

Public

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Workgroup Meeting 5 – CMP471: Interim Connection Date Delay Process Ahead of CMP434 Gated Application Window

Date: 30/06/2026

Contact Details

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

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

Key areas of discussion

The workgroup's discussion focused on reviewing the Workgroup consultation document and supporting legal text, with particular attention given to the interaction between legal text and NESO guidance, the design of the proposed process, scope considerations for embedded projects, and whether the drafting provides sufficient clarity, certainty and governance arrangements ahead of consultation.

Next: Prior to the next workgroup meeting, the proposer and National Energy System Operator will update the consultation document, legal text and consultation questions to reflect workgroup feedback. The updated documents will be reviewed at a showstopper session, with the aim of resolving any outstanding issues and confirming readiness for consultation.

Action Log Review

Action 5 – Open, no new update.

Action 6 – RM confirmed that the TO and affected TO coordinate directly between themselves on connection dates prior to the issue of the Transmission Owner Construction Offer (TOCO) and Affected Transmission Owner Construction Offer (ATOCO), and NESO is generally not involved unless a significant misalignment is identified once the TOCO and ATOCO have been issued. Action has been closed.

Action 9 – Open, awaiting update from Ofgem.

Action 11 – Open. MD advised that draft legal text has been developed, but the key deliverable is updated NESO Gated Modification guidance to support CMP471. He is awaiting a draft from RM and NESO and offered to help draft the changes if needed. MD and RM to catch up offline.

Public

Action 12 – Open, but a requirement to develop an update to the guidance above.

Action 15 – Open.

Action 16 – Closed.

Action 17 – Open, as a session is taking place this week to look at the legal text.

Action 18 – Closed. RM explained the point around if changes can be made before a connection offer has been signed.

Action 19 – TB explained that the NESO modification application change scoping exercise had been launched to gather user feedback on potential connection changes, including connection date delays.

A new action was raised for TB to identify the licence and CUSC provisions that enable or restrict NESO from undertaking this activity.

Action 20 – MD noted that the discussion had focused on the impact on queue management and reinforcement changes, and that TO representatives had previously indicated they would consider and feedback on impacts that could have a material effect. IV explained that where a connection date change affects another TO's network, the standard Affected TO process would apply. The host TO would engage the affected TO, which would assess whether the change impacts its network works or connection arrangements. This could introduce additional assessment time where connections are close to network boundaries. Action has been closed.

Action 21 – Still open, investigating internally.

Action Log Summary

The Workgroup reviewed the outstanding actions, closing Actions 6, 18 and 20 following clarification from NESO and Workgroup members. Key discussion points focused on the need for updated NESO guidance to support CMP471 (Actions 11 and 12), ongoing engagement with Ofgem and TOs (Action 15), and the forthcoming legal text review session (Action 17). The Workgroup also discussed NESO's modification application change scoping exercise, resulting in a new action to identify the relevant licence and CUSC provisions that enable or restrict this activity.

Legal Text Discussions

The Workgroup members began by debating whether the solution could be implemented through CUSC legal text alone or whether it fundamentally relies on supporting NESO guidance. Members questioned whether key concepts and assessment criteria could be sufficiently understood without additional guidance and agreed to include consultation questions on whether the balance between legal text and guidance is appropriate.

Discussion then moved onto whether a user should be able to submit a completion date delay request before signing a Gate 2 Modification Offer and whether the draft legal text provides enough certainty around the process. Concerns were also raised that the legal text currently

Public

requires decisions and justifications to be provided but does not specify clear response timescales for NESO or TOs.

The Workgroup considered whether the legal text should explicitly set out the circumstances in which a request could be rejected. Some members favoured greater prescription to provide certainty, while others supported retaining flexibility. The discussion linked closely to the wider debate on how much detail should sit in legal text versus guidance.

Workgroup members discussed whether embedded projects should fall within scope. While no changes were proposed at this stage, the group agreed that consultation questions should explore whether excluding these projects could create unintended consequences or leave gaps in the proposed process.

The Workgroup identified potential interactions with wider commercial arrangements, particularly Contracts for Difference (CfDs). Members agreed it would be useful to seek stakeholder views on whether user-led completion date delays could have unintended impacts on existing regulatory or commercial frameworks.

The Workgroup reviewed several drafting decisions made during development of the proposal, including the treatment of submission windows and process obligations. Particular attention was given to whether additional legal text is needed to ensure requests are responded to within defined timescales and that reasons for decisions are provided as part of a clear and enforceable process.

The Workgroup reviewed the evolution of the legal text, including earlier discussions on introducing a formal submission window. Workgroup members noted that, rather than creating a standalone provision, the final drafting approach relies on provisions contained within Sections 17 and 18. The Workgroup agreed it would be helpful for the Workgroup consultation document to explain this development and capture the rationale behind the drafting decisions considered during workgroup discussions.

Workgroup Consultation

The Workgroup completed a detailed review of the draft Workgroup consultation document, working through each section to ensure the document accurately reflected previous discussions and the differing views expressed by members. Significant time was spent refining the consultation questions to ensure stakeholders would be able to provide meaningful feedback on the proposed solution, its implementation and its wider impacts.

Workgroup members considered whether the consultation appropriately captured areas of uncertainty, including the expected volume of connection date delay requests, the interaction between CMP471 and wider connections reform initiatives, and the role of the NESO modification application change scoping exercise. The Workgroup agreed that further references should be included where appropriate to provide consultees with additional context and evidence.

The Workgroup also reviewed the sections covering operational complexity, systems impacts, process design, embedded and distribution-connected projects, and regulatory considerations.

Public

Several consultation questions were reworded or added to better explore stakeholder views on implementation challenges, potential unintended consequences and whether the proposed scope and design of CMP471 are appropriate.

Workgroup members agreed that the consultation document should provide greater transparency on how the proposal and legal text had evolved throughout the Workgroup process, including key drafting decisions and alternative approaches that had been considered. NESO will update the consultation pack and circulate a revised version for review at the showstopper session prior to consultation.

Next Steps

The Workgroup agreed that MD will update the consultation document and legal text to reflect comments from the review, including further consideration of response timescales, justification requirements and the interaction between legal text and guidance. The Workgroup will also discuss guidance-related issues with MD to help address outstanding workgroup questions.

TP will update and restructure the consultation document, incorporate the agreed consultation questions, update the timeline, prepare the annexes and circulate an updated consultation pack ahead of the next meeting.

The Workgroup also agreed that the consultation document should better explain the evolution of the legal text, including discussions around submission windows and the approach adopted through Sections 17 and 18, to provide stakeholders with greater context on the options considered.

The next Workgroup meeting will be used as a showstopper session to review the updated documents, address any remaining issues and confirm readiness for consultation.

Actions

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

Action Number	Workgroup	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
5	WG1	TOs	Provide qualitative impact assessment on JIP / Existing Agreement Timeline impacts.	WG2	Open
6	WG2	RM	Confirm NESO ability to align TO connection dates and amend earliest SBN dates post-TOCO.	WG3	Closed

Public

9	WG2	Ofgem	Consider whether licence clarification or change is needed for connection date delays without full modification applications.	WG3	Open
11	WG2	MD	Prepare summary of NESO guidance, CUSC provisions and CMP471 legal text interactions.	WG3	Open
12	WG2	RM	Confirm whether delay and milestone/exception requests should be managed as one process or separately.	WG3	Open
15	WG3	TP/RB/RM	Set up Ofgem/TO/NESO alignment session on interpretation, flexibility and process approach.	WG4	Open
17	WG3	TP	Hold follow-up with proposer and NESO on legal text and Gated Modification Guidance.	WG4	Open
18	WG3	RM	Confirm options or changes to the position that changes can only be made once the offer is signed.	WG4	Closed
19	WG4	TB	Seek NESO clarification on the modification application change scoping exercise, including its intent, participation expectations and interaction with CMP471.	WG5	Open
20	WG4	MD/TOs	Consider TO process impacts where host TO connection date changes may affect other TOs and require coordination.	WG5	Closed
21	WG4	RW	Develop minimum objective “showstopper” criteria for connection date delay requests from a TO perspective.	WG5	Open
22	WG4	TB/RW	Consider NESO operational impacts and coordination with TOs when assessing delay requests and managing partial accommodation scenarios.	WG5	Open
23	WG4	TB/RW	Review how User Commitment Methodology applies to securities freeze, including updated	WG5	Open

Public

costs and whether securities are reissued or remain frozen.

Consider whether transitional offers should be in

24 WG4 MDTB/RW scope and clarify how they are currently treated WG5 Open within the gated process.

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Teri Puddefoot	TP	NESO	Chair
Ryan Baldwin	RB	NESO	Technical Secretary
Mollie Griffiths	MG	NESO	Technical Secretary
Matthew Dowds	MD	Muir Hall Energy	Proposer
Terry Baldwin	TB	NESO	NESO Rep
Chiara Oppo	CO	NESO	NESO Rep
Ruth Matthew	RM	NESO	NESO Rep
Isabelle Vasko	IV	National Grid Electricity Transmission	Workgroup Member
Rob Smith	RS	Enso Green Holdings	Workgroup Member
Andrew Colley	AC	SSE	Workgroup Member (alt)
Lamin Saidy Vulart	LSV	Qair UK	Workgroup Member
Thomas O'Neill	TO	Qair UK	Workgroup Member (alt)
Khamun Ward	KW	Voltwise Power	Workgroup Member (alt)
Claire Hynes	CH	RWE	Workgroup Member (alt)
Kirsty Dawson	KD	Stratkraft	Workgroup Member
Harriet Eckweiler	HE	SSE Transmission	Workgroup Member
Martin Hardwick	MH	Northern Powergrid	Workgroup Member

Public

Andrew Allan	AA	RWE	Workgroup Member (alt)
Ciaran Fitzgerald	CF	Scottish Power Renewables	Workgroup Member
Niall Stuart	NS	Hutcheson Associates	Workgroup Member
Mark O'Connor	MO	EDF ENERGY RENEWABLES LIMITED	Workgroup Member
Fiona Casey	FC	SSE Transmission	Workgroup Member (alt)
Ben Clarke	BC	Bute Energy Ltd	Workgroup Observer
Emma Webster	EW	Bute Energy	Workgroup Observer (alt)
David Barber	DB	GridLink Interconnector Ltd	Workgroup Observer
Allan Love	AL	Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Observer (alt)
Patrick O'Mahony	PO	Perigus Energy	Workgroup Observer