

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:	Joseph Henry	
Company name:	ESO	
Email address:	Joseph.henry2@nationalgrideso.com	
Phone number:	07970673220	
Which best describes your organisation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer body <input type="checkbox"/> Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator <input type="checkbox"/> Generator <input type="checkbox"/> Industry body <input type="checkbox"/> Interconnector	<input type="checkbox"/> Storage <input type="checkbox"/> Supplier <input checked="" 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	<p>Do you believe that the Original Proposal better facilitate the Applicable Objectives?</p>		
<p>Mark the Objectives which you believe each solution better facilitates:</p>			
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 40%; padding: 2px;">Original</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D</td> </tr> </table>		Original	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D
Original	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D		
<p>Overall we believe that the Original Proposal better facilitates the Applicable Objectives.</p> <p>Against Objective A, by raising the bar for Onshore Connection Applications to the NETS we believe that this will allow the ESO to manage the connections applications process in a more efficient manner, preventing speculative applications without any landowner engagement from entering the queue. The modification will enable the connections process to be more robust, allowing the ESO to establish that conversations have taken place between the User and the landowner in each new application. It will bring about efficiencies in that reducing speculative applications will reduce our current attrition rate of projects which do not progress which currently sits at ~60-70%. We agree with the request from Ofgem and DESNZ as part of the Connections Action Plan to raise this modification on this basis, and agree that it should be implemented as soon as feasible to increase the robustness of the connections application process.</p> <p>A reduction in speculative applications will also lead to increased efficiencies for the ESO insofar as inefficient network capacity allocation and inaccurate transmission network planning will reduce. This will ultimately lead to lower network costs, as well as shorter timescales for connection dates being offered to projects.</p> <p>Against Objective B, we believe this modification will allow fairer and more efficient access for new generation projects to connect to the NETS, and well as increasing meritocracy within the process by supporting genuine applications to connect to the NETS. Raising the bar on</p>			

		<p>this process and making it more robust can only be beneficial.</p> <p>Against Objective C, we believe this modification is neutral.</p> <p>Against Objective D, this modification will increase efficiency in management of the connections application process by reducing speculative applications. It will also provide clarity within the CUSC and enhance the robustness of the connections application process.</p>
2	Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>We support the implementation approach that we have proposed (10 Working Days). We do recognise however that there may be need for a short transition period to enable the process to be embedded, to embed implementation checks. We are considering whether there may be benefit extending the initial 10 working days outlined in our Original Proposal to potentially facilitate this implementation.</p> <p>We also propose to produce a guidance document to aid the launch of this process and increase industry understanding of how this will work in practice.</p>
3	Do you have any other comments?	No
4	Do you wish to raise a Workgroup Consultation Alternative Request for the Workgroup to consider?	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>

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.	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>We agree with the rationale put forward by Ofgem and DESNZ in the Connections Action Plan and believe the implementation of CMP427 Original Proposal satisfies the objectives outlined therein.</p> <p>We recognise that the LoA process will need further enhancements to solidify its robustness in regards to</p>
---	---	---

		Modification Applications and Duplications. We are also working with the Connections Process Advisory Board (CPAG) to highlight further areas to enhance the process as part of a secondary modification to be raised as part of Connections Reform if CMP427 is approved.
6	Do you believe that an LoA should have a validity period? If so, please provide a timescale and your rationale.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No We recognise the discussions within the workgroup in regard to a validity period and suggest that a period of 6-12 months should be sufficient as the requirements of the LoA are superseded by milestones set out in the Queue Management process resultant of CMP376.
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 The table will help the ESO to identify projects which are not credible for a realistic application. This adds further robustness to the process. We support that this table is not codified but instead will form part of ESO published guidance which will be reviewed periodically. We also highlight that we will require a level of discretion and that the table acts merely as an indicative tool which Users can utilise as guidance for their specific applications.
8	Do you agree with format and the categories proposed in the Energy Land Density table? If not, please provide your rationale.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No We believe that the correct format and categories have been captured (they mirror those highlighted on the application form) and thank workgroup members for their support in the production of the table during the workgroup process.
9	Do you have different values that you can provide for the Energy Land Density table? If so, please provide your rationale.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No We welcome any feedback to make the table fit for purpose and hope that feedback will come as part of this consultation process.
10	Do you believe that the LoA should be in the form of a standard template? If not, please provide your rationale.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No The standardisation of the template creates a level playing field for all connections applications and reduces the burden on both ESO in administering the process and assessing the LoA. We do however recognise that from time to time there may be a need for elements of the template to be amended. We will have ultimate discretion to accept any LoA and would endeavour in such

		instances to provide feedback on LoAs which are not acceptable to the ESO.
11	Do you believe the use of the word “authorise” within the LoA, could have adverse legal consequences? If so, please provide your rationale.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Using “authorise” could suggest that the Developer requires “permission” to make/has an active role in an application. The User does not require authorisation from the landowner to make the application, the purpose of the LoA is to demonstrate that they have held discussions with the Land Owner in regards to making an application to connect to the NETS. The ESO would use this LoA to confirm that this is the case. So whilst no adverse legal consequences it could be misleading in intent
12	Do believe the proposed LoA template is suitable for all jurisdictions (England & Wales, and Scotland)? If not, please provide your rationale.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No The options to select relevant jurisdictions are clearly outlined in the proposed templates.
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 We believe that having this additional information would be beneficial in adding clarity to the nature of the discussions, however we note that this information is already included in the Connection application process.
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 We recognise, particularly in regard to applications where Compulsory Purchase Orders are involved, that an exemptions process may be required, that it may not be practical for a User to obtain a LoA from the Landowner. We are in agreement with the suggestion from the workgroup that providing for this circumstance may be required in this matter, and that it gives the Authority the option to include exemptions as part of CMP427. We would see that this would provide an option for such projects but think that further workgroup discussion is required on this matter, if indeed an Alternative is forthcoming. One particular element we feel needs further consideration is which organisations could provide permission for this exemptions. We agree that Secretary of State is a viable option, but also consider that the

		Authority may be well placed to provide such exemptions also.
--	--	---