

Meeting Summary

CISG Sub-Group - Connections strategic change & impact to CUSC (Meeting #2)

Date: 05/09/2023 **Location:** MS Teams
Start: 10:00am **End:** 12:30am

Participants

Attendee	Company	Attendee	Company
Camille Gilsean (CG)	ESO (Chair)	Alison Price (AP)	ESO (Tec Sec)
Joseph Henry (JH)	ESO (Presenter)	Laura Henry (JS)	ESO (Presenter)
Paul Mullen (PM)	ESO (Presenter)	Paul Youngman (PY)	Drax
Suzanne Law (SL)	SSE	Alex Ikonic (AI)	Orsted
Claire Hynes (CH)	RWE	Deborah MacPherson (DM)	Scottish Power Renewables
Alex Howison (AH)	Lowcarbon	Dennis Gowland (DG)	Research Relay Ltd
Grace March (GM)	Sembcorp	Garth Graham (GG)	SSE
Pedro Rodriguez (PR)	Lightsourcebp	Rose Harrison (RH)	ESO
Klaudia Staryzk (KS)	Ofgem	Shabana Akhtar (SA)	Ofgem
Paul Jones (PJ)	Uniper	Molly Nesbitt (MN)	Ofgem
Precious Nwokoma (PN)	Fred Olsen renewables		

Apologies: Will Kirk-Wilson (WK) and Djaved Rostrom (DR) - ESO

Please note: These notes are produced as an accompaniment to the slide pack, [link here](#):

Introduction and ways of working – CG

CG introduced herself to confirm that she is now chairing this meeting going forward. Since the last meeting Karen Thompson-Lilley has moved on to another role within the ESO.

The intent of these meetings remains the same.

Action log update - CG

Action 001 – provide comments on terms of reference by 26/7/23.

ESO received comments from two parties – agreed this action can now be closed.

Action 002 – TEC amnesty request

ESO to confirm if they will publish a summary of who has gone through TEC amnesty.

LH – Terminated customers will not be published as it can be seen as parties are either naturally removed from the TEC register or have a reduction in TEC. We do not want to name and shame customers. Questions were received in the meeting on timings and actual TEC reduction figure; LH confirmed that from a process perspective, the ESO are now liaising with impacted parties to confirm they want to terminate/reduce TEC – some parties have already confirmed that they no longer want to participate in the TEC amnesty. The ESO will follow a process where we will confirm terminations/reductions with relevant TO's, obtain final sums from TO's and update agreements. The timelines will not be the same for each party and all must be completed by September 2024 as per Ofgem's letter of comfort.

Once all the parties involved have made a decision either to reduce TEC or terminate, the ESO will communicate the actual reduction (rather than the expected 8.1GW applications received as part of the TEC amnesty).

Agreement that we close this action but **open a new action 014 for LH to update sub-group on what the TEC amnesty final figure is, once discussions with parties have concluded.**

Action 003 – Queue Management

ESO to confirm if stakeholders will have sight of the Queue Management guidance document.

LH – We will not be providing sight of the guidance document prior to an Ofgem decision, as the current draft covers a solution for the range of outlined solutions in the final report to Ofgem.

A point raised by GG later in the meeting, suggested that holding a session with stakeholders post Ofgem decision may add value by having the process steps validated by Users. The action was taken away to see if this could work in progress. Updated action 003 to reflect this.

For reference, CMP376 Queue Management documentation outlining the solution and WACM's can be found [here](#).

Action 004 – Action 011 & Action 013

ESO are to address questions raised by sub-group members on the non-firm process.

AP – Neither Will and Djaved from the ESO were able to attend the meeting today. They have provided an update for today's meeting – the non-firm product is still under development and Will and Djaved will come back to this sub-group to answer your questions when further information is available. The ESO understands the importance of allowing potential providers to stack services mindful of any system impact and transparency to facilitate efficient market operation.

Actions carried forward to next workgroup.

Action 012 – Non-firm and TNUoS taskforce

ESO to check with TNUoS taskforce as to why non-firm was removed from their scope of work.

CG – this action will be carried forward to next workgroup.

Terms of Reference (ToR) – JH

An updated terms of reference document were issued out as part of the pack for this meeting. GG had proposed some changes which JH proposed that we accept into the document – no one disagreed of this approach.

Feedback was also received from CH how ENA and DNO attendance at this meeting may help facilitate a whole system view. Whilst it was felt that we could not mandate them to attend as part of the Terms of Reference, it was agreed that we update the terms of reference with consideration of alignment with the ENA and DNO's to reflect an increase in whole system conversations being needed.

LH mentioned that ENA will be on the panel at October's Customer Seminar in London.

GG mentioned that seminars being held early Monday morning is difficult for commuters.

LH confirmed that the seminar date was moved in October due to the volume of people who registered to attend, with a bigger room being required. The conference centre could only accommodate the seminar on this date – but GG's feedback would be considered when planning seminars.

New action 015: JH to update ToR to include consideration of ENA and DNO liaison.

5-point plan – LH

LH updated the subgroup on the connections queue. Laura advised that the connections queue contracted background is still growing. There has been a 300% increase in applications since 2021, with dates being offered out into the 2030s. This encompassed 376GW of generation projects.

Data shows 70% of projects may never be built. Planning permission is an issue, leading to speculative applications preventing other customers for connection to the NETS. GG noted that there were reported changes to planning permission this morning regarding onshore wind. LH confirmed that 25GW a month is currently being offered a month.

LH showed a comparison of FES predictions vs current contracted projects by generation type. Most contracted positions are higher than FES, especially within storage. PY asked whether there was a feedback link to FES if reality is not matching with predictions. LH stated that the FES team are made aware of this but current contracted background much higher than FES which highlights the current issues in connections process. GM stated that there was a difference with the length of time regarding storage. Would be good to see this broken down.

New action 016: LH to review if Storage Contracted Generation needs to be broken down into duration timeframes.

GG stated storage stands out and it would be good to understand more around this project. The other technology types are not substantially different. A deep dive may be useful, linking into GMs previous point. LH takes this point on board. LH highlighted Fossil fuels and Offshore wind are also significantly higher.

LH gave an overview on 5PP – it was launched in Feb 2023 and are tactical initiatives in place to improve process ahead of connections reform.

TEC amnesty – first time this has been launched since 2013 and is a good way to progress projects out of the queue. 8.1GW of applications received but likely to reduce. Ofgem letter of comfort arrived in August and next steps are being confirmed with customers, with process to start as soon as ESO able.

Construction Planning assumptions previously held that 100% of projects connect. This is 30-40% in actuality. Subsequently, planning assumptions have been amended.

Treatment of Storage is now modelled as 0MW.

Both the work on Construction planning assumptions and Treatment of Storage should together reduce connections dates and works for customers.

The TO's are working at different timelines in identifying customers however the deadline for revised offers is the same across all TO's - 1. March 2024

NGET have agreed the methodology for CPA (Construction Planning Assumption) and should complete all studies by October. Scottish TOs close to finalising the methodology. NGET have received more expressions of interest.

To apply this to contracted background NGET said they would not be able to do this with current rate of application which subsequently led to the two-step offer programme.

PY asked around treatment of storage a 0MW and whether each TO planned to do this. LH confirmed that was the case and that this should reduce connections dates for those who have expressed an interest.

Queue Management – CMP376 final report was submitted to Ofgem in June and are awaiting a decision (due 15 September 2023). ESO raised Original and WACM7 (all agreements two years out from connection within 2 years of the mod being approved). Other WACMs (Workgroup Alternative CUSC Modifications) looked at issues such as dynamic QM.

ESO advised that the guidance document is under production, and that they are liaising with TOs. GG asked whether there were plans for the ESO to share guidance note ahead of publication to encompass stakeholder views and suggested that the 10-day decision/implementation could be used to do this via a stakeholder meeting. GG opined that this is important for stakeholders to have an opportunity to provide feedback to optimise the document. LH said there was no plans to do so as the permutations of the WACMs make the guidance note difficult to digest. GG clarified that he was talking about a review period after the decision. LH acknowledged this. ESO to take this away. LH said more comfortable with this approach. **(Reflected as an update to action 003).**

Non-Firm – Non-firm offer development was launched in June. This allows energy storage to connect on a non-firm basis as soon as enabling works completed. TOs taking slightly different approaches – NGET looking to get the ball rolling as soon as possible and have created a set of criteria which will be published ASAP - this is how they identify different batches.

Batch 1 due asap, awaiting legal clarification, as with TOCO appendices.

Scottish TOs are taking a slightly different approach.

PY asked whether storage would effectively go to zero in contracted positions. Initial thoughts are that we would want to still track the Contracted Generation for storage. **New action 017: LH to take this question away – links with Action 016 around how we display Contracted Generation for Storage**

LH mentioned that Storage will be modelled at 0MW for studies regardless of whether they are firm/non-firm (linked to treatment of storage on the 5 point-plan). **New action 018: to clarify with WK/DR.**

GG stated a concern on 3 different TO approaches. He put some comments in the chat which he wants to see addressed via a non-firm update:

- I. contractual certainty, to the User, around the very rare occasions when intact system conditions apply (including details of exactly what local constraint(s) will / will not be relevant to them) such that they will be clear about the probability of uncompensated curtailment (if they sign up to this new approach);
- II. consistency of the application of this contractually by the ESO to all relevant Users; and
- III. transparency to all market participants of the volume to be curtailed, uncompensated / out of merit, by local constraint(s), as well as (real time) when the volume has been so curtailed by the ESO.

New action 019: capture these as consideration points when WK/DR update sub-group on non-firm product.

GM asked if the Storage 0MW treatment was for network planning or T&T Model? **New action 020 for this point to be clarified.**

Connections Reform – PM

PM gave a verbal update on connections reform. PM advised that there were 78 consultation responses from a broad range of stakeholders and thanked stakeholders for contributions. Several stakeholders are being engaged to further understand their responses to make sure we are interpreting their responses correctly and to find out where pain points are to better understand. A few stakeholders are still to be contacted.

Non confidential responses will be published as soon as feasible.

The responses have been summarised internally, key points highlighted, and initial recommendations are being developed. PM will be back to future CISG groups to update.

Final recommendations are due for November publication. Reform will be discussed at the connection's seminar in October.

Next Steps - CG

AOB:

PJ wanted to raise that the reduction in pre-app meetings means Users are having to self-serve more. Some self-serve elements are difficult for people raising new applications to understand. Would like to know if any updates.

LH advised portal teams are developing maps to help customers see where there may be capacity on the network, as well as other tools.

In NGET, there are regional webinars/seminars happening which talks about some of this regarding preapplications.

PJ said it was not particularly clear from the advertising that this forum would deal with this.

DM asked whether there were further regional webinars planned by NGET. LH advised that there were several per month, customers contacted if applied within a specific invite. PJ advised first date 25th September, first region being Wales. DM asked whether this was going to Transmission (T) connected only or SoW/App G customers. LH advised it is for directly connected customers and embedded customers. PJ suggests the email states it is a breadth of stakeholders that NGET would like to talk to. DM asked for a contact. LH advised that DM checks with SPR's contract manager. LH confirmed that seminars targeted at T connected and Embedded Generation (EG).

CH advised it would be good to get guidance on non-firm connections also to see some form of standardised offering. This will be picked up under the updates WK/DR will provide to the sub-group,

PR asked whether the CMP376 decision would be applied retrospectively to projects blocking queue? LH advised that several WACMs look at doing this, so it is dependent on the Ofgem decision. Request that links to the CMP376 landing page be included in the minutes – the site can be accessed [here](#)

DG spoke of non-firm curtailment. May be worth checking in with SSED as they have experience in this area and that it may help with modelling – whether this is done regionally/nodally etc. Mapping exercise may prove to be useful. DG also mentioned that any holistic plan for the onshore network would need to be aware of length of non-firm. **Action 021 on WK/DR to follow this up.**

CG advised next meeting 26th September.

Action Item Log

Action items: In progress

ID	Description	Owner	Notes	Target Date	Status
001	Provide comments on draft ToR	All	Email comments to alison.price@nationalgrideso.com	26/07/23	Closed
002	TEC amnesty requests	LH	ESO to confirm if they will publish a summary of who has gone through TEC amnesty	05/09/23	Closed
003	Queue Management – uploading evidence	LH	Giving stakeholders sight of the guidance document before	26/09/23	C/Forward

			publication (updated to reflect that this is after the Ofgem decision)		
004	Non-firm updates	WK/DR	Update sub-group as non-firm solution develops	26/09/23	C/Forward
005	Non-firm and Capacity Market	WK/DR	Speak to DESNZ to confirm that they are aware that the non-firm initiative restricts Users from participating in the CM	26/09/23	C/Forward
006	Non-firm and Capacity Market	WK/DR	ESO to consider if they need to do more to make it clear that a move to a non-firm product restricts operability in some markets, such as the Capacity Market	26/09/23	C/Forward
007	Non-firm – Curtailment information	WK/DR	What information will the rest of market have on the quantum of curtailment behind T boundaries, both ahead of time and real time?	26/09/23	C/Forward
008	Non-firm – Curtailment times	WK/DR	How long is the curtailment to be active– in market timeframes for the products being used by the ESO, such as settlement period(s) in BM?	26/09/23	C/Forward
009	Non-firm – Curtailment queue	WK/DR	As curtailment is to be in reverse queue order (Djaved answer a few moments ago) will users have visibility of their place in the queue, relative to other users signed up to this option, for them to understand the probability of curtailment?	26/09/23	C/Forward
010	Non-firm - Process	WK/DR	<p>As more non-firm is connected on the network, how is it decided which gets turned off first? What is the process? How transparent will this be?</p> <p>For example, if there are two non-firm connections at one node – will both be restricted to 50%? Or only one asset 100% restricted? (Is it all or nothing? Or can there be partial?) etc. This needs to be completely transparent.</p> <p>Additional information added post mtg by LH: Will you rotate sites, scale, or something else?</p>	26/09/23	C/Forward

011	Non-firm - Process	WK/DR	How is this activity accounted for beside balancing actions – what conditions would the ESO be allowed to instruct non-firm to turn down/off, or when should they take a bid/offer from another asset at the same node – national energy balancing vs. locational system impacts. How are the local impacts defined/calculated? And is it only on an energy basis, or are other system products like Short Circuit Level and Reactive power also restricted?		C/Forward
012	Non-firm and TNUoS task force	KT	TNUoS taskforce have non-firm as out of scope however the ESO is trying to encourage it. Reach out to TNUoS taskforce to discuss why it may not be in their scope of work	26/09/23	C/Forward
013	Late question – received post meeting from LW: Curtailment - interruptions	WK/DR	On sign-up, a User may agree to be interrupted x times per year. Should more sites subsequently connect, can NGESO increase the triggers that interrupt me?	26/09/23	C/Forward
014	TEC amnesty	LH	Confirm the actual TEC amnesty figure against the published expected 8.1GW	26/09/23	New
015	Terms of Reference	JH	Update ToR to include liaison with DNO's and ENA	26/09/23	New
016	Storage as contracted Generation	LH	Consider breaking down storage based on duration timeframes	26/09/23	New
017	Storage modelling of 0MW	LH	Should the Connections queue for Storage show contracted and non-firm position?	26/09/23	New
018	Storage modelling	WK/DR	Confirm if Storage is modelled at 0MW for studies regardless of whether they are firm/non-firm	26/09/23	New
019	Non-firm topics which need confirmation	WK/DR	(1) contractual certainty, to the User, around the very rare occasions when intact system conditions apply (including details of exactly what local constraint(s) will / will not be relevant to them) such that they will be clear about the probability of uncompensated curtailment (if they sign up to this new approach);	26/09/23	New

(2) consistency of the application of this contractually by the ESO to all relevant Users; and
(3) transparency to all market participants of the volume to be curtailed, uncompensated / out of merit, by local constraint(s), as well as (real time) when the volume has been so curtailed by the ESO

020	Storage assumption 0MW	WK/DR	Is the 0MW treatment for network planning or T&T Model?	26/09/23	New
021	Scottish and Southern experience in how stacking works	WK/DR	Reach out to see how non-firm operates in regions where this is already in existence	26/09/23	New
