

Connections Reform - Policy Consultation on Required Licence Changes Response Form

We are consulting on conditions in the Electricity System Operator, Transmission and Distribution licences in relation to the ongoing connections reform process, which aims to enable quicker connection for ready-to-connect projects that align with strategic energy system plans and provide a more coordinated and efficient network design for connections.

We would like views from stakeholders with an interest in the electricity connections process and the ongoing reforms. We particularly welcome responses from connection customers, developers and network companies. We also welcome responses from other stakeholders including members of the public.

Your feedback is important to this process. Please take this opportunity to provide any feedback that you may have. To aid your response, each question is linked back to the relevant document for ease of reference.

We encourage you to read the Connections Reform - Policy Consultation on Required Licence Changes and the subsidiary documents:

- **Annex A:** Proposed NESO Licence Modifications; and
- **Annex B:** Proposed Transmission Standard Licence Modifications before responding to the consultation questions.

This document outlines the questions for this consultation and once the consultation is closed, we will consider all responses.

Please provide your feedback using this response form and sending a copy to connections@ofgem.gov.uk by 5pm on 6th January 2025.

We encourage early submission ahead of the deadline where possible to aid the processing of responses.

Contents

Connections Reform - Policy Consultation on Required Licence

Changes Response Form..... 1

Data and confidentiality..... 3

Consultation questions..... 4

Proposed Electricity System Operator Licence Conditions..... 4

General approach to changes to the Electricity System Operator licence
..... 4

Section A: Definitions and Interpretation 5

Section E: Industry Codes and charging..... 6

Proposed Electricity Transmission Standard Licence Conditions... 12

General approach to modification of the Electricity Transmission
Standard Licence Conditions..... 12

Section D: Transmission Owner Standard Conditions 12

Section E: Offshore Transmission Owner Standard Conditions..... 16

Distribution Standard Licence Conditions – Policy Intent 17

Chapter 1: Interpretation and application 17

Chapter 2: General obligations and arrangements..... 17

Chapter 4: Arrangements for the provision of services 18

Chapter 5: Industry codes and agreements..... 18

New Conditions19

Proposed Electricity Transmission Special Licence Conditions 20

Proposed Electricity Distribution Special Licence Conditions 20

Proposed Electricity Interconnector Standard Licence Conditions 20

Proposed Electricity Generation Standard Licence Conditions 20

General feedback..... 21

Data and confidentiality

Contact name: Richard Hillam

Role title: Country Manager

Company name: Aukera Energy

Telephone number: 07919 413997

Email address: richard.hillam@aukera.energy

Date of submission: 03 Jan

Do you want your response treated as confidential? Please choose the option that is relevant to you.

Yes / No No

Please tell us if parts of your responses or your whole response contains confidential information and explain why below.

[Write your response here]

Consultation questions

Proposed Electricity System Operator Licence Conditions

General approach to changes to the Electricity System Operator licence

1. Do you agree that licence changes are necessary to adequately facilitate the policy intent of the reformed Connection Process, if it is approved?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

2. Do you agree with the approach summarised in paragraphs 3.2 to 3.8?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

3. Do you agree that we have considered all relevant areas of the licence which might need modifications, and that we have proposed changes in relation to all relevant matters? If there are areas we need to consider further, please specify. Also, please specify any matters that we have addressed but which you do not think should be relevant.

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

Section A: Definitions and Interpretation

Condition A1:

4. Do you agree that the new definitions as set out in paragraphs 3.12 to 3.19 and draft legal text in condition A1, as set out in Annex A, are necessary to and adequately facilitate the policy intent of the reformed Connection Process?

Please provide the reasons for your answer and any alternative suggestions if you disagree.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

5. Do you agree that no changes are required to the existing definitions in condition A1, as set out in Annex A, and that the proposed new changes are enough?

Please provide the reasons for your answer and identify any changes you consider to be needed.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

Condition B3: Conduct of ISOP Business

6. Do you agree this clarification in paragraph 3.21 and proposed text in condition B3, as set out in Annex A, is required?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

Condition C11: Requirements of a Connect and Manage Connection

7. Do you agree with the policy intent behind the changes we are proposing that these types of "full" offers will only be made to the "non-gated" applications or "Gate 2" applications?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.



Making a positive difference
for energy consumers

Error! Unknown document property name.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

8. Do you agree that proposed text in condition C11, as set out in Annex A, gives appropriate effect to the policy intent?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

Section E: Industry Codes and charging

Condition E2: Connection and Use of System Code (CUSC)

9. Do you agree with the policy intent behind the changes we are proposing in paragraphs 3.28 and 3.29?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

10. Do you agree that proposed text in condition E2, as set out in Annex A, gives appropriate effect to the policy intent? Do you think any further changes would be appropriate?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

Condition E12 (New): Connection Criteria Methodology

11. Do you agree with the proposal for the licensee to create and maintain the Connections Criteria Methodology as in paragraphs 3.30 and 3.34?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

12. Do you agree with the objectives and scope of the Connection Criteria Methodology as in paragraphs 3.32 and 3.33, respectively?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

13. Do you agree that the new condition E12, as set out in Annex A, provides the right level of governance and industry engagement to ensure that the Connections Criteria Methodology is developed and modified in a robust manner?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

Condition E13 (New): Connection Network Design Methodology

14. Do you agree with the objectives of the Connections Network Design Methodology as in paragraph 3.38?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

15. Do you agree with the scope of the Connections Network Design Methodology as set out in paragraph 3.35 and 3.37 is aligned with the TMO4+ connection reform process?



Making a positive difference
for energy consumers

Error! Unknown document property name.

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

16. We have kept the licence change broad for 'preparing offers' as in paragraph 3.37. Should we be more specific with the scope to include further description in the licence that it will determine the queue order, study applications and assess the infrastructure required to enable/prepare offers to enter into a "Gate 2" agreement?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

17. Do you agree that the proposed addition of conditions E13 , as per Annex A, and in this section provides the right level of governance and industry engagement to ensure that the Connections Network Design Methodology is developed and modified in a robust manner?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

Condition E14 (New): Project Designation Methodology

18. Do you believe the NESO should be able to designate projects for prioritisation in the circumstances as specified in paragraph 3.42?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

19. Do you agree that the NESO should only be able to designate projects after a period of consultation as in paragraph 3.43, for existing agreements also in the first application window?

If not, please explain your reasoning, along with alternative suggestions if appropriate.

Yes/ No [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

[Write your response here]

20. Do you agree that the proposed additions of conditions E14, as set out in Annex A, provide the right level of governance and industry engagement to ensure that the Project Designation Methodology is developed and modified in a robust manner?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

[Write your response here]

Condition E15: Requirement to offer terms

21. Do you agree with the requirements that an application window as in paragraph 3.56 is practical and sufficient? Please provide the reason for your answer. What is the right maximum and/or minimum period prescribed in the licence for how long the application window should be open? Is the minimum requirement of at least once every year sufficient?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No No

We understand the term annually to mean once every 12 months but worry this could be interpreted as meaning once in each calendar year. Likewise we note the use of the term *should* rather than *must*, and believe that this creates a degree of ambiguity over the degree of requirement on NESO to comply with this clause. We would therefore propose that paragraph E15.9 should read as:

'These application periods *must* occur at least once every 12 months...'

We would also propose that if three months' notice is required to be given ahead of the opening of an application window, the application window need not be more than two weeks. As per our responses below, we believe that there is scope to complete the entire application window and issue offers in a shorter time frame than currently proposed and that this is important to giving developers clarity on the outcome of their connections application soon as possible.

22. Do you agree that 6 months as mentioned in paragraph 3.59 to provide an offer once the application window closes is adequate? Do you agree with our proposed option regarding timing for the NESO to make offers, or do you prefer any of the alternative options set out in paragraph 3.60? Are there any other options we should be considering? Please provide the reasons for your answer and suggest alternative.

Yes/ No [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

We believe that there is scope to complete the entire application window and the issuing of offers in a shorter timeframe than currently proposed, given the work which has been carried out to date on 2030 and 2035 pathways and also on the existing connection agreements with the existing queue.

This could be achieved through shortening the application window and also the five-month period Proposed for the Gate 1 Reservation + Gate 2 Design Process.

We would also highlight that it is imperative that each application window has concluded and offers have been issued before the subsequent application window opens, in order to allow projects which have not attained Gate 2 to re-apply in the subsequent application window.

If this is not the case, it will be possible for projects in later allocation rounds to jump ahead of projects issued with Gate 1 offers in the preceding application window as set out in the following example:

- Solar Project X applies for a Gate 2 offer in application window 1;
- It is unsuccessful as technology cap in the region has been breached by earlier projects and it is therefore issued with a Gate 1 offer in Month 9;
- It has already missed the deadline to apply in application window 2 so now must wait until window 3 before it can reapply for a Gate 2 offer;
- Solar Project Y applies for a Gate 2 offer in application window 2 and as a result of projects in application window 1 not signing their Gate 2 offers there is now headroom to allow this project to align with the regional 2030 pathway and it is, therefore, issued with a Gate 2 offer. This means it has now jumped ahead of Project X;
- Project X applies for a Gate 2 offer in application window 3 but the technology cap for the relevant region has already been met by the sum of offers accepted in application window 1 and application window 2 so it remains at Gate 1;
- Project Y has, therefore, being able to jump ahead of Project X despite the fact that Project X had an earlier connection date and was first to apply for a Gate 2 offer.

We would strongly argue that paragraph E15.9 must, therefore, clearly state that an application window cannot open until the prior application window has concluded and all Gate 1 and Gate 2 offers have been issued. This will ensure that all projects have clarity on the current status of their connection offer/agreement in any application window, which we would argue is essential to ensuring the fair and efficient functioning of the new connections process.



Making a positive difference
for energy consumers

Error! Unknown document property name.

23. Do you agree with our proposed approach of specifying which type of applications get which type of offers as in paragraphs 3.52 to 3.55? Does this cover all type of applications?

Please provide the reason for your answer and mention if any type of applications is not captured in here.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

24. Do you agree that the proposed legal text in condition E14, as set out in Annex A, meets the policy intent above?

Please provide the reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]



Making a positive difference
for energy consumers

Error! Unknown document property name.

Proposed Electricity Transmission Standard Licence Conditions

General approach to modification of the Electricity Transmission Standard Licence Conditions

25. Do you agree with our approach mentioned in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.3?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

26. Do you agree that we have considered all the areas of the licence which might need modifications?

Please provide the reasons for your answer and specify if you think we have missed some areas.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

Section D: Transmission Owner Standard Conditions

Condition D1: Interpretation of Section D

27. Do you think any other modifications to definitions are required for the transmission licence in addition to the ones proposed for the System Operator Licence in paragraphs 3.12 to 3.19, in the consultation document?

Please provide a reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

28. Do you agree that the proposed text in SLC D1, as set out in Annex B, meets the policy intent?

Please provide a reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

29. Would you suggest any changes to the new and existing definitions in SLC D1 that are pertinent to Connections Reform?

Please provide a reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

**Condition D4A: Obligations in relation to offers for connection etc.
(Transmission Owners)**

30. Do you agree with the policy intent and the rationale described in the paragraphs 4.6 to 4.10, in respect of the changes to SLC D4A.1, in the consultation document?

Please provide a reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

31. Do you agree with the proposed changes to the text of SLC D4A.1, as set out in Annex B?

If you disagree or partially agree, please provide a reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

D4A.2- New proposed Paragraph 2 – requirements to offer terms requirements to offer to enter into agreement with the ISOP and provisions for that offer

32. Do you agree with the policy intent and the rationale for the proposed changes described in the paragraphs 4.11 to 4.13, in respect of the changes to SLC D4A.2, in the consultation document?

Please provide a reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

33. Do you agree that the proposed changes to the text of the new paragraph 2 of SLC D4A, as set out in Annex B, effectively facilitate the policy intent?

Please provide a reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

D4A.2, D4A.3, D4A.4, D4A.5- Proposed paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6 (formerly paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5)

34. Do you agree with the policy intent described in paragraph 4.17, in respect of the changes suggested in paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5, now amended to become paragraph 3, 4, 5 and 6, of SLC D4A, in the consultation document?

Please provide a reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

35. Do you agree that the proposed changes to the text of the amended paragraph 3, 4, 5 and 6 of SLC D4A, as set out in Annex B, effectively facilitate the policy intent?

Please provide a reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

Condition D16: Requirements of a connect and manage connection

36. Do you agree with the policy intent and the rationale in respect of the proposed changes to SLC D16 as described in paragraphs 4.19 to 4.23, in the consultation document?

Please provide a reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

37. Do you agree that the proposed changes to the text of SLC D16, as set out in Annex B, effectively facilitate the policy intent?

Please provide a reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

New Condition D18: Requirements to comply with connection network design methodology for Use of System and connection (Transmission Owners)

38. Do you agree with the policy intent behind the proposed new licence condition as explained in paragraphs 4.24 to 4.26, in respect to the proposed SLC D18, in the consultation document?

Please provide a reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

39. Do you agree that the proposed text gives appropriate effect to the specific policy intent, as detailed in Annex B?

Please provide a reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

Section E: Offshore Transmission Owner Standard Conditions

Condition E17: Obligations in relation to offers for connection etc. (Offshore Transmission Owners)

40. Do you agree with the policy intent and rationale in respect of the changes proposed to SLC E17, in paragraphs 4.28 to 4.34, in the consultation document?

Please provide a reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

41. Do you agree that the proposed changes to the text in SLC E17, as set out in Annex B, effectively facilitate the policy intent?

Please provide a reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

New Condition E25: Requirements to comply with connection network design methodology for Use of System and connection (Offshore Transmission Owners)

42. Do you agree with the policy intent behind the proposed new licence condition as explained in paragraph 4.35, in respect of the SLC E25, in the consultation document?

Please provide a reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

43. Do you agree that the proposed text of the new condition, as detailed in Annex B, gives effect to the policy intent?

Please provide a reason for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

Distribution Standard Licence Conditions – Policy Intent

Chapter 1: Interpretation and application

Condition 1: Definitions for the standard conditions

44. Do you agree that changes are likely be required to some of the definitions within licence condition 1?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

Chapter 2: General obligations and arrangements

Condition 4: No abuse of the licensee's special position

45. Do you consider any modifications to licence condition 4 are required?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]



Making a positive difference
for energy consumers

Error! Unknown document property name.

Chapter 4: Arrangements for the provision of services

Condition 12: Requirement to offer terms for Use of System and connection

46. Do you agree with the policy intent to modify licence conditions 12.1 and 12.4 under both scenarios?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

Condition 19. Prohibition of discrimination under Chapters 4 and 5

47. Do you agree with our view that no changes to licence condition 19 are necessary under any of the two scenarios?

If no or you partially agree, please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

48. If you disagree, what kind of change to the licence condition 19 do you believe is necessary?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

[Write your response here]

Chapter 5: Industry codes and agreements

Condition 20. Compliance with Core Industry Documents

49. Do you see any risk related to introducing an obligation for DCUSA licensees to comply with the Clean Power 2030 Action Plan and SSEP?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]



Making a positive difference
for energy consumers

Error! Unknown document property name.

50. Do you agree with the changes suggested to licence condition 20?

If no or you partially agree, please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

Condition 12A. Requirement to progress User applications into the Gated Window process

51. Do you agree with the proposal to define a new licence condition 12A.1 – requirement to perform “Gate 2” checks in line with the NESO methodology?

Please provide the reasons for your answer.

Yes/ No Click or tap here to enter text.

[Write your response here]

52. Do you agree with the proposal to define a new licence condition 12A.2 – requirement to perform “Gate 2” checks in a timely manner? If so, do you consider the approach to the condition should be principles-based or prescriptive?

Please provide any information / evidence you can to support your response.

Yes/ No Yes

As a development team with significant experience of transmission and distribution connection applications we would urge Ofgem to take a prescriptive approach with ambitious but realistic deadlines defined within which the DNOs are required to perform these checks and all other aspects of processing connections applications.

New Conditions

New Conditions 12A.3 and 12A.4 - Submission of projects for transmission assessment

53. Do you agree with the proposal to define new licence conditions 12A.3 and 12A.4 - this would introduce a requirement to submit projects for transmission assessment within a timely manner?

Please provide any information / evidence you can to support your response.

Yes/ No Yes

We would also stress the need for clear penalties wherever this requirement was not met.

Proposed Electricity Transmission Special Licence Conditions

54. Do you think any Electricity Transmission Special Licence Conditions changes are required?

If you think that changes are required, please provide the reasons for your answer.

[Write response answer here]

Proposed Electricity Distribution Special Licence Conditions

55. Do you think any Electricity Interconnector Standard Licence Conditions changes are required?

If you think that changes are required, please provide the reasons for your answer.

[Write your response here]

Proposed Electricity Interconnector Standard Licence Conditions

56. Do you think any Electricity Interconnector Standard Licence Conditions changes are required?

If you think that changes are required, please provide the reasons for your answer.

[Write your response here]

Proposed Electricity Generation Standard Licence Conditions

57. Do you think any Electricity Generation Standard Licence Conditions changes are required?



Making a positive difference
for energy consumers

Error! Unknown document property name.

If you think that changes are required, please provide the reasons for your answer.

[Write your response here]

General feedback

We believe that consultation is at the heart of good policy development. We welcome any comments about how we've run this consultation. We'd also like to get your answers to these questions:

Do you have any comments about the overall process of this consultation?

Do you have any comments about its tone and content?

Was it easy to read and understand? Or could it have been better written?

Were its conclusions balanced?

Did it make reasoned recommendations for improvement?

Any further comments?

[Write your response here]