

Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma

CMP427: Update to the Transmission Connection Application Process for Onshore Applicants

Industry parties are invited to respond to this consultation expressing their views and supplying the rationale for those views, particularly in respect of any specific questions detailed below.

Please send your responses to cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com by **5pm on 26 January 2024**. Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration.

If you have any queries on the content of this consultation, please contact Catia Gomes catia.gomes@nationalgrideso.com or cusc.team@nationalgrideso.com.

Respondent details	Please enter your details	
Respondent name:	Claire Hynes & Tim Ellingham	
Company name:	RWE Renewables (Swindon) Ltd & RWE Supply & Trading	
Email address:	Claire.hynes@rwe.com	
Phone number:	07787273960	
Which best describes your organisation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer body <input type="checkbox"/> Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Generator <input type="checkbox"/> Industry body <input type="checkbox"/> Interconnector	<input type="checkbox"/> Storage <input type="checkbox"/> Supplier <input type="checkbox"/> System Operator <input type="checkbox"/> Transmission Owner <input type="checkbox"/> Virtual Lead Party <input type="checkbox"/> Other

I wish my response to be:
(Please mark the relevant box) Non-Confidential Confidential

Note: A confidential response will be disclosed to the Authority in full but, unless agreed otherwise, will not be shared with the Panel or the industry and may therefore not influence the debate to the same extent as a non-confidential response.

For reference the Applicable CUSC (non-charging) Objectives are:

- a) *The efficient discharge by the Licensee of the obligations imposed on it by the Act and the Transmission Licence;*
- b) *Facilitating effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity, and (so far as consistent therewith) facilitating such competition in the sale, distribution and purchase of electricity;*
- c) *Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency *; and*

d) *Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the CUSC arrangements.*

*The Electricity Regulation referred to in objective (c) is Regulation (EU) 2019/943 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 June 2019 on the internal market for electricity (recast) as it has effect immediately before IP completion day as read with the modifications set out in the SI 2020/1006.

Please express your views in the right-hand side of the table below, including your rationale.

Standard Workgroup Consultation questions		
1	Do you believe that the Original Proposal better facilitate the Applicable Objectives?	Mark the Objectives which you believe each solution better facilitates: Original <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D A - Positive –This will help to prevent speculative projects reserving a position in the connection queue without the intention of developing the site as demonstrated by the discussions with the Landlord. B – Positive - This modification will ensure that the applicant is in discussions with the landlord to develop an appropriately sized site for their technology which provides more fair and transparent grounds for the grid connection request and thus better facilitates competition between generators. C - Neutral D - Positive - This modification should help to reduce the extra administration caused by NGESO having to process speculative connection applications resulting in greater efficiency in the administration of the CUSC arrangements.
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Yes, there should not be any barrier to providing an LoA when a new connection application is undertaken after the implementation date.
3	Do you have any other comments?	No.
4	Do you wish to raise a Workgroup Consultation Alternative Request for the Workgroup to consider?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Click or tap here to enter text.

Specific Workgroup Consultation questions		
5	Do you believe that the proposed LoA meets the objectives set out by Ofgem and DESNZ in CAP? If not, please provide your rationale.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Yes, we consider that the standardised LoA's meet the requirements set out in the Joint Connection Application Plan to put in place an LoA that will <i>“provide confirmation that the project developer has formally engaged in discussions with the landowner(s) in respect of the rights needed to enable the construction of the project on their land, although it would not require evidence that the rights have been granted”</i> .
6	Do you believe that an LoA should have a validity period? If so, please provide a timescale and your rationale.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No A valid Letter of Authority provides confirmation that the developer has discussed leasing or obtaining land from the landlord and is not legally binding on either party. Milestone three in Appendix Q in the construction agreement requires evidence of land rights. It is therefore suitable that milestone three is utilised to provide the necessary evidence for the land that will be used for the project. The interim period between the LoA and milestone three provides the developer with an opportunity to negotiate the relevant parcel of land for it's project. The validity period of any LoA is for the discussion between the developer and the landlord and the only relevance to the ESO is that it is a valid LoA at the time of the connection application.
7	Do you agree, in principle, with the concept of an Energy Land Density table? If not, please provide your rationale.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No We are fully supportive of the ESO gaining an understanding of the minimum amount of land required for these technologies to be deployed. However, without the context of the type of technology and factors such as size of the wind turbine, number of MW's it produces, spacing required, we are concerned that these numbers will be misconstrued and used to penalise companies that have proposed a different density of technology for varying reasons. For example, the area required for a 2 hour battery is different to a 4 hour battery. The density of the materials used, Lithium Ion is available with multiple different chemistries - Nickel Manganese Cobalt, Lithium Iron Phosphate are two most common.. and they would not be in the same ratio. In future, solid state batteries may require a significantly different amount of space.

		<p>The current table needs to state what it's numbers are based on, to ensure a progressive two-way conversation with developers and to ensure that the ESO know what the de-minimis level is based on today and assess when it needs to be changed. Due to the transformation of technologies, it is also likely to be out of date quite quickly. This could be administratively burdensome to keep up to date in the guidance and so we leave it to the ESO to determine whether it is beneficial to them.</p>
8	<p>Do you agree with format and the categories proposed in the Energy Land Density table? If not, please provide your rationale.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Developers should be allowed to justify why they have a different density or a more novel solution. There may be benefit in providing a range of values and not just a de-minimis level for certain technologies to add greater granularity and more context to the discussions with the ESO.</p>
9	<p>Do you have different values that you can provide for the Energy Land Density table? If so, please provide your rationale.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>We provided our Energy Land Density numbers to NGENSO prior to the consultation. In the CCGT field, we consider that any CCGT is likely to come with Carbon Capture Storage (CCS) or hydrogen going forward. The footprint is likely to require more than just CCGT and therefore a range of values may be needed. If added, we suggest that you could utilise 45 acres for a new build 800MW CCGT plant with CCS. The number provided isn't scalable as we couldn't do 400MW on 22.5acres. This needs to be kept in mind for any MW/acre value for this technology.</p>
10	<p>Do you believe that the LoA should be in the form of a standard template? If not, please provide your rationale.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Yes, a standard template makes it easier for developers to utilise. Landlords will become familiar with the standard layout. Whilst bespoke LoAs would be more likely to increase concerns and cause legal advice to be sought more frequently.</p>
11	<p>Do you believe the use of the word "authorise" within the LoA, could have adverse legal consequences? If so, please provide your rationale.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>At distribution level, there is already a Letter of Authority and therefore the utilisation of the word authorise is not setting a precedent. The word 'authorisation' can mean to grant authority, to empower or formally approve. In this case, the Landlord is empowering the developer to be allowed to apply for a grid connection application on their</p>

		land so the wording is appropriate and aligns with existing industry practice.
12	Do believe the proposed LoA template is suitable for all jurisdictions (England & Wales, and Scotland)? If not, please provide your rationale.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No No comment.
13	Do you believe that the technology type should be included in the LoA template? If you not, please provide your rationale.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Yes, the technology type should reflect the transparent discussions that the User is having with the landlord.
14	Do you consider the exemption approach to deal with exceptional circumstances appropriate? If not please provide your rationale.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Yes, we agree in certain circumstances an exemption approach should be applied such as when a developer will need to utilise a compulsory purchase agreement on the land then they should not be required to request a LoA from the landlord.