

ALoMCP Steering Group, 24 March 2021

Notes and actions

| Name | Company | Name | Company |
|---|--|---------------|--------------------|
| Julian Leslie | NGESO — Chair of Steering Group | Graham Stein | NGESO |
| Steve Mockford | GTC | Bryan O'Neill | Ofgem |
| Mark Johnston | NPg | Andy Vaudin | EDF Energy |
| John Rowland | NPg (Stakeholder workstream chair) | Andrew Colley | SSE Generation |
| Paul Munday | SSEN (Customer Support & Delivery Assurance workstreams chair) | Paul Graham | Sembcorp Energy UK |
| Matt White | UKPN | Paul Richards | Ylem Energy |
| Christian Hjelm | WPD | | |
| Programme delivery colleagues in attendance | | | |
| Bieshoy Awad | NGESO | Mike Robey | NGESO |
| Avisa Ali | NGESO | | |
| Apologies | | | |
| Cara Blockey | ENW | John Smart | SSEN |
| Gerry Boyd | SPEN | Steve Beasley | Anesco |

Progress to date

- Programme team to review data presented in slides 4 and 6 and clarify the discrepancy.
 - Slide 4's overall status pie chart draws data from the application portal on the capacity (MW) of applications 12,856 MW. This includes approved applications and applications not yet approved, but that are in principle eligible and engagement is well advanced. Slide 6 in contrast focusses just on applications that have been formally approved through the programme's assessment process.
- Julian gueried why more sites and capacity had been approved in the window 6 assessment.
 - Customer engagement, particularly for sites 5MW up to 50MW, had increased and communication activity is thought to be increasing programme recognition amongst site owners. Some companies had also become familiar with the programme and made applications for multiple sites.

RoCoF and Vector Shift risk reduction

- Vector Shift, slide 10, illustrates peak Vector Shift at risk, which has reduced from 1200 MW to less than 600 MW. This scale of risk reduction means ESO does not expect to spend any additional money managing Vector Shift risk.
- For RoCoF up to 0.2 Hz/s, the programme has seen less applications than originally expected.
 The revised baseline (slide 9) indicates that RoCoF risk is below 400 MW for 80% of the time.
 Graham noted that ESO's Dynamic Containment product was now making a significant
 contribution with 500 MW of capacity participating. Risk reduction achieved now suggests
 that losses can be managed through frequency control rather than limiting RoCoF.
 - ESO to re-baseline RoCoF risk in the next four weeks and report back to the Steering Group in early May.



- Bryan queried the status of the Frequency Risk and Control Report consultation. Graham reported that the consultation period had closed and that a recommendation will now be taken to the Security and Quality of Supply Standard panel in early April.
- Andy asked for clarification on the remaining RoCoF up to 0.2 Hz/s to be addressed. Is this
 progressing within the programme?
 - Graham clarified that not all of the approved RoCoF applications in slide 6 were for critical RoCoF (up to 0.2 Hz/s). In addition, the programme's Delivery Assurance activity has identified some variance between site's reported pre-change protection settings and actual protection observed on site. The overall objective for ESO is to move the 0.125Hz/s RoCoF risk to less than 500 MW.

Fast Track

- Julian sought views on whether the Fast Track scheme should close as planned at the end of March
- Christian raised that there appeared to be little cost risk in supporting a small extension and that this may help further de-risk summer operability.
- Steve highlighted that 70% of Fast Track's approved capacity had been achieved since the Steering Group's December decision to extend it, which suggests there may be benefit in a further extension.
- Julian supported these views and raised a counter-argument that closing the Fast Track scheme could help notify the sector that there will not be later increases in payment rates, to counter a risk that sites might delay applying in the hope of a higher payment later on.
- Matt raised how consideration of the Fast Track links to the DCRP consideration of potentially bringing forward the compliance date for RoCoF sites.
- Andy stated he had no objection to an extension to Fast Track and that ESO communications should note how ESO will manage risk in the future (through frequency control) as an added incentive to sites to act now to avoid the risk of tripping in the future.
- Steering Group discussed the duration of a short extension and agreed that one month would be insufficient to mobilise communication of the extension and time for industry response.
- Agreed to extend Fast Track until the end of May and for the programme to develop communications activity to support this.
 - Post meeting note: the programme has extended Fast Track for applications to be submitted no later than Friday 28 May.

Issues and priorities

- Christian flagged the need to co-ordinate the planned communication on key dates (12 months left to apply and 12 months before the compliance deadline) with the outcome from DCRP consideration of potentially bringing forward the compliance deadline for RoCoF sites.
- Paul G queried the extent to which the programme had sought to engage the major players regarding inverter compliance status and Loss of Mains protection within generation equipment. Graham shared that the programme had received a mixed response from manufacturers and that there was a need to pick up the pace on this Paul G suggested a pareto focus, i.e. on the 20% of manufacturers responsible for 80% of inverters. Andy stated EDF would be happy to engage in this topic.

Any other business

Agreed for Mike R to schedule the next Steering Group in early May