

## Actions

### Accelerated Loss of Mains Change Programme: Steering Group

Wednesday 27 November 14:00 at ENA, 4 More London SE1 2AU

Name	Company	Name	Company
Julian Leslie	NGESO	Graham Stein	NGESO
Simon Brooke	ENW	Steve Beasley	Anesco
Matt White	UKPN	Steve Mockford	GTC
Magda Paluch	WPD, for Peter Aston	Paul Richards	Ylem Energy
Greg Farrell	NPg, for Sam Turner	Martin Queen	Ofgem
Andrew Sweeney	SPEN, for Anne Heaney	Andy Vaudin	EDF Energy
Paul Graham	Sembcorp Energy UK	Andrew Colley	SSE Generation
Programme delivery colleagues in attendance			
Paul Munday	SSEN (Customer Support workstream chair)	Matt Magill	NGESO Value Assurance workstream chair)
Xiaoyao Zhou	NGESO	Mike Kay	NGESO
Bieshoj Awad	NGESO	Mike Robey	NGESO

Item	Focus
1.	<p><b>Welcome</b></p> <p>Julian to Chair meeting and welcomed everyone.</p> <p>Julian highlighted the Steering Group directions and decisions for the meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Views on Assessment Strategy</li> <li>2. Approval for window 3 application and assessment calendar</li> <li>3. Direction on engagement to accelerate programme delivery</li> </ol> <p>And also: To note the E3C report on the 09 August incident, regarding the possibility of accelerating the ALoMCP.</p>
2.	<p><b>Accelerated Loss of Mains Change Programme overview</b></p> <p><i>Paper: ALoMCP SG01 01 Overview</i></p> <p>Graham presented. Noted that the ALoMCP is the last currently scheduled Distribution Code actions to address Loss of Mains. Questions and clarifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50,000 sites; does this include type-tested and roof-top sites? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Domestic scale generation, including domestic roof top installations, are excluded from the programme. Type tested equipment without specific LoM settings are excluded, but type tested equipment with settable LoM protection is included</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Are all sites &gt;5MW Vector Shift, or are some RoCoF sites being re-visited? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some revisiting of RoCoF sites is required, particularly if the inverters are wrong or there is Vector Shift there.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Anticipate operating the delivery windows for two years.</li> <li>• Must implementation be completed in the next window period?</li> </ul> <p>No, applicants state their implementation date. Note that the Assessment Strategy considers the implementation lead time within its criteria and shorter lead times are more valuable to the programme.</p>

Item	Focus
3.	<p><b>Steering Group role and constitution</b> <i>Paper – ALoMCP SG01 02 Constitution Execution version 1.0</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal to modify the quorum criteria to state that one the minimum 4 participants required in order to be quorate must be a BSUoS payer or Stakeholder representative. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Proposal agreed by Steering Group members</b></li> <li>○ <b>ACTION: Mike R to revise the Constitution document to reflect this decision and re-issue to all by 06 Dec.</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Clarification that workstream chairs are expected to attend Steering Group meetings to represent their workstream and to present progress, issues and risks within their area.</li> </ul>
4.1	<p><b>Overview of Programme KPIs</b> <i>Paper – ALoMCP SG01 03 Reporting and Tracking DCRP Paper 08Aug2019</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend also tracking the benefit being delivered. I.e. track how the risk is being reduced as implementation progresses. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Agreed to capture this in the financial measures (Value Assurance workstream) and report within end of assessment reporting (January for window 1).</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
4.2	<p><b>Progress to date: Window 1 report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note how looming deadlines help drive applications</li> <li>• Analysis was circulated before the end of the DNO verification period. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Action: Bieshoy to circulate the final analysis (for applications forwarded to NGESO by DNOs for assessment), Bieshoy to confirm date</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Why would NGESO not approve all applications forwarded by the DNOs? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some may be rejected if the lead time is too long, if out of scope or identified as not a priority in the assessment strategy</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Noted the need to engage larger sites to increase applications from priority sites.</li> <li>• During window 1 DNO assessment, some DNOs have engaged applicants with a long lead time before implementation offering the opportunity to amend their submission to a shorter lead time. Feedback suggests this resulted in a positive change in a worthwhile proportion of sites.</li> <li>• Concern raised about the high proportion of applications for relay changes (rather than settings changes or disabling the function) and this has a high cost implication for the programme. Original estimate was for 40% replacement and 60% settings change / function disablement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Action: Schedule Customer Support Workstream meeting/call to discuss issue and how this is considered within the guidance to applicants, Payment Process Specification, on the application portal, through the assessment process and the checklist provided with contractual terms for generators when their application is accepted. To develop and agree edits to Payment Process Specification, guidance and checklist.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Meeting scheduled for 10 December.</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>○ <b>Action: NGESO to work with the Customer Support workstream to develop an engagement plan for inverter manufacturers.</b></li> <li>○ <b>Action: Customer Support workstream to identify actions to address the higher proportion of relay replacements than originally anticipated.</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Continued overleaf</i></p>

Item	Focus
4.2	<p><b>Progress to date: Window 1 report - continued</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern raised about components behind the relay (such as inverters) that also have Loss of Mains protection and the approach that the project is taking to these. Need to review this risk before going much further. Suggested not to spend much without upfront checks. DERs receive documentation when their application is accepted, which includes explicit assurance requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Action: Customer Support workstream to review guidance on application portal as well as that provided to accepted applications by the end of December. Share with Steering Group for January Steering Group call.</b></li> <li>○ <b>Action: Mike to add to risk register</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Discussion on the point that some DGs tripped on 49Hz during 9<sup>th</sup> August event, how to address the incorrect under-frequency settings. What risks the programme is focussed on: Just Loss of Mains or Frequency as well? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Action: Customer Support workstream to identify actions to address under frequency settings.</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
5.	<p><b>Workstream reports, issues and risks</b></p> <p><u>Customer Support workstream</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paul Munday summarised the workstream’s activity. The customer support issues log mainly includes application issues and some on assessment. The portal is good, but basic. Customers want confidence in their applications being successful. The issue of implementation lead times is a key issue.</li> <li>• Stakeholders reported that the go-live date for window 1 applications was not clearly communicated. Retrospective applications, supported by the appropriate evidence can be submitted, although this approach carries a risk to the generator that their application may not be accepted.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Paper – ALoMCP SG01 05 Budget Allocation</i> <i>Paper – ALoMCP SG01 06 The Payment Sum</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new table of definitions for the payment amounts is being developed for approval.</li> <li>• See item 4.2 for discussion and actions on Relays and Inverters.</li> </ul> <p><u>Delivery Assurance workstream</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Paper – ALoMCP SG01 07 Delivery Assurance Policy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Format for verification. A pro-forma checklist is provided identifying the evidence required for generator self-certification, which their DNO then verifies.</li> <li>• Record keeping raised to ensure that a good and accessible record of participating sites’ evidence is maintained by each DNO.</li> <li>• DNO site sampling will not be completely random and will be driven by a logical approach.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Continued over leaf</i></p>

Item	Focus
5.	<p><b>Workstream reports, issues and risks - continued</b></p> <p><u>Value Assurance workstream</u></p> <p>Steering Group views sought on Assessment Strategy <i>Paper – ALoMCP SG01 08 NGESO Assessment Strategy</i></p> <p>Discussion on Assessment Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Steering Group agreed to modify the assessment strategy to accept applications with implementation dates up to and including spring 2021 (~18 months).</b></li> <li>• <b>Steering Group agreed to allow sites with &gt;0.5Hz/ second during current assessment window.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Action: NGESO to modify the Assessment Strategy to reflect these changes.</b></li> <li>○ <b>Action: Value Assurance workstream to review what can be published from the Assessment Strategy.</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Suggestion to reserve a portion of the budget for smaller generators, whilst also recognising the programme's priority to reduce the overall system risk by tackling larger generators. The programme costs do reflect the estimated number and capacity of sites (slide 5), indicating that a large proportion of the forecast costs are from lower capacity sites. No additional action agreed at this time.</li> </ul>
6.	<p><b>Next steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation for window 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Steering Group approved window 3 dates</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Engagement approach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Steering Group identified the following key items to share:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. window 1 assessment results;</li> <li>ii. key elements of the assessment strategy;</li> <li>iii. promote shorter lead times to implementation;</li> <li>iv. clarify approach on relay replacement versus settings change / disablement; and</li> <li>v. inverter treatment.</li> </ol> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
7.	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p><i>Aligning future meetings with end of window assessment schedule</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Action: Mike to schedule:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Steering Group teleconference call in January to:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ review progress in investigating relay replacement versus settings change and inverter issues</li> <li>○ Review EC3 9 August report's view on the need to accelerate the programme.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Steering Group meeting to be after NGESO assessment of window 2 completes (after 10 March 2020)</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Volunteer, ideally from Steering Group, sought to Chair the Stakeholder workstream</li> <li>• Reporting on budget forecast to BSUoS payers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Action: NGESO to report to the TCMF SIG once the window 1 assessment is complete.</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>