

# JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE

## Minutes

|        |            |           |                |
|--------|------------|-----------|----------------|
| Date:  | 22/10/2020 | Location: | Teleconference |
| Start: | 09:00      | End:      | 12:00          |

### Attendees

| Via Teleconference       | Company | Via Teleconference     | Company |
|--------------------------|---------|------------------------|---------|
| James Greenhalgh (Chair) | NGESO   | Roddy Wilson           | SHET    |
| James Whiteford          | NGESO   | Bless Kuri             | SHET    |
| Richard Proctor          | NGESO   | Colin Foote            | SPT     |
| Jingchao Deng            | NGESO   | David Adam             | SPT     |
| Richard Mather           | NGESO   | Mark Perry             | NGET    |
| Nicola Bruce             | NGESO   | Paul Obanor (Tech Sec) | NGESO   |

### 1. Apologies for Absence

Lilian MacLeod

### 2. Sign off minutes from last meeting

Minutes of last meeting were reviewed and accepted.

### 3. Review actions from last meeting

Actions were reviewed. Completed, ongoing and new actions are identified on the attached Actions Register. The follow-up / ongoing actions identified are within the “ONGOING” tab of the actions spreadsheet – where actions have been amended or follow-up actions identified text is displayed in bold BLUE.

**KEY:** NEW ACTION UPDATED ACTION

**UPDATED ACTION 251019-03: JW** – Ongoing, there are a few outstanding queries and some missing PLDs which have all been raised with NGET. All parties are currently discussing the sign off of next years PLDs.

**UPDATED ACTION 300120-03: RW** – Closed, Modelling subgroup is progressing with discussions on reviewing our model exchange processes and methods. Paul Thompson (ESO) took an action to pick up this discussion.

**UPDATED ACTION 130820-01: CF** – Closed, Representatives are; Murray Yelland, Antonio Estezo (NGESO); Stuart Mitchell (SPT); Mark Holland (SHET); Afshin Pashaei (NGET).

**NEW ACTION 221020-01: MP** to find out from Colin Stelfox (ESO) and Cathy (NGET) the details and participants of the TNCC/ESO monthly post event analysis discussion and circulate to JPC.

## 4. Sub-Group Reports

### 4.1. JPC-ETYS/NOA – RP

#### 4.1.1. JPC ETYS subgroup update.

- 4.1.1.1. **RP** stated that the last meeting was on 21<sup>st</sup> October.
- 4.1.1.2. **RP** stated that ETYS is in the drafting stage now, there are some delays, but we are confident that we will meet the deadline.
- 4.1.1.3. **RP** added that NOA is currently in the CBA stage. We have started discussions on the next cycle, and we are also reviewing how things have gone so far and what we will change for next year.

### 4.2. JPC-OA – NB

#### 4.2.1. JPC OA subgroup update:

- 4.2.1.1. **NB** stated that NGESO have opened discussions with all three onshore TOs about potentially reviewing the timelines for the long-term plan and the operational assessment to alleviate resource clash.
- 4.2.1.2. **NB** stated that the next meeting will be on 26<sup>th</sup> November.

### 4.3. JPC-Modelling – CF

#### 4.3.1. JPC Modelling subgroup update.

- 4.3.1.1. **CF** stated that the last meeting was on 21<sup>st</sup> October.
- 4.3.1.2. **CF** stated that there were discussions on data sharing, dynamic modelling and how to get closer to doing regular benchmarking studies of dynamic performance.
- 4.3.1.3. **CF** added that code modifications relevant to the group were discussed which include 138, 141, 139 (Planning Data Exchange).

### 4.4. JPC-IP – JW

#### 4.4.1. JPC IP subgroup update.

- 4.4.1.1. **JW** stated that the last meeting was on 21<sup>st</sup> October.
- 4.4.1.2. **JW** stated that the group continued the discussion on flexible devices and connection applications assessments. In the last JPC we discussed about some questions that would be used in discussions with developers, these questions will now be used to see if they are fit for purpose.
- 4.4.1.3. **JW** added that there was also a discussion on the relationship between NOA and Network Compliance. From this, we will be drafting a paper for discussion in the next JPC meeting.
- 4.4.1.4. **JW** added that the boundaries of influence were discussed and there was a potential to review them due the number of new HVDC links connected to the network.
- 4.4.1.5. **JW** concluded by stating that the PLDs for 2021/2022 year and the timeline for approval of 2022/2023 were discussed.

## 5. Update on Pathfinder projects - Jingchao Deng (JD)

### 5.1. JD gave updates on the Pathfinder projects

#### 5.1.1. JD - High voltage pathfinder

- **Short-term Mersey:** We have published an Expression of Interest (EOI) on 8th September 2020 to identify the willingness of existing connections to participate in the reactive power service this covers the period from April 2021 to 31st March 2022. The EOI closed on 22nd September 2020 and we are currently reviewing the responses received to decide on our procurement approach for contracts starting from 1 April 2021 with the possibility of a further one year extension on a rolling monthly basis to ensure compliance in the Mersey area prior to long term contract holders connecting.
- **Long-term Mersey:** From April 2020 to March 2031, we have already awarded a couple of contracts to our commercial providers, PeakGen and Zenobe. One contract is for 200MVARs of shunt reactor and the second is for provision of 38MVARs on battery storage system.
- **Next High Voltage regions:** We have also progressed work to determine the next priority regions for High voltage analysis and will be taking forward the Pennine region as well as progressing other regions in parallel such as the West Midlands and South West Peninsula. We intend to go for a tender in quarter three this year and we have already started our engagement with the DNOs and TOs.

#### 5.1.2. JD - Stability pathfinder

- We published the Expression of Interest pack in September 2020 which is a formal start of the phase 2 tender process. Deadline for EOI is 8/01/2021.
- We are working with our TO colleagues to agree a scope of connections review process which will be undertaken by TOs as part of the phase 2 tender process. This is published as part of Expression of Interest pack.
- We have published an SRF template for phase 2 solutions.
- We are working with our TO colleagues to support pathfinder related pre-apps and/or customer calls.
- We have held two webinars since the EOI publication – EOI overview webinar and Technical Specification and feasibility study webinar. We will be holding 2 more webinars – assessment methodology (27/10) and contract terms (in Nov).

#### 5.1.3. JD - Constraint management and Commercial solutions

- The pathfinder is preparing all the communications ahead of the announcement at the end of Q2 2020 and is working on building a more detailed timeline and resource requirements more clearly.
- The pathfinder is considering a two-stage approach:
  - expressions of Interest stage (EOI) where the technical capability of all participants can be assessed against their effectiveness and their capabilities and upon deeming them to be eligible can continue
  - commercial tender stage where the users can submit their availability costs and this will be measured against their value in terms of £/MW effective to determine the cheapest volume to resolve the constraint,
- The tender is expected to be run in Q1 FY2021/22 and year 1 service delivery period to be Q2 2021 - Q1 2022.

#### 5.1.4. JD – Probabilistic Pathfinder

- We have developed post-fault actions and automated optimal post-fault actions to better assess the boundary capability. These actions include QB tapping, smart wires

setting, and Inter-trips. These new features have enabled us to compare the current scaling-based methodology in Power Factory against the probabilistic methodology.

- The probabilistic assessment expanded onto the voltage assessment, this year we will give updates in the ETYS about the voltage assessments with the probabilistic approach.
- Lastly, we are going to focus on developing a joint market and network module for the tool and compare the total constraint cost with the current approach (boundary capability vs detailed network model).

#### 5.1.5. Pathfinder Questions and Comments (JPC Group)

- **CF** asked for more explanation on an alternative to the boundary capabilities.  
**JW** explained that the tool now enables us to have circuit level granularity.
- **DA** stated that the stability pathfinder has raises a number of challenges and issues from the onset.  
**JG** added that it is worth noting that the Mersey pathfinder was the first trial into the pathfinder projects, and I am confident there is a lot of conversation between all parties and the pathfinder products are continuing to develop. Also, it is very important that we have a clear articulation of what our real problems and concerns are and how we can overcome the concerns and issues.  
**DA** added that collectively we have an obligation to derive a coordinated system, clearly all parties need to work together regarding the pathfinder projects, and maybe some of the issues with the stability pathfinder may have stemmed from engagement in the early stages.
- **DA** asked for more explanation regarding a statement from the constraint management pathfinder update: “the proposal was submitted to the design authority”.  
**JD** explained that the design authority mentioned is the ESO internal design authority.
- **DA** added that in terms of timelines and process, how does the ESO internal design authority interacts with the design authorities within the TOs.  
**JD** stated that these comments will be fed back to Griffin John (ESO).
- **CF** stated that regarding the constraint management pathfinder, we now have a weekly call with Griffin John (ESO). Our concern is that the constraint management pathfinder does not face the same issues with the stability pathfinder

## 6. Update on proposals for Strategic Wider Works and Joint Projects

### 6.1. SPT - DA

- 6.1.1. **DA** stated that the initial needs case for the Eastern Link has been submitted to Ofgem.  
**MP** added that there have been some discussions with Ofgem regarding the CBA included in the Eastern Link initial needs case. Ofgem are not satisfied with the CBA and are looking to get a much firmer and robust CBA.  
**DA** agreed with MP and added that this highlights some of the challenges with the annual process that has been established across ETYS and NOA and how you incorporate the SWW CBAs and the timelines to deliver.

### 6.2. NGET - MP

- 6.2.1. There are several SWW projects in the pipeline that will be submitted early next year. We will be working with the ESO's CBA team as soon as NOA is concluded. Given the number of projects and their complexity, we will ensure we utilise NOA as part of the process.
- 6.2.2. **JG** stated that given the issues in Scotland and the east coast of England, do all parties feel the need to discuss about the concerns in the ways of working for SWW. Do we need a broader conversation between ESO, TOs and Ofgem about the approaches taken in each of the three regions in addition to what we have already?  
**All TOs** agreed that the above-mentioned conversations between ESO and TOs are needed.  
**JG** added that the next step would be ‘where and how’ these conversations should take place.

**NEW ACTION 221020-02: JG** to discuss with NH on how the current concerns in the ways of working on proposals for SWW would be raised, with a possibility of setting up an ESO/TO working group to discuss these concerns and feed the output into the NOA committee for an open discussion.

### 6.3. **SHET - RW**

- 6.3.1. Shetland Link – Work is now proceeding; contracts are getting signed for the cable works. The contract strategy is to split the contracts across cables, converters and substation works.
- 6.3.2. Orkney and Western Isles – no additional updates

## 7. Reports from other working groups

### 7.1. **SQSS – RW**

- 7.1.1. The SQSS Panel meeting was held on 21<sup>st</sup> October.
- 7.1.2. The modification 26, which is non-standard voltage addition is out for consultation. This had been submitted to the authority for approval but was sent back to resolve minor errors in the legal text which had been caught at the last meeting. This will be modified and sent back to the authority.
- 7.1.3. Modification 27, which is the system stability criteria and requirement following the August incident last year. The panel approved the working group established to investigate this modification. The working group established its terms of reference and they will produce a final modification report on 10<sup>th</sup> November. The SQSS panel will carry out a vote on the final report on 19<sup>th</sup> November and will be issued to the authority on 23<sup>rd</sup> November.  
One party is of the opinion that the SQSS should still contain some minimum requirement for frequency response.

## 8. AOB

- 8.1. **BK** stated that regarding the Grid Code TO representation, Roddy will be taking over.
- 8.2. **BK** asked for updates on the Independent Engineer role as identified through the 9<sup>th</sup> August Grid Code modifications.  
**JG** stated that the Independent Engineer role was one of the recommendations that came through the investigation outcome from the 9<sup>th</sup> August event. There has been a lot of discussion in the working groups about the requirements for the Independent Engineer role there has been a lot of questions on how the role would work and if it adds value or whether it increases costs.  
**JG** added that the current position of the working group is for Ofgem make a recommendation. Ofgem declined to make a recommendation but asked for the parties to make proposals about what they considered to be an alternative arrangement.  
The ESO's view was that the role is a valuable addition to the process, and it helped to provide us with more certainty and independence from just the developers when they go through the grid code compliance process.  
The next grid code working group meeting would have more detailed discussions on how to progress this.

**NEW ACTION 221020-03: JG** to ask a member of the ESO compliance team to give more details on the progress of the working group regarding the Independent Engineer role.

- 8.3. **NESOS 2020 Project (CF)** - In 2014 and 2016 there was a collaborative work done across the TOs and ESO under the banner of Northern England and Scotland Operability Studies. Following the news from EDF about the change in the timelines of the closures of their nuclear stations, we thought it would be necessary to revisit the studies done in 2016 under the NESOS banner and consider what implications we might have going through the 2020s with the network development plans we have during that period.

We have created a group to revisit these studies and have drafted the terms of reference which now go to the esteemed group (ESO, SPT, NGET and SHET).

The program of work will include security of supply; voltage control; system strength and transient stability. An important aspect is in system access planning and what early closure might mean for outage planning, outage availability and the knock-on effect we may have on network development.

The steering group will at the first week of November and studies will commence all through winter to conclude in March 2021.

## 9. Dates of next meeting

- 9.1. **PO** – Proposed dates for future meetings: January 28 (Teleconference)
- 9.2. **JG** – Closed the meeting.