security of supply. The EBR aims to do this through harmonisation of electricity balancing rules and facilitating the exchange of balancing resources between European Transmission System Operators (TSOs). Article 18 of the EBR states that TSOs such as the NESO should have terms and conditions developed for balancing services, which are submitted and approved by Ofgem.

Please express your views in the right-hand side of the table below, including your rationale.

Standard Workgroup Consultation questions

1	Do you believe that the Original Proposal better facilitates the Applicable Objectives	Mark the Objectives which you believe the original solution better facilitates than the current baseline:	
		Original	☒ i ☒ ii ☐ iii ☒ iv ☐ None

Public

	versus the current baseline?	Yes I believe that the Original Proposal better facilitates Applicable Objectives i, ii and iv with iii being Neutral. i) Positive – This Proposal will allow Licensee’s to efficiently discharge their obligations by putting greater onus on contestability alongside the wider suite of code modifications. Contestability at Transmission has often been a difficult process to navigate for Users and expanding what can be done contestably etc etc ii) Positive – By moving contestability to Section 2 of the CUSC will increase competition for Transmission connections. Contestability has often been stifled by the 2km rule TCA rule as it limits what Users can build as part of their contestable works. This is especially difficult in North of Scotland where lines and cables often stretch a great distance due to location of the project site to the MITS. This change will allow Users greater freedom in what they can build and if done successfully should speed up the connection alongside cheaper delivery. iii) Neutral iv) Positive – This change will promote efficiency by moving contestability out of the restrictive Charging section and expanding on the contestability legal text. The current location and detail of contestability has led to it being open to interpretation e.g. NESO advising can only build at 132kV which is not stated.
2		☒ Yes

Public

	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	☐ No Yes agree with the implementation approach and the alignment with the implementation of CMP330/374. It must also ensure alignment with CM079 so that both CUSC and STC are implemented together.
3	Do you have any other comments?	No
4	Do you wish to raise a Workgroup Consultation Alternative Request for the Workgroup to consider?	☐ Yes (the request form can be found in the Workgroup Consultation Section) ☒ No Click or tap here to enter text.
5	Does the draft legal text satisfy the intent of the modification?	☒ Yes ☐ No Yes the legal text satisfies the intent of the modification as it adds much welcomed detail around how contestability should work.
6	Do you agree with the Workgroup's assessment that the modification does not impact the Electricity Balancing Regulation (EBR) Article 18 terms	☒ Yes ☐ No Click or tap here to enter text.

Public

	and conditions held within the Code?	
--	--------------------------------------	--

Specific Workgroup Consultation questions

7	Do you believe that the Workgroup met the questions and concerns raised by Ofgem in the send back letter of August 2024. If not, please would you provide further information or evidence on any of the points set out in the send back letter appearing in Annex 03 of this report	Yes believe that the Workgroup has met the questions and concerns raised by Ofgem. The Workgroup has worked through key areas around lack of clarity of potential risks highlighting how the process handles these and what mitigations are in place. Clarity has also been provided in terms of financial and time saving benefits with quantifiable data being provided by the Workgroup and input being provided around how the process works in Ireland.
8	To what extent does CMP414, consequential to CMP330/374, help achieve the objectives outlined in Ofgem's demand connections reform call for input, as well as providing benefits to generation and storage? What gaps do you believe there are and what	Believe that this modification helps to achieve the objectives outlined in Demand Connection Reform call for input. It will allow Users to build assets quicker and ideally cheaper than the TO would. If a User has the funds and capabilities to build assets up to 400kV then this will be a support the objectives of Demand connections reform.

Public

	would you recommend to address them? Please provide evidence for any comments	This modification is only part of the wider picture and will support the overall objectives with further detailed work required. The right financial commitments will need to be designed alongside relevant planning criteria to ensure the project is ready and can be constructed quickly.
--	---	---