

Actions

Accelerated Loss of Mains Change Programme: Steering Group

Tuesday 28 January 2020 via teleconference

Name	Company	Name	Company
Julian Leslie	NGESO – Chair of Steering Group	Graham Stein	NGESO
Simon Brooke	ENW	Steve Beasley	Anesco
Sam Turner	NPg	Andy Vaudin	EDF Energy
Andrew Sweeney	SPEN	Paul Graham	Sembcorp Energy UK
Paul Munday	SSEN (Customer Support & Delivery Assurance workstreams chair)	Andrew Colley	SSE Generation
Matt White	UKPN	Paul Richards	Ylem Energy
Peter Aston	WPD		
Programme delivery colleagues in attendance			
Bruce Anderson	SPEN	Bieshoy Awad	NGESO
Xiaoyao Zhou	NGESO	Mike Robey	NGESO
Apologies			
Steve Mockford	GTC	Martin Queen	Ofgem

Item	Focus
1.	<p>Welcome</p> <p>Julian welcomed everyone.</p> <p>Agenda restructured to review programme progress first and then to consider Item 02 (to Review the E3C Report views on the scope and timescale for ALoMCP and the Electricity Task Group term of Reference in response).</p>
3.	<p>Window 1 Report</p> <p>Bieshoy summarised the headlines from Paper Item03.</p> <p>Matt queried the reference to “this precludes the low frequency setting of 49Hz...”. Bieshoy stated that 49Hz is covered by the Delivery Assurance Policy and the evidence proforma, requiring applicants to check everything.</p> <p>Matt queried the approach being taken where disabling some relays (thought to be CoMap) caused wider settings issues.</p> <p>Bieshoy noted this was a separate risk.</p> <p>Graham confirmed that the report has been published: NGESO website, within Balancing Services> system security service> transmission constraint management> market information: https://www.nationalgrideso.com/document/161406/download ENA website, from the ALoMCP webpage: http://www.energynetworks.org/assets/files/ALoMCP%20-%20Window%20One%20Report%20v22Jan2020.pdf</p> <p>Paul M asked if website hits could be captured, noting that the report was quite hard to find.</p> <p>Action: NGESO to capture and report website statistics (and request of ENA website too).</p>

Item	Focus
4.	<p>Relay replacement versus settings change</p> <p>Graham reported that the original programme risk assessment had been reviewed and found to be still valid; in the majority of cases it was not necessary to replace replays and that changing settings / disablement would suffice.</p> <p>The application and assessment process has been modified to clarify that relay replacement will only be supported for synchronous / Doubly-Fed-Induction-Generation (DFIG) sites. For non-synchronous / non-DFIG sites, the programme will only fund at the settings change rate.</p> <p>The necessary changes have been scoped for the portal and are being scheduled. In the meantime, a manual screening process will apply.</p> <p>Inverters</p> <p>Graham noted that loss of mains is built into some inverters and that there are also potential resilience issues.</p> <p>The programme has received mixed and at times inconsistent feedback from inverter manufacturers. Response to a proposed webinar with inverter manufacturers has been poor to date, but NGESO will move ahead this (likely in March). Trade associations will also be engaged to help mobilise this sector.</p> <p>The Delivery Assurance Policy has been changed and the evidence proforma updated to capture inverter information.</p> <p>Andy V queried whether the approach being taken challenges the outcome from the previous work group and University of Strathclyde study on type testing?</p> <p>Graham noted the previous study was some time ago (2015/16) and that it had looked at quite small equipment, whereas the current programme focusses on larger kit.</p> <p>Andy V queried if there is a risk that a future programme will be necessary for small domestic-sized generators?</p> <p>Graham said that if possibly required it would be discussed through this Steering Group first.</p> <p>Matt – has the cap on the number of inverter changes that would be funded by the programme been changed?</p> <p>Graham clarified that the existing cap had not changed.</p> <p>Matt shared concern that inverters will not have been considered by applicants. Have we checked that this will not be a problem? Is the guidance explicit?</p> <p>Graham – We will capture this information through the proforma and we have added more information to the guidance document.</p> <p>Paul M – Yes, we can sense check this via the information now required in the proforma.</p> <p>Bieshoy – The programme also has more site sampling in the early stages, where DNOs will be able to check the information provided through the proformas and these sample sites can also be used as an opportunity to check inverter issues specifically.</p> <p>Graham agreed that physical checks on site will give us all confidence in how well the process is working.</p>
2.	<p>Electricity Task Group Terms of Reference</p> <p>Graham introduced Paper02, which addresses action 4 from the E3C report on the 09 August 2019 Power Disruption.</p> <p>The paper includes 7 actions. To consider whether an additional action explicitly on 49Hz should also be added.</p> <p>Progress against these actions will be tracked through ALoMCP delivery meetings and reported to the March Steering Group meeting.</p> <p>(continued overleaf)</p>

Item	Focus
2.	<p>(continued)</p> <p>Julian summarised that the plan to be reported back to E3C in April will need to either describe our actions to accelerate the ALoMCP or to clarify the cost benefit view on why we can't accelerate.</p> <p>Graham noted that more communications and engagement activity is required to drive applications. Paul queried what enforcement action would be taken on non-participating / non-compliant sites. Can we add modelling activity on the implications of non-compliant sites to inform what to do about them? Graham also noted that 49Hz sites could be identified and approached directly.</p> <p>Julian clarified that we will need the Steering Group to agree the plan to be reported back to E3C in April at the March Steering Group meeting.</p> <p>Action: Graham to lead the programme's activity and tracking against these actions and to report back to the March Steering Group.</p>
5.	Mike R summarised progress against 27 November Steering Group actions.
6.	<p>Any other business</p> <p>Action: All to respond to Mike R on the March Steering Group meeting date options.</p> <p>Action: Mike R to confirm the preferred meeting date.</p>