Public

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Workgroup Meeting 13: CMP460 - Improving Transmission Connection Asset Charging

Date: 28 October 2026

Contact Details

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

Proposer: Joe Colebrook, joe@innova.co.uk

Key areas of discussion

The purpose of Workgroup 13 was to review the Actions Log, discuss the revised Legal Text, review progress on the Workgroup Report, discuss and undertake a Stage 1 vote on the Alternative Request, and review the remaining Terms of Reference.

Actions Log

The following actions were discussed:

- **Action 14 (Closed)** – The revised Legal Text had been completed and returned with comments from NESO Legal. The remaining points would be considered under the Legal Text agenda item.
- **Action 40 (Open)** – The worked examples remained outstanding. The Proposer intended to complete them for the next Workgroup meeting, so they could be included in the final Workgroup Report.
- **Action 45 (Closed)** – The Alternative Request had been submitted and was included on the meeting agenda.
- **Action 50 (Closed)** – The Proposer presented supporting material covering projects connected before implementation, accepted offers not yet connected, and new offers after implementation. The discussion also identified a potential need for a consequential STC change.
- **Action 51 (Open)** – The impact assessment remained under review. Further clarification was required on the value of existing connection assets, the basis of the figures used, and the treatment of current connection charges, capital contributions, and future TNUoS effects. The Proposer would follow up with the NESO SME and the TO representative.
- **Action 52 (Closed)** – The Legal Text had been updated following Workgroup 12 and provided for NESO Legal review.

- **Action 53 (Open)** – Discussions with NESO Legal and the Connections Team were continuing on whether agreement changes and implementation requirements needed to be expressly reflected in the Legal Text and the lead time required.
- **Action 54 (Closed)** – The Alternative Request had been completed and brought to the Workgroup for consideration.
- **Action 55 (Open)** – The Workgroup Report remained under development, and the collaboration space would remain open for Workgroup members to review and add their comments.
- **Action 56 (Closed)** – The geographical and customer-group distributional impacts had been considered. The Workgroup agreed that the outcome should be captured in the Workgroup Report.

Legal Text

The Workgroup reviewed the latest Legal Text and the comments received from NESO Legal. The discussion focused on the wording in Section 14.2.6 and the repayment mechanism in Section 14.6.6, rather than reopening provisions previously considered by the Workgroup.

NESO Legal had queried the phrase "intended to be solely required". The Proposer explained that NESO would ultimately classify assets for the purposes of its agreement with the User, informed by information from the TO. The TO representative described how construction offers, asset schedules, design information, and subsequent changes could evidence whether an asset was intended for sole or shared use. The Proposer considered that some interpretation was unavoidable and that the wording should remain unless NESO Legal identified a specific problem or proposed an alternative. The NESO SME would provide the additional context to NESO Legal.

NESO Legal had also suggested reconsidering "capable of" in Section 14.2.6 but had not proposed replacement wording. Workgroup members considered that the wording captured whether an asset could physically serve another User and questioned whether a change was needed without an example of likely misinterpretation. The NESO SME would provide the Workgroup's context and seek revised wording if NESO Legal continued to consider a change necessary. If further comments remained, the Proposer requested a direct discussion with NESO Legal before the next meeting, so the outstanding drafting could be resolved.

For the repayment mechanism, the Workgroup agreed wording that NESO would pay the User upon receipt of the relevant sum from the Transmission Owner. The proposed words "in accordance with the STC" were removed so that the CUSC did not prescribe the operation of another Code. Members discussed whether a consequential STC change would be required to create the TO-to-NESO payment mechanism. The NESO SME agreed to take this into the STC

scoping work, confirm whether a change was required and, if so, identify an appropriate route and proposer.

Workgroup Report

The Chair confirmed that the draft Workgroup Report had been reviewed at the previous meeting and was available in the collaboration space. No comments had been received at the time of the Workgroup meeting.

The Workgroup Report would be updated to include the substantially completed post-Workgroup Consultation discussions and to record the Alternative Request and its approval as a WACM. Members would be notified when the revised version was available and asked to provide comments before the next meeting. The intention was to resolve substantive comments at the next Workgroup so that the final meeting could focus on the Workgroup vote and sign-off rather than new drafting points.

Alternative Request and Vote

KM and PB of Roadnight Taylor presented the Alternative Request, sponsored by Statkraft. They confirmed that the Alternative retained the broad approach of the Original Proposal but would not refund historic capital contributions for projects connected before implementation. Projects with an accepted offer but not connected by implementation would have capital contributions and connection charges removed, with any capital contribution already paid refunded in full. New offers after implementation would be issued on the revised basis.

Workgroup members discussed the appropriate cut-off for determining whether a project was connected, including the relationship between the Charging Date, Completion Date, the transmission connection, and the connection of an embedded customer. Following discussion, the Alternative Request proceeded to the Stage 1 vote, with the cut-off and associated drafting requiring further development if the request became a WACM. KM and PB would also prepare an equivalent version of the Original Proposal's scenario material to show how the Alternative applied to the different project categories.

The Chair conducted a Stage 1 Alternative Vote. Of the 17 Workgroup members eligible to vote, 12 were in attendance and unanimously voted for Alternative Request 1 to become Workgroup Alternative CUSC Modification 1 (WACM1). The WACM would be developed alongside the Original Proposal.

Terms of Reference

The Workgroup reviewed the remaining Terms of Reference (ToR), focusing on the items that required a clearer conclusion or additional evidence in the Workgroup Report.

(c) Consider coordination with TOs to revise construction agreements

The Workgroup discussed the implementation steps, agreement changes, and coordination required between NESO and the TOs. The Proposer considered that relevant charging appendices and clauses would need to be updated between approval and implementation. The TO representative explained that cessation of connection charging could be implemented through a legally binding side letter rather than wholesale amendment of agreements and highlighted the importance of aligning the change with annual charge-setting and TNUoS forecasting. The Proposer would prepare a slide setting out the agreements, sequencing, coordination, and timing, with input from the TO representative, for discussion at the next Workgroup meeting.

(d) Consider alignment with the End-to-End Connections Review

The Workgroup clarified that this ToR related to Ofgem's Connections End-to-End Review rather than connections reform or Reformed National Pricing. No direct dependency or conflict with CMP460 was identified. The Technical Secretary would add a short section to the Workgroup Report recording the consideration and conclusion, using the correct review title and supporting reference.

(f) Consider the interaction with distribution and transmission business plans and the ability for TOs to secure funding for any works

The Chair confirmed that this had been discussed previously and that the remaining requirement was to capture the outcome clearly in the Workgroup Report.

(h) Consider the impacts of socialised costs on consumers and other parties

The Workgroup considered that the impact on consumers was covered by the impact assessment. The impact on other parties was principally the corresponding reduction in costs for DNO Users and their customers. This explanation would be strengthened in the Workgroup Report. The TO representative also raised a potential consequence for Connection Asset Replacement arrangements where sole-use assets ceased to be classified as Connection Assets. This point would be revisited when the impact assessment returned to the Workgroup.

AOB and Next Steps

No additional items of business were raised.

The Chair noted that two Workgroup meetings remained, both in December. The outstanding work was to resolve the Original and WACM1 Legal Text, complete the Terms of Reference, undertake the Workgroup vote, and finalise the Workgroup Report. The order could be adjusted, with the next meeting potentially focusing on the Legal Text and vote, with the final meeting used to complete the Workgroup Report.

PB confirmed that they would provide a tracked-changes version of the current Legal Text showing the WACM1 changes by 04 November 2026. The NESO SME would then share it with NESO Legal for review.

The Chair confirmed that the Workgroup Report would be updated, recirculated, and placed in the collaboration space with deadlines for comments. Members were asked to complete their actions between meetings, particularly the remaining Legal Text work. The WACM1 and its Legal Text would be discussed further at Workgroup meeting 14 on 02 December 2026.

Actions

For the full Actions Log, click here.

Action Number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
14	WG2	JC / AH	Review potential changes to Legal Text with legal team (possibly Section 3 or 11).	WG6	Closed
40	WG8	JC	Update or develop worked examples in Section 14.11 to reflect the revised legal text and consult the charging team to ensure accuracy of first year charges in the examples.	WG9	Open
45	WG9	PB	PB and other interested Workgroup members to consider the scope, alignment, and differences between the potential alternative(s) being considered in preparation for the next Workgroup meeting.	WG10	Closed
50	WG11	JC	Provide supporting material explaining the proposed implementation cut-off points and treatment of legacy projects, including the relevant repayment arrangements.	WG12	Closed
51	WG11	JC	Review and, if necessary, update the impact assessment to determine whether it estimates the capital contributions paid by DNO	WG12	Open

			customers, liaising with the NESO SME where further information is required.		
52	WG12	JC	Update the Legal Text following the Workgroup 12 discussion, including the agreed refund formula, treatment of future projects and removal of the unintended AGIC/SGT amendment, and provide a stable version to the NESO SME.	WG13	Closed
53	WG12	AH	Submit the stable revised Legal Text to NESO Legal and seek advice on whether the Legal Text must expressly require and/or timetable updates to existing connection offers and agreements.	WG13	Open
54	WG12	JC / PB / KM	Review the proposed Alternative Request, confirm whether a single request covers both approaches, agree the submitter, and provide the final request by 07 October 2026.	WG13	Closed
55	WG12	All	Review the draft Workgroup Report in the collaboration space and submit comments by the notified cut-off ahead of Workgroup 13.	WG13	Open
56	WG12	AH	Seek further NESO input on the geographical and distributional effects of allocating the additional costs through TDR, for inclusion in the impact assessment and Workgroup Report.	WG13	Closed
57	WG13	AH	Confirm through the STC scoping work whether a consequential STC change is required to support CMP460 and, if required, identify the appropriate route and proposer.	WG14	New
58	WG13	JC	Prepare implementation/coordination slide for ToR C.	WG14	New

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Robert Hughes	RH	NESO	Chair
Matthew Larreta	ML	NESO	Technical Secretary
Joe Colebrook	JC	Innova Capital Limited	Proposer
Aishwarya Harsure	AH	NESO	NESO SME
Alex Pentecost	AP	Eclipse Power Solutions	Workgroup Member (Alternate)
Brian Hoy	BH	SP Electricity North West	Workgroup Member
Damian Clough	DC	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member
Daniel De Wijze	DDW	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Edda Dirks	ED	SSEN Transmission	Workgroup Member (Alternate)
Jonathan Whitaker	JW	SSEN Transmission	Workgroup Member (Alternate)
Kyle Murchie	KM	Roadnight Taylor	Workgroup Member
Mark O'Connor	MOC	EDF Power Solutions	Workgroup Member
Matthew Paige-Stimson	MPS	NGET	Workgroup Member
Natalija Zaiceva	NZ	UK Power Networks	Workgroup Member
Ollie Easterbrook	OE	NGED	Workgroup Member (Alternate)
Paul Mott	PM	NESO	NESO SME
Philip Bale	PB	Roadnight Taylor	Workgroup Member (Alternate)
Rob Smith	RS	Enso Green Holdings Limited (EGHL)	Workgroup Member
Will Bowen	WB	UK Power Networks	Workgroup Member (Alternate)