

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status	Workgroup Closed
1	WG 1	Ofgem	To provide clarification on the current interpretation of the CUSC and the (NESO and TO) licence obligations, specifically whether TOs and NESO are required to offer the earliest possible connection date when issuing CMP435 offers (including where this may result in a project having a non-firm position for a period when this was not the case with their Existing Agreement) and whether changes to connection dates as a result of delays to transmission infrastructure can already be accommodated under existing arrangements, ie reflected in the connection dates set out in updated offers.	Ofgem and TOs provided statements to the Workgroup at WG 3.	WG2	Closed	WG3
2	WG 1	TP and TO Workgroup members	As per Action 1 and including: To provide a clear statement of their interpretation and current approach, including any regulatory or statutory basis for offering the earliest possible connection date, and to confirm how they are currently handling delay requests in practice. Additional wording added at WG2: TOs should ensure their responses clearly reference the specific licence conditions, CUSC wording, or any external letters they are relying on, so that workgroup members can align and compare these with Ofgem's response to Action 1.	Ofgem and TOs provided statements to the Workgroup at WG 3.	WG2	Closed	WG3
3	WG 1	MD	Proposer to consider whether any supporting evidence or examples from TO engagement can be shared with the Workgroup to support understanding of the issue.		WG2	Closed	WG2
4	WG 1	TP/MD	TP to share up to date baselines with MD. MD to add legal text to these.	Action completed.	WG2	Closed	WG2
5	WG 1	TOs	TOs to provide a qualitative impact assessment to help the workgroup understand how this modification could impact the Joint Industry Plan (JIP) AKA Existing Agreement Timeline	NESO to provide data from RFI and TOs make an assessment based on that. Superseded by Action 25 for NESO to provide data.	WG2	Closed	
6	WG2	RM	Confirm - What ability do NESO have to ensure TOs are aligning connection dates and to change the earliest customer connection dates in Scheme Briefing Notes (SBN) after a TO has issued a TOCO to NESO.	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 closed at WG5.	WG3	Closed	WG5
7	WG2	TOs	TOs to consider whether a high-level description of the assessment process can be provided to the workgroup. If not feasible, TOs will confirm this and the action may be closed	National Grid Transmission (NGET) webinar shared with Workgroup members. RW shared slides with the Workgroup at WG4.	WG3	Closed	WG4
8	WG2	IV	Slides to be shared within the workgroup to support understanding of impacts (from Action 2)	Slides shared to the Workgroup at WG3.	WG3	Closed	WG3
9	WG2	Ofgem	Ofgem to consider whether changes or clarification to licence conditions are required to enable connection date delays without requiring a full modification application, or to avoid penalising TOs for accommodating such delays.	Ofgem have provided correspondence and confirmation that their role at workgroups will be to listen and will not be providing comment or clarification. Ofgem confirmed that they wish to listen to WGs and not provide comments.	WG3	Closed	WG7
10	WG2	RM	confirm the correct position on whether a Gate 2 agreement must be signed before a gated / non-gated modification can be submitted, given conflicting guidance. (The action arose when IV raised a point about NESO guidance on whether a Gate 2 offer must be signed before a modification (or delay request) can be submitted.)	Gate 2 agreement must be signed before a gated /non-gated modification can be submitted, however RM needs to look at other options and so a new Action was taken (Action 18).	WG3	Closed	WG4
11	WG2	MD	A summary slide or section that brings together all relevant inputs and references, including NESO guidance and relevant CUSC provisions (e.g. milestones, exceptions processes), to show how they interact with the CMP471 proposal. To improve clarity and traceability across: NESO guidance (e.g. milestone extensions due to reform delays) Existing CUSC provisions (e.g. Section 16.5 exceptions) The proposed CMP471 legal text To help the workgroup understand how the different mechanisms work together in practice	[WG4] MD advised that draft legal text has been developed, but the key deliverable is updated NESO guidance to support CMP471. He is awaiting a proposal from RM/NESO and has offered to help draft the changes if needed. [WG5] 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.	WG3	Closed	WG9
12	WG2	RM	Confirm whether it is preferable (and feasible) for connection date delay requests and associated milestone/exception requests to be handled together as a single process, or continue being managed separately across different NESO teams. I Workgroup it was highlighted that: Connection date delay requests go through one route (applications → TOs → contracts) Milestone exceptions (e.g. QM milestones) are handled by a different team/process There was concern this could create: <u>Inefficiency</u>	Provided by RM.	WG3	Closed	WG3
13	WG2	TP/NESO	Consider STCP Modification process and impacts.	STCP to be shared with the Workgroup at WG3.	WG3	Closed	WG4
14	WG2	MD	Consider impact on DNOs and embedded generations. NESO to take away and confirm how the process works for DNO/embedded projects, specifically: •How connection date delay requests are handled in practice •How Appendix G updates feed through the process •Whether and how this impacts S-curves, securities, and liabilities.	MD confirmed that CMP471 will focus on transmission-connected users, as accommodating all distribution-connected generators would introduce additional complexity. Any solution for DNO-connected customers would likely need to be developed separately by DNOs.	WG3	Closed	WG4

15	WG3	TP/RB/RM	Set up cross party alignment session (Ofgem / TOs / NESO) •Formal action to bring parties together to align interpretation of: oUSC and Licence interpretation oConnection date flexibility oProcess approach•	Meeting took place between Ofgem and Tos. Tos provided Ofgem with their interpretation. Ofgem did not provide their interpretation as they felt it was not material to the modification.	WG4	Closed	WG7
16	WG3	TB/RM	Confirm ownership and update route for guidance. Clarify: oWho owns Queue Management (QM) guidance oWho owns Gated Modification Guidance oHow updates will be managed alongside the mod		WG4	Closed	WG5
17	WG3	TP	Follow-up session with proposer and NESO to review legal text and Gated Modification Guidance updates.		WG4	Closed	WG7
18	WG3	RM	As a follow up to Action 10 – RM to confirm potential options/changes to current position (Changes can only be made once the connection offer is signed.)	RM explained the point around if changes can be made before a connection offer has been signed.	WG4	Closed	WG5
19	WG4	TB	Mod App Change - TB to seek clarification from NESO on specific points raised about the scoping exercise—particularly: The intent and implications of the exercise, Ambiguity around whether participation is effectively required, How it interacts with (or differs from) CMP471 activities.	Covered and provided in latest NESO Connections Reform webinar.	WG5	Closed	WG5
20	WG4	MD/TOs	Consider and feedback to Workgroup - process consideration regarding impacts on Transmission Owners (TOs). WG highlighted that: Where a host TO processes connection date changes, this could affect other (affected) TOs. Changes in programme, scope, or timing could require: The affected TO to update their own offers, and Additional coordination between TOs.	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	WG5	Closed	WG7
21	WG4	IV	Consider - minimum set of objective criteria to prevent non-viable requests progressing through the process. IV to take away and develop a set of "showstopper" / entry criteria from a TO perspective (i.e. situations where a connection date delay request should not proceed), and Bring these back to the Workgroup to test and refine.	Moved Owner to IV who will bring a set of showstopper scenarios to WG8.	WG8	Closed	WG8
22	WG4	TB/RW	Operational impact on NESO. Consider how NESO would practically manage the process being proposed – particularly the coordination between NESO and TOs when: Assessing delay requests, and Managing any "in-between" scenarios where a request cannot be fully accommodated.	To be considered in consequential STCP modification.	WG5	Closed	WG8
23	WG4	TB/RW	NESO to review and confirm how the "application of the User Commitment Methodology" interacts with the securities freeze, including: Whether updated costs/contract positions would be reflected immediately, and Whether securities (e.g. cancellation charge secured amounts) would actually be reissued or remain frozen.	See email from NESO	WG5	Closed	WG4
24	WG4	MD/TB/RW	Transitional Offers - Action on MD: to consider whether and how transitional offers should be included within scope, taking into account feasibility and impacts. Action on NESO: to clarify how transitional offers are currently treated within the gated process, which will inform whether they should be included in CMP471.	Superseeding by action 28. RM response: If this is in reference to customer's that received transitional offers in 2024/25. In which case, subject to them submitting a mod app they were able to apply for a gate 2 offer. If they met the Gate 2 criteria and capacities, then they will be studied alongside the other projects for a gate 2 offer, this will then firm up their connection point and connection date from the indicative ones included in their transitional offer.	WG8	Closed	WG8
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.	RM 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 WG requested further break down of the data which - RM to provide after WG. NESO provided additional breakdown of data: [NESO received 156 responses for connection date delays; the split is as follows: NGET - 87 (55.8%) , SPT - 39 (25%) , SSENT 30 (19.2%)]	WG8	Closed	WG12
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.	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. WG members questioned this timeframe and asked for further clarification at WG12. Additional clarification provided after meeting with NESO IT and the 4 Proposers. Action closed at WG12.	WG8	Closed	WG12
27	WG8	TB/MD	NESO rep to arrange a follow-up session with the proposer, NESO and NESO Legal to review outstanding guidance and legal drafting points.	Meeting took place, action closed.	WG8	Closed	WG10

28	WG8	MD/RM/TOS	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.	Issue had effectively been overtaken by subsequent legal text discussions and broader Workgroup consideration of transitional arrangements. Closed at WG11.	WG8	Closed	WG11
----	-----	-----------	--	---	-----	--------	------