

Public

Code Administrator Meeting

Summary

Workgroup Meeting 11 – CMP471: Interim Connection Date Delay Process Ahead of CMP434 Gated Application Window

Date: 26/08/2026

Contact Details

Chair: Robert Hughes, Robert.Hughes3@neso.energy

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

Key areas of discussion

The Workgroup considered the revised CMP471 timetable, Ofgem's position on a related interpretation issue, progress against outstanding actions, and the treatment of the three alternative requests. The formal Workgroup vote was undertaken on the alternatives, subsequent WACMs, and the Original Proposal. Key areas of discussion included NESO's implementation timescales, the scope of Alternatives 01 and 03, the outcome of the Workgroup vote, and further legal text changes required before the next meeting.

Timeline Update

The timeline update was introduced by the Chair, who explained that the original intention had been to submit the CMP471 Workgroup Report to the Panel on 25 August. However, three alternative requests were submitted shortly before the penultimate workgroup meeting, creating additional requirements relating to legal text, scope considerations and governance matters. As a result, the original timetable was no longer achievable, and a revised programme was required.

The Chair emphasised that the modification remained subject to an urgent timetable, both because the Panel and Ofgem had requested urgent progression and because the proposal itself is time sensitive. They noted that the

Public

Workgroup's objective was to maintain momentum while ensuring that the alternative requests and associated legal text were considered appropriately. The Workgroup were happy with the new proposed timeline.

Ofgem Slot

As agreed at CMP471 Workgroup 7, future meetings will include a dedicated Ofgem slot to allow Workgroup members to raise questions.

The Authority Representative confirmed that Ofgem would not be able to provide a definitive position on the separate interpretation of licence agreements issue within the CMP471 timeline, as the matter was being considered outside the modification process.

The discussion concluded that the issue would remain unresolved for the purposes of CMP471, but that the report should provide sufficient context for the Panel and Ofgem to understand the Workgroup's consideration of the matter.

Action Log Review

Action 25 – Connection Date Delay Request Volumes – Remains Open

The Chair invited the NESO Representative to provide an update on Action 25, which sought data on the potential volume of Connection Date Delay Requests. The NESO Representative confirmed that consent had been obtained from the Transmission Owners to share a breakdown of the survey responses and provided the split by TO area.

NGET – 324 (61.1%)

SPT – 136 (25.7%)

SSENT – 69 (13%)

The Proposer and several Workgroup members noted that the key interest was not the overall volume of responses, but the subset specifically relating to connection date delay requests. They questioned whether a further breakdown

Public

could be provided. The NESO Representative explained that additional approval would be needed before that information could be shared.

A number of Workgroup members argued that the information should not be commercially sensitive and should already be available through existing reporting channels. The Chair acknowledged the strength of views expressed and requested that the additional information be provided as soon as possible, with the next Workgroup meeting acting as the latest acceptable deadline. As a result, Action 25 remained open pending the provision of the date-delay specific breakdown.

To note: Following the workgroup, NESO provided the responses relating to connection date delay requests. NESO received 156 responses for connection date delays; the split is as follows:

NGET – 87 (55.8%)

SPT – 39 (25%)

SSENT 30 (19.2%)

Action 26 – NESO Implementation and IT Arrangements – Remains Open

The NESO Representative reported that discussions had taken place with NESO Connections and IT teams. Based on those discussions, NESO's initial assessment was that implementation of the modification would require approximately four months following an Ofgem decision, increasing to six months if changes to milestones were also required. This estimate reflected the need for requirements gathering, design, build, testing and training activities.

Several Workgroup members questioned the estimate and asked whether a manual process, portal query, or existing arrangements could be used instead of a full system build. Concerns were raised that a four-to-six-month implementation period could significantly reduce the practical value of the

Public

modification. The Proposer suggested that alternative approaches and potential legal text changes should be explored if they could reduce implementation timescales.

The NESO Representative explained that the estimate reflected not only front-end submission requirements but also changes required to NESO's back-end systems and data flows. However, several Workgroup members requested a more detailed explanation of the assumptions underpinning the estimate.

The Chair concluded that the action could not be closed. The NESO representative was asked for:

1. A clearer explanation of the basis for the four-to-six-month estimate.
2. Further exploration of whether manual workarounds or alternative solutions could be used.
3. A follow-up discussion involving the NESO Representative, the Proposer, and interested Workgroup members before the next meeting.

Action 28 – Transitional Offers and Section 18 Drafting – Closed

The Chair reviewed Action 28, which related to the treatment of transitional offers and whether this affected the proposed removal or retention of Section 18 drafting. They noted that the issue had effectively been overtaken by subsequent legal text discussions and broader Workgroup consideration of transitional arrangements.

No objections were raised by the Proposer, NESO Representative or Workgroup members. The Chair concluded that the action had been satisfactorily addressed through the Workgroup's ongoing legal text development. As a result, Action 28 was closed.

Scope determination of Alternatives 01 and 03

Public

The Chair explained that in their view, Alternatives 01 and 03 extended beyond the defect identified in CMP471. They stated that CMP471 was intended to address the absence of a mechanism for requesting a connection date delay, whereas those alternatives also proposed changes to user progression milestones and queue management arrangements. The Chair noted that these areas could involve issues regarding CMP376 and therefore raised further potential scope concerns.

The discussion focused on the Chair's role in determining scope and the implications of that determination. While differing views were expressed, the Chair stated that he did not wish to prolong a procedural debate given the urgency of the modification timetable.

As a pragmatic solution, the Chair decided not to prevent any of the alternatives from progressing to a Stage 1 vote. They proposed that the Workgroup should vote on whether each alternative request should become a Workgroup Alternative CUSC Modification (WACM). The Chair confirmed that both the substantive arguments and the scope concerns would be recorded in the Workgroup Report. The discussion concluded with agreement to proceed to the stage one vote, which determined whether each alternative should be developed and assessed further by the workgroup.

Recap of the Three Alternative Requests

The Chair invited the proponents of the three alternatives to provide a brief recap of their proposals before the workgroup considered whether they should proceed as Workgroup Alternative CUSC Modifications (WACMs).

Alternative 01 – GridLink

The alternative proposer explained that this option would automatically recalculate all user progression milestones following approval of a connection date delay request. The intention was to keep project obligations aligned with the

Public

revised connection programme and avoid the need for separate milestone extension requests.

Alternative 02 – Aukera

The alternative proposer outlined a proposal that would require users to demonstrate that their project had been delayed by exceptional circumstances before a connection date delay request could be approved. The aim was to restrict the process to projects affected by factors outside their control and to avoid creating an unrestricted right to delay connection dates.

Alternative 03 – Enso Energy

The alternative proposer presented an option that would allow users with an approved connection date delay to request corresponding queue management milestone delays through the existing exceptions process without needing to provide additional justification. The proposed delay would be capped at the lesser of 18 months or the period derived from the revised connection date. The Proposer stated that the cap was intended to reflect the period of uncertainty experienced by projects while limiting the extent of any relief provided.

Workgroup Vote

The workgroup completed voting on the Original Proposal and the three alternatives. All three alternatives progressed to become WACMs. Alternatives 01 and 03 received support to do this by majority voting. Alternative 02 was saved by the Chair, based on the principle that it represented a viable alternative which should be considered by Ofgem. Following the stage one vote they were subsequently assessed against the applicable CUSC objectives, alongside the Original Proposal. An advisory best-option vote indicated the strongest support was for WACM 3.

Legal Text Review

The Proposer and a representative from the NESO Legal team led a review of the latest draft legal text, focusing on the proposed connection date delay process, application requirements, assessment arrangements, submission windows and consequential changes arising from an approved delay request. The discussion

Public

was intended to identify any remaining drafting issues before the final workgroup meeting.

A significant area of discussion concerned the treatment of consequential changes following an approved connection date delay. Several Workgroup members questioned whether certain updates, such as trigger dates, user commitment arrangements and milestone dates, should automatically follow from an approved delay or remain subject to existing processes. Different views were expressed on the extent to which these outcomes should be explicitly prescribed in the legal text.

The Workgroup also discussed the proposed submission windows and offer acceptance arrangements. Some Workgroup members queried whether the drafting could be simplified, while others considered that separate provisions were required to reflect different customer circumstances and implementation scenarios.

Several points remained dependent on the outcome of further discussions with NESO regarding implementation and system requirements. The Chair concluded that additional drafting work was required before the legal text could be finalised. The Proposer and the NESO legal representative agreed to review the outstanding comments and circulate an updated draft containing the few remaining issues for further discussion as comments, ahead of the next meeting.

Next Steps

Before the final meeting, the Workgroup will focus on closing the remaining actions, progressing further NESO engagement on implementation requirements, refining the legal text and preparing the Workgroup Report. Members were also asked to provide any outstanding voting statements.

Actions

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

Public

Action Number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
25	WG7	RM/TB	NESO to provide the workgroup with data indicating the potential volume of Connection Date Delay Requests, including relevant information gathered through its request for information process.	WG9	Open
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

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Robert Hughes	RH	NESO	Chair
Mollie Griffiths	MG	NESO	Technical Secretary
Matthew Dowds	MD	Muir Hall Energy	Proposer
Paul Mott	PM	NESO	NESO Representative
Ben Sayer	BS	National Grid Electricity Transmission	Workgroup Member
Rob Smith	RS	Enso Green Holdings	Workgroup Member
Lamin Saidy Vulart	LSV	Qair UK	Workgroup Member
Thomas O'Neill	TO	Qair UK	Workgroup Member (alt)
Kirsty Dawson	KD	Stratkraft	Workgroup Member
Andrew Allan	AA	RWE	Workgroup Member (alt)
Ciaran Fitzgerald	CF	Scottish Power Renewables	Workgroup Member

Public

Niall Stuart	NS	Hutcheson Associates	Workgroup Member
Khaman Ward	KW	Voltwise Power	Workgroup Member
David Barber	DB	GridLink Interconnector Ltd	Workgroup Observer
Ruth Matthew	RM	NESO	NESO Representative
Gareth Williams	GW	Scottish Power Transmission	Workgroup Member
Harriet Eckweiler	HE	SSE Transmission	Workgroup Member
Garth Graham	GG	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member
Alastair Southworth	AS	Harmony Energy	Workgroup Member
Andrew Colley	AC	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member (alt)
Dimosthenis Kalis	DK	Ofgem	Authority Rep