

Annex 6 – CMP328 Pros and Cons of TPW and proposed DIA process

Document was created ahead of Workgroup Consultation and reflects Workgroup Member views. We specifically asked respondents to the Workgroup Consultation for any additional views – these have been added to this list

Workgroup Advantages of Third Party Works (TPW) Process	Workgroup Disadvantages of Third Party Works (TPW) Process
TPW works process is an established process which most or all DSOs/CUSC parties have had experience of	Historically not used by DSOs/CUSC parties to apply a charge to undertake a distribution impact assessment
Allows for a consistent approach to transmission connections which trigger the requirement for physical Distribution works.	Historically not used to document enduring non-build required parameters on transmission connections which impact the distribution network (e.g. Active Network Management/intertrip)
The TPW process is captured within CUSC.	No agreement on the level of information provided to DSOs by CUSC parties regarding the transmission connection
TPW process works well where there are one off physical works required to be undertaken by a DSO to facilitate a connection. It can also be used where there are no ongoing requirements beyond the completion of the task.	The process currently does not automatically include any provision for the contracts held between ESO and DNO/CUSC parties to be updated to reflect the new connection (in the same way as the Statement of Works/ Project Progression process allows for) – this is a separate process.
Direct contact between DNO and Transmission User means the Transmission User can request what they want to meet their connection.	Current arrangements mean that the customer must contact the relevant DSO for an assessment, which can result in misaligned work programmes across multiple connecting parties
	Limited visibility to DNO of wider transmission network conditions until and unless TPW is required
	Does not address how ESO will handle transmission connections which impact on Grid Supply Point headroom (with reference to Appendix G/Transmission Impact Assessment)

Annex 6 – CMP328 Pros and Cons of TPW and proposed DIA process

Document was created ahead of Workgroup Consultation and reflects Workgroup Member views. We specifically asked respondents to the Workgroup Consultation for any additional views – these have been added to this list

	Does not address the Cost Apportionment Factor (CAF)/Electricity Connection Charge Regulations (ECCR) gap between distribution and transmission customers. A DCUSA Mod would be required to address this.
	Does not address the conflict between a right to Transmission Entry Capacity (TEC) access and a non-build constraint solution proposed by a DNO to a transmission customer which could prioritise their own customers without TEC access
	Doesn't go far enough to address current issues with inconsistent publication of projects that have secured TEC. Will require full transparency and ideally publication to function optimally, which would also improve efficiency of assessment of all connection types by DNOs/customers

Annex 6 – CMP328 Pros and Cons of TPW and proposed DIA process

Document was created ahead of Workgroup Consultation and reflects Workgroup Member views. We specifically asked respondents to the Workgroup Consultation for any additional views – these have been added to this list

Workgroup Advantages of Distribution Impact Assessment (DIA) Process	Workgroup Disadvantages of Distribution Impact Assessment (DIA) Process
Provides an automatic facility for the DNOs to apply a charge to undertake a distribution impact assessment.	Additional time constraints for when an application for connection is concluded. With the sequential approach proposed, additional time would need to be added to Transmission works conclusion as customer would not wish TO commence works until DIA concluded thus delaying connection date
Makes provision for enduring non-build requirements on either or both DNO and transmission User connection	Not developed under the ENA Open Networks project and so unintended consequences may materialise
Provides a consistent level of information provided by ESO to DNOs to complete initial assessments	This has not been assessed as a queue milestone within the Queue Management open network product that this is needing to be achieved to proceed with connection. However, the Proposer noted that the queue management process has a milestone in Distribution offers for the Transmission Impact Assessment process
Provides customer with a single point of contact for any requirements on their connection (i.e. that the customer should only have to deal with the organisation that they applied to for a connection)	Does not address the conflict between a right to Transmission Entry Capacity (TEC) access and a non-build constraint solution proposed by a DNO to a transmission customer which could prioritise their own customers without TEC access

Annex 6 – CMP328 Pros and Cons of TPW and proposed DIA process

Document was created ahead of Workgroup Consultation and reflects Workgroup Member views. We specifically asked respondents to the Workgroup Consultation for any additional views – these have been added to this list

Ensures a clear channel of communication between all affected parties	Doesn't go far enough to address current issues with inconsistent publication of projects that have secured TEC. Will require full transparency and ideally publication to function optimally, which would also improve efficiency of assessment of all connection types by DNOs/customers
	Does not address how the ESO will handle transmission connections which impact on Grid Supply Point headroom (with reference to Appendix G/Transmission Impact Assessment)
Provides a means for DNOs to be informed of any connections which could have an impact on the distribution network and customers	Does not address how ESO will handle transmission connections which impact on GSP headroom (with reference to Appendix G/Transmission Impact Assessment)
Facilitates coordination and promotes a whole system approach	Transmission applicants lose control of part of their connection and reliant upon ESO to pass-on their priorities for the DIA (i.e. cost/time pressures which may affect the DNO's solution)
It is clear who is "triggering" and queue order is managed by the ESO; similar to the Statement of Works process which customers are often familiar with; has defined timescales; better visibility to DNO of conditions on the wider Transmission network, allowing a picture to be built over time which will inform discussions with their customers and future PP/SOWs; ESO, as the contractual counterparty to TOs, DNOs and to all Users with transmission access rights, has the necessary information to understand the impacts on parties, and challenge the proposed DIA offer.	Does not address the Cost Apportionment Factor (CAF)/Electricity Connection Charge Regulations (ECCR gap between distribution and transmission customers. A DCUSA Mod would be required to address this.