

## Meeting minutes

### National Electricity Transmission System Security and Quality of Supply Standards (NETS SQSS)

#### SQSS Review Panel

Date:	13/03/2019	Location:	WebEx
Start:	10:00	End:	11:00

#### Participants

Attendee	Attend/Regrets	Attendee	Attend/Regrets
Chrissie Brown National Grid ESO Code Administrator Chair (CB)	Attend	Cornel Brozio SP Transmission Ltd (CB)	Attend
Rashpal Gata-Aura National Grid ESO Technical Secretary (RGA)	Attend	Diyar Kadar SP Transmission Ltd (DK)	Attend
Bieshoy Awad National Grid ESO (BA)	Attend	Bless Kuri SHET (BK)	Attend
Rachel Woodbridge-Stocks National Grid ESO (RWS)	Attend	Simon Lord Generation Representative (First Hydro) (SL)	Attend
Alan Creighton Network Operator (AC)	Attend	David Lyon OFTO (DL)	Attend
Xiaoyao Zhou National Grid ESO (XZ)	Regrets	Roddy Wilson SHETL (RW)	Regrets
Mike Lee OFTO (ML)	Regrets	Shilen Shah Authority Representative (SS)	Regrets
Le Fu National Grid (NGET) (LF)	Regrets	Xiaolin Ding National Grid ESO (XD)	Regrets
Greg Heavens National Grid ESO (GH)	Regrets	John Sinclair OFTO (JS)	Regret
	Choose an item.		Choose an item.

## Discussion and details

---

### 1. Introductions and apologies

The Chair opened the Panel meeting by making introductions and noted the apologies received.

---

### 2. Approval of Panel Minutes for January 2019

The minutes from the SQSS Panel meeting held on **16 January 2019** were approved subject to minor amendments highlighted by the Panel Members. The minutes have been duly updated and are now available on SQSS website [here](#)

---

### 3. Review of Actions Log

The Action Log is available on SQSS Website [here](#)

---

### 4. Chapter 7 Guidance

#### Variations to Connection Designs

BA clarified to the Panel members that a Design Variation is meant to allow the User to tailor their own connection to serve their own needs. The User should be able to request what they want and provided that this Design Variation have no negative impact on anyone else (as stated in the SQSS), it cannot be objected to. All negative impacts are usually mitigated contractually via clauses in the bilateral agreement or via one off charges. Provided that the User is happy with these clauses/charges, the Design Variation will be acceptable. If there is a negative impact on the system or anyone else, then the variation would not be acceptable.

A Design Variation, in principle, is good for the User (otherwise they won't request it) and neutral for all other parties (because of contractual arrangements and additional charges mitigating such impact – as required by the SQSS) and hence is good for the consumer and does not require any additional justification via a Cost Benefit Analyses (CBA).

#### Cable Rating

BA provided clarity on cable rating stating that there needs to be clarity about the difference between the term “dynamic ratings” when it is used in the context of a subsea cable connecting an offshore windfarm compared to that in the context of an overhead line. The former tends to be available for an extended period of time compared to the latter which changes a lot quicker.

The owner of a kit is responsible for specifying its operating limits and carry the risks associated with that specification. ESO, will operate the cable to the rating specified by the OFTO. Compliance will be assessed (by the OFTO) based on these ratings. The OFTO can make additional capacity available and can restrict the capacity if they wish to. If the OFTO does this, ESO will operate to the new limits. Because of the way Connection

---

and User of System Code (CUSC) is written, restrictions arising will take place at zero cost of the ESO.

So, if a cable is designed to take wind variability/persistence into account, there could be two options.

- The cable being declared at a higher rating (full capacity of wind farm) and, if it gets too hot, the capacity available is reduced. This would be a risk to OFTO's revenue.
- The cable being declared at the lower rating and, unless it gets too hot, the additional capacity is made available. The risk here is that the OFTO may for some reason not make this capacity available to the windfarm.

If everyone is doing the right thing, there would not be a problem. If the design is not correct or if the OFTO is being difficult, there could be a commercial risk. This risk needs to be addressed however not through the interpretation of the SQSS.

### **Use of dynamic rating**

BA went on to clarify the optimal rating of the cable. The cable may take full power but does not need to take full power for 100% of the time. There could be some savings if the cables are rated below. SQSS does not dictate how to calculate, it is the responsibility of the OFTO to say what the value of the cable is. The system will be operated within ESO. BA further went on to say that: -

- (a) if the cable is designed to use full capacity 100% of the time this could pose a risk for the OFTOs if the wind persists for a long time. OFTO would have to make the capacity lower and OFTO lose some value.
- (b) From time to time OFTO to allow the ESO to operate the system by issuing the extra capacity – OFTO could be risk averse – may not happen as a real risk. If the User gives us a higher rating, then it will be compliant and if the rating is lower then there is risk involved.

Some discussion took place following the above detailed presentation by BA and an action was taken away by the Chair.

### **ACTION:**

CB will speak to Ofgem and seek guidance on this matter highlighting the risk and how this can be taken forward.

### **Next Steps**

CB advised the Panel members that there will be two documents making Chapter 7 – the first part will be sections 1 - 4 which the Workgroup have developed and has already been published. The second part which National Grid ESO have produced/developed and will be circulated to all for review and comments.

---

**ACTION:**

CB will circulate this document for agreement ahead of publication.

---

**5. Action log**

**Action 28.5 (P2 work) P2**

AC gave an update that Ofgem are still considering the approval of EREC P2/7. Consultation closed last week, expectation is that any comments received will be incorporated and he should hear from Ofgem by the end of the month.

**Action 29.2** CB asked when the work on this modification would progress as there had been no timetable brought forward or meetings held for a considerable amount of time. BA to provide an update on when this work is likely to be able to progress at the next Panel meeting.

---

**6. Workgroup Updates/Industry Consultations/Modification Reports**

**GSR025: Updating the SQSS to reflect the recent modification to Engineering Recommendation P28**

CB advised the Panel Members that GSR025 was ready to be submitted to Authority and will be submitted imminently.

---

**7. Authority decisions**

- None
- 

**8. Standing Items**

- a) **Modification Register – please refer to modification register [here](#)**
- 

**9. AOB**

All Panel Members confirmed to the Chair that there had nothing further to discuss.

---

---

**10. Next Meeting**

The next NETS SQSS Review Panel will be held on Wednesday **8 May 2019**.

---