

Public

Code Administrator Meeting

Summary

Workgroup Meeting 8 – CMP471: Interim Connection Date Delay Process Ahead of CMP434 Gated Application Window

Date: 05/08/2026

Contact Details

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

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

Key areas of discussion

Workgroup 8 focused on progressing the outstanding issues arising from the Workgroup Consultation and ensuring that these had been adequately considered ahead of finalisation of the Workgroup Report.

A detailed review of the action log was undertaken, with discussions focusing on Queue Management milestone interactions, Transmission Owner assessment criteria, connection delay volumes, legal text development and implementation considerations.

The Workgroup sought to resolve outstanding issues arising from consultation responses and previous discussions, with a focus on identifying any matters requiring further consideration prior to finalisation of the Workgroup Report and legal text.

Action Log Discussion

The Workgroup continued its consideration of issues raised through consultation responses and previous discussions, with particular focus on the interaction between Connection Date Delay Requests (CDDRs), Queue Management (QM) milestones and the supporting legal text. Several members expressed concern that, where a CDDR is approved, the associated QM milestones may not automatically align with the revised connection date. While the Proposer clarified that the intention of CMP471 was not to introduce additional QM flexibility beyond that already permitted through existing arrangements, Workgroup members highlighted the need for greater clarity regarding how approved delays would interact with QM milestones in practice. The Workgroup

Public

agreed that further clarification within the legal text and associated guidance would support implementation and improve certainty for users.

The Workgroup also considered circumstances in which a delay request may not be capable of being accommodated. Representatives from the Transmission Owners (TOs) outlined a number of factors that may need to be considered as part of any assessment, including detrimental impacts on other customers, impacts on network reinforcement requirements, the efficient and economic operation of the system, and circumstances where significant changes to network studies or connection arrangements may be required. Members generally recognised that the ability to assess these factors would form an important part of determining whether an alternative connection date could reasonably be accommodated.

Discussion was held on the need for additional transparency following implementation of CMP471. Several Workgroup members supported the inclusion of a post-implementation reporting mechanism, allowing industry to understand how many projects were eligible to use the process, how many applications were submitted, and how many requests were ultimately accommodated. Members considered that such information would assist stakeholders in understanding the effectiveness of the modification and provide valuable insight into the practical operation of the process following implementation.

The Workgroup revisited concerns regarding differing TO positions on post-offer connection date changes. Scottish TO representatives reiterated their view that, under their current interpretation of licence obligations, post-offer connection date negotiations are not currently permissible without regulatory clarification. In contrast, National Grid Electricity Transmission explained that it considered there to be greater flexibility under its existing arrangements. Members agreed that these differing positions should be clearly recorded within the Workgroup Report to ensure stakeholders and decision-makers understand the potential implications for implementation of the proposal.

Members also discussed the practical operation of the proposed process and identified a potential issue whereby a Gate 2 Offer could expire before a CDDR assessment had been completed. The Proposer noted that this issue should be addressed through the legal drafting to ensure applicants are not disadvantaged while awaiting an outcome to a delay request. The Workgroup agreed this would be an important consideration when reviewing the draft legal text.

Public

Terms of Reference

The Workgroup reviewed the Modification's Terms of Reference and considered whether each requirement had been adequately addressed through consultation responses, Workgroup discussions and emerging legal text.

Members agreed that the key issues relating to eligibility, connection date delay assessments, network impacts, implementation considerations and the interaction with Queue Management arrangements had been considered throughout the Workgroup process. In particular, the Workgroup confirmed that there were no EBR implications associated with the proposal, agreed that the enduring treatment of non-Gate 2 to Whole Queue projects fell outside the scope of CMP471, and considered that discussions relating to Queue Management milestones, TO assessment criteria and network impacts had adequately addressed the Terms of Reference relating to eligibility, limits on the use of the process and the need for revised network studies.

The Workgroup therefore concluded that the Terms of Reference had been addressed and that the associated discussions would be reflected within the Workgroup Report and supporting legal text.

Ofgem Update

SB attended the Workgroup on behalf of Ofgem and advised that, due to annual leave across key Ofgem personnel, there was limited substantive update available at this stage. SB confirmed that feedback from previous Workgroup discussions had been shared internally and agreed to relay further Workgroup comments and requests within Ofgem. Members reiterated the importance of receiving Ofgem input ahead of completion of the Workgroup phase, particularly in relation to licence condition interpretation and connection delay volume information.

In response to questions from Workgroup members, SB confirmed that the issue regarding differing TO interpretations of licence obligations was being considered within Ofgem, although she was unable to provide a definitive position at the meeting.

The Workgroup requested that any available views, guidance or feedback be shared as soon as practicable to support completion of the Workgroup Report and subsequent Code Administrator Consultation

Next Steps

Public

Draft legal text and a draft Workgroup Report will be developed following review of comments received from legal advisers and discussions held during Workgroup 8. These documents are intended to be shared with Workgroup members for review ahead of the next meeting.

Workgroup members were asked to review and provide comments on the draft legal text and Workgroup Report in advance of Workgroup 9, with a preference for comments rather than tracked changes to support efficient consolidation of feedback.

Outstanding actions remain in relation to Connection Date Delay Request volumes, TO assessment criteria, legal text development and implementation considerations. Updates on these items will be provided at subsequent meetings where available.

The Workgroup will continue its review of the legal text, outstanding consultation issues and Workgroup Report drafting at Workgroup 9, with the intention of resolving any remaining matters ahead of completion of the Workgroup phase and agreement of the Workgroup Report.

Actions

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

Action Number	Workgroup	Owner	Action	Due Status by
5	WG1	TOs	Provide qualitative impact assessment on JIP / Existing Agreement Timeline impacts.	WG2 Closed
6	WG2	RM	Confirm NESO ability to align TO connection dates and amend earliest SBN dates post-TOCO.	WG3 Closed
9	WG2	Ofgem	Consider whether licence clarification or change is needed for connection date delays without full modification applications.	WG3 Closed
11	WG2	MD	Prepare summary of NESO guidance, CUSC provisions and CMP471 legal text interactions.	WG3 Closed

Public

12	WG2	RM	Confirm whether delay and milestone/exception requests should be managed as one process or separately.	WG3 Closed
15	WG3	TP/RB/RM	Set up Ofgem/TO/NESO alignment session on interpretation, flexibility and process approach.	WG4 Closed
17	WG3	TP	Hold follow-up with proposer and NESO on legal text and Gated Modification Guidance.	WG4 Closed
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 Closed
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 Closed
22	WG4	TB/RW	Consider NESO operational impacts and coordination with TOs when assessing delay requests and managing partial accommodation scenarios.	WG5 Closed
23	WG4	TB/RW	Review how User Commitment Methodology applies to securities freeze, including updated costs and whether securities are reissued or remain frozen.	WG5 Closed
24	WG4	MDTB/RW	Consider whether transitional offers should be in scope and clarify how they are currently treated within the gated process.	WG5 Closed
25	WG7	RM/TB	NESO to provide the workgroup with data indicating the potential volume of Connection Date Delay Requests, including relevant information	WG9 Open

Public

			gathered through its request for information process.	
26	WG7	TB	NESO to share its response on implementation and process arrangements once feedback has been received from the relevant internal IT and Connections teams.	WG9 Open
27	WG7	TB	NESO to arrange a follow-up session with the proposer, NESO and NESO Legal to review outstanding guidance and legal drafting points.	WG8 Closed
28	WG7	MD/TB /RM	Review the treatment of transitional offers and confirm whether this affects the proposed removal or retention of Section 18 drafting. Seek views from Ruth Matthew and TO representatives before finalising the legal text.	WG9 Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Robert Hughes	RH	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
Garth Graham	GG	SSE	Workgroup Member
Isabelle Vasko	IV	National Grid Electricity Transmission	Workgroup Member
Rob Smith	RS	Enso Green Holdings	Workgroup Member
Gareth Williams	GW	Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Member
Khamun Ward	KW	Voltwise Power	Workgroup Member (alt)
Lamin Saidy Vulart	LSV	Qair UK	Workgroup Member

Public

Thomas O'Neill	TO	Qair UK	Workgroup Member (alt)
Kirsty Dawson	KD	Stratkraft	Workgroup Member
Harriet Eckweiler	HE	SSE Transmission	Workgroup Member
Mark O'Connor	MO	EDF Energy Renewables Limited	Workgroup Member
Gary Simpson	GS	Island Green Power	Workgroup Member (alt)
Ciaran Fitzgerald	CF	Scottish Power Renewables	Workgroup Member
Niall Stuart	NS	Hutcheson Associates	Workgroup Member
Alejandro Castro	AC	RE Projects Development	Workgroup Member
Fiona Casey	FC	SSE Transmission	Workgroup Member (alt)
Damian Clough	DC	SSE	Workgroup Member (alt)
Ben Clarke	BC	Bute Energy Ltd	Workgroup Observer
Emma Webster	EW	Bute Energy Ltd	Workgroup Observer (alt)
David Barber	DB	GridLink Interconnector Ltd	Workgroup Observer
Patrick O'Mahony	PO	Perigus Energy	Workgroup Observer