

ALoMCP Steering Group, 27 May 2021

Notes and actions

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

Outcomes

- Steering Group supported the programme's proposed approach, following the closure of the Fast Track scheme, to continue accept applications from 5-50MW sites within the general programme application process.
- Steering Group supported the development of a sampling approach for sites self-declaring their compliance to increase confidence in these reports.

Actions

- Programme team to provide an update on committed costs to date, cost projections for completing the programme and the savings achieved to date.
Programme interim update:
 - Value of approved generator applications (windows 1-6) £23.33m.
 - Additional value of approved Fast Track scheme applications: £0.51m
 - Invoiced value for Licensee costs (excludes the costs above) to 14 May: £2.67m
- Share the outcome of the window 7 assessment when available.
- Circulate the slides for today's meeting. *Action complete.*

Programme presentation – Steering Group questions and comments

- Bryan requested an update on programme committed costs to date and a projection of costs to complete the programme.
- Julian noted the £20m+ savings achieved by the programme to date

- Graham reported that by September ESO will be operating the system differently to manage frequency risk which will allow RoCoF Loss of Mains to happen, thereby avoiding the large cost of curtailing RoCoF.
- Andy asked whether the outstanding sites with 0.2 Hz/s RoCoF were within the 5 to 50 MW capacity range.
 - Bieshoy reported that these sites are distributed across all site capacity sizes.

Discussion on the programme's proposed approach to 5 to 50 MW sites following closure of the Fast Track scheme to applications from 28 May:

- Andy recognised the benefit of a 'carrot' approach (in allowing these sites to apply for support to make changes through the general ALoMCP process) and asked what progress has been made on the 'stick' of enforcement.
 - Graham reported that a Distribution Code modification has been developed by a working group on enforcement of G59 3-7 and this will be discussed by the DCRP Thursday 03 June. If this is supported and the modification passes through the required process, we expect to have an agreed approach to enforcement in place by the end of this summer.
- Paul noted that the 'stick' approach is challenging to implement as the programme does not know which sites are affected. The incentive for affected sites to come forward to make changes with programme support is therefore still an important approach.
- Mark asked how many sites could be affected by other forms of non-compliance and might feel disadvantaged by this approach
 - Bieshoy estimated 50 sites (800 MW) had been rejected in previous application windows due to existing non-compliance. Bieshoy believed much of this related to sites with non-compliant RoCoF settings, but not at the most sensitive levels that qualified for the Fast Track scheme.
- Christian noted it was sensible to keep the opportunity open for these sites to apply. He asked what issues this might cause, such as potential for complaints from sites with other forms of non-compliance that had applications been rejected. Christian highlighted the need for clear messaging on the programme's approach.
- Mark agreed that it made sense to support this approach for the estimated 100 sites and supported the need for clear messaging to clarify the approach and respond to potential challenges.
- **Julian confirmed the Steering Group decision to support the programme's proposed approach, following the closure of the Fast Track scheme, to continue accept applications from 5-50MW sites within the general programme application process.**

Discussion on the programme's proposed approach to increasing confidence in the validity of sites self-declaring their compliance without programme support

- Harriet noted that a difference between undertaking sample site visits for sites supported in making LoM protection changes through the programme and those that self-declare compliance without programme support is that we have the lever to withhold the support payment to the site until after the sample site visit has been completed. This lever would not be available for the un-supported sites, so how can we incentivise these sites to participate in the sampling?
 - Graham noted that DNOs do have existing powers through the Distribution Code. He also considered what payment might make a difference here, but noted that the current £500 offered to sites selected for sample site visits within the programme would be very unlikely to make a difference as a standalone payment for sites not supported through the programme, once administration effort is factored in.

- Andy questioned whether the sampling requires physical visits or is desk-based evidence review.
 - Graham noted that most sampling was done remotely due to covid and included a combination of checking documentation and video calls to observe equipment and settings.
 - Paul agreed that paperwork evidence is always required with actual or virtual visits to verify this.
- Christian questioned what the implications of would be finding non-compliance through the sampling.
 - Graham advised that only a small handful of issues had been identified so far which have been addressed on a case by case basis. If the volume of issues increases the programme would need to consider adopting a co-ordinated response.
 - Mark noted that where issues arise at sites where recognised contractors had been used, the programme should consider the implications for other sites this contractor had delivered.
- Julian confirmed the Steering Group decision to support the development of a sampling approach for sites self-declaring their compliance to increase confidence in these reports.

Any other business

- Share the outcome of the window 7 assessment when available.
- Circulate the slides for today's meeting. Action complete.