

CMP330 & CMP374 Workgroup Consultation Summary

17 December 2021 – 17 January 2022

8 non confidential responses received.

- Most respondents supportive of the proposal and implementation approach.
- Some respondents highlighted that they believed further sections of the CUSC would be impacted by this change, in particular Section 2 (Connections), Section 7 (Dispute Resolution), Section 11 (Interpretation and Definitions) and Section 15 User Commitment).
- Majority of respondents agreed that there should be a process to allow subsequent applicants to take over the contestable build – however there should be a clearly defined ‘point of no return’ considered.
- One respondent challenged the point outlined in the report that “existing backgrounds” (not contracted background) would be taken into consideration when developing an offer.
- Some respondents noted that the intervention criteria require further detail as they are too broad.
- Mixed views on whether additional safeguards should be required for the delivery of non-shared infrastructure assets.
- Most respondents agree with the principles outlined in the adoption agreement, however some noted this would cause inefficiencies.
- One respondent suggested that an alternative approach for the adoption agreement could be to apply key aspects of the adoption agreement into the STC which the TOs are bound to comply with.
- Mixed views on if this proposal brings forward any additional risks of the Onshore TO’s. Some respondents noted the following concerns:
 - Regulatory concerns - does not align with the regulatory price control set in 2021 and if a change is to be introduced, it should be done at the same time as the price control review for T3.
 - Volume of changes required to the STC/STCP’s
 - Possible license changes and T2 business plans required to deliver the proposed changes.
- Most respondents gave a view that 132kV in Scotland would introduce discriminatory treatment between parties.
- One respondent questioned the acknowledgment of public safety consequences of the User or Contractors.
- Five respondents agreed that this change would benefit their organisation, three respondents disagreed, noting this change would have a negative impact.