

Joint Planning Committee Meeting

Tuesday 16th April 2013
Ramada Hotel/Birmingham, International Airport

Attendees:

Brian Punton	SHET	Mike Barlow	SHET
David Adam	SPT	Dave Cason	SPT
John Zammit-Haber	NGET	Andy Hiorns	NGET
Kelvin Lambert	NGET	Martin Moran	NGET
Richard Proctor	NGET		
Bieshoy Awad (Technical Secretary)	NGET		

1. NGET UK Operating Model

A summary of the new NGET-UK Operating Model was presented to update both SPT and SHET on the recent changes on NGET's structure.

Action: Once the final structure and appointments have been announced, a note will be circulated to SPT/SHET.

2. The JPC ToRs

General

It was highlighted that the JPC meetings will help to provide better coordination between all TOs and the SO. This would align with Ofgem's view that all parties should demonstrate they are working together in an effective manner. The JPC meetings would also provide some form of feedback for all parties. This would help to improving their internal processes.

Membership

The STC specifies that all parties should be members of the JPC. This includes the SO (NGET), incumbent onshore TOs (NGET/SPT/SHET), and OFTOs (not Offshore Developers). The membership may, at some point, extend to cover any new Onshore TOs and interconnectors once they become parties to the STC.

OFTOs participation is fundamental. They hold a Transmission Licence with specific licence obligations and they need to engage in the forums that facilitate them meeting their licence obligation including the JPC. It is noted that OFTOs are already showing signs of engagement as they participate in the SQSS review group. OFTO's contribution would probably be essential to some discussions that would take place within the JPC such as Boundary of Influence and development of integrated systems.

OFTOs have license obligations to ensure confidentiality. It is important to understand that these obligations exist. However, the JPC should not be trying to police these obligations. OFTOs should manage their processes internally. The confidentiality issue has been raised with Ofgem and they are yet to respond.

Action: Confirm with John Twomey if there is any update on Ofgem's situation regarding OFTO's confidentiality/business separation arrangements

There are issues that might limit the scope of discussions within the JPC meeting when OFTOs are present. For example, existing OFTOs are able to bid for new Offshore Network and their presence at the JPC may give them some advantage over other parties who are not yet OFTOs.

STC Parties have the responsibility to develop the STC such that it is fit for purpose. A review of STCP16.1 needs to take place. However, it should be ensured that no parties are excluded.

The JPC is a workgroup of the STC Committee. However the JPC does not report to the STC Committee. The JPC itself have its own workgroups that report directly to the JPC. The structure of the workgroups will vary from one to another. Some workgroups need to have representation from all parties. Others might have some parties not represented. There will be some split between these workgroups and only relevant technical information would be shared among them.

The membership of the JPC and its division into separate groups would be determined by what the JPC is actually trying to achieve – as specified in the Terms of Reference. Due to the nature of their network, OFTOs inputs/interactions would probably be much simpler than these between incumbent Onshore TOs. A simple North/South split may help to ensure focus is maintained but it might change once Scottish OFTOs are appointed. The structure of the meetings, subgroups, reporting needs to be agreed by all parties. This structure should ensure that all parties are able to participate and interact in order to meet their licence obligations.

Action: NEGOT to suggest a structure (and a diagram clarifying interactions/reporting for the JPC and subgroups) and circulate the structure to SHET/SPT for discussion.

The SO will chair the JPC meetings in order to overcome difficulties that may arise from rotating the Chair position when the number of JPC parties increase,

Subgroups

SHET suggested the addition of an "Offshore Coordination (OC) Subgroup" to the four groups already proposed. The Offshore Coordination Subgroup will be working under ITPR to formulate the process of Offshore Coordination in conjunction with the CION process. It may be beneficial to allow Offshore Developers to join this subgroup however it may be difficult to ensure that all Developers would be open in the presence of other Developers.

Action: Discuss with Louise Wilks and check if there is any material to update the JPC on ITPR and offshore coordination in general.

Action: NEGOT to provide a draft ToR for the Offshore Coordination subgroup for all parties to comment.

The JPC will agree the Terms of References of the subgroups.

The majority of technical discussions will take place within the subgroups with reports, deliverables, and recommendations submitted to the JPC for approval. The JPC will discuss

these outputs and approve them as required. The JPC will also monitor the progress of the subgroups and provide them with a dispute resolution mechanism.

The subgroups will need to carry on continuous review of the STC Section D/STCPs they use and recommend modifications as required. The recommendations will be taken forward by the JPC.

The subgroups will need to develop and improve processes as required.

The subgroups will need to interact together and exchange information required to perform their roles. For example the IP, CPR, and MG would need to work together in several occasions.

Action: Revise the ToR for the JPC and the subgroups to reflect the discussions. The target is to agree the ToRs for the JPC and two of the subgroups (IP/MG) by mid May.

Minutes

A report would be provided to the STC working group on every meeting and will be published on the websites of all parties

3. The Subgroups ToRs

The Modelling Subgroup

The modelling subgroup will be responsible for all modelling and data exchange activities among all the JPC Parties and between these Parties and external Parties. This includes: managing and developing datasets to support the planning process; coordination of provision of data for external parties; facilitation of data and information exchange required to discharge licensees obligations efficiently; coordination, provision, and validation of system models; and coordination of modelling tools and model formats.

The Modelling Subgroup will also support the developments of study techniques and guidelines required for complex analysis and provide feedback to other Subgroups to ensure these techniques are incorporated in their processes

The IP subgroup

The IP subgroup will develop investment processes, procedures and guidelines including STC amendment proposals; undertake review of the Boundary of Influence between different Transmission Licensees; determine the Boundary of Influence for new OFTOs; review, analyse, and develop potential solutions for boundary issues. It is expected that the work done under the IP group would supersede, or at least contribute to, some sections of the ENSG report.

The IP subgroup will also coordinate and undertake system studies as defined and agreed in the study guidelines.

The IP subgroup will maintain a coordinated investment plan for all parties; suggest and discuss changes to these investment plans; maintain a list of derogations available for all parties, discuss the operational implications of these derogations, and discuss the need for new derogations; and ensure common coordinated approach via sharing best practice for investment planning.

The OA subgroup

Will support Operational Studies and interactions between different schemes. It will also support the implementation of the NAP processes. The aim would be achieving some balance between constraints costs due to outages and any extra costs TOs may incur while trying to minimise these constraints.

SHET would provide group members from their planning team. They may need to have some representation from either their control room or their project teams.

SPT would provide group members from their planning team with some support from their design team.

Action: Need to identify relations and interactions between the JPC, STC Section C, and the NAP.

Action: Provide a map for the NAP process.

The CPR subgroup

Will coordinate, and monitor the progress for Transmission Reinforcement Works, mainly in relation to Connection Applications. It will also ensure that any changes are fed back into the correct channels in order to ensure the information is communicated effectively.

It is necessary to check how this subgroup would run in parallel with other process such that it improves the communication and coordination process without duplicating tasks.

Action: Show the time line for a sample connection project with different stage where the CPR subgroup discusses/provides support to the project.

4. ETYS

The ETYS study guidelines were circulated for both SHET and SPT prior to the JPC meeting. The OFTOs, on the other hand, have only received a request of information.

A timeline has also been sent for all parties. SHET raised a point about the adequate timeframe for escalation and highlighted their view that a escalation following a one week slippage in data communication is very strict.

It was raised that the ETYS process should include some learning points in order to provide the feedback required to improve the process.

It was highlighted that treatment of embedded generation is still a challenge in the ETYS process especially with only one DNO (SHEPD) providing breakdown of embedded generation capacity into different fuel types and generation technologies. It was also noted that the change of information received about embedded generation and changes in the treatment of embedded generators would cause a step change in the Investment Planning processes.

SHET raised the point of clarifying the terminology used and highlighted that some terms, e.g. FLOP ZONES, might have no specific meaning for SHET.

It was pointed out that ETYS uses network configurations that are based on generation scenarios rather than contracted background which might trigger questions from generation parties. However, similar problems have been dealt with previously within the ODYS process.

Action: ETYS study guidelines needs more clarity on losses.

NGET pointed out that NDP analysis will be used to decide on NGET's investments in wider system reinforcements. There was a discussion that SHET and SPT might benefit from a similar sort of analysis and, if this is the case, there will need to be significant coordination between all parties.

Generation backgrounds will be sent by the end of April. Other data exchange will take place during May. The final ETYS document should be ready by the end of October with the deadline for publishing it at the end of November.

NGET will present the ETYS to the ENSG and feedback will be provided.

Action: NGET to confirm that generation backgrounds were sent.

Action: All parties to confirm that the process of data exchange is on target.

5. Generation Scenarios

Generation scenarios will be sent towards the end of April. The main scenarios at the moment are the Gone Green and Accelerated Growth. NGET uses two sensitivities around these two main scenarios. Other local sensitivities may occasionally be used.

Action: NGET to provide information about sensitivities used by NGET around the two generation scenarios for both SPT and SHET.

It was noted that the major difference in the generation scenarios in Scotland is about the time by which marine projects connect.

Generation scenarios based on Gone Green with some sensitivities around Scottish Onshore Wind would support investment options within the Scottish network and on the B6/B7 boundaries.

It was also noted that under the Security Background of the NETS SQSS, Scotland will be importing power the major difference in the generation scenarios in Scotland is about the time by which marine projects connect.

6. Reporting from other Working Groups

ENSG

NGET has provided a brief description of the Gap Analysis which aims to identify any potential gaps in the planning and coordination processes between different parties in the electricity market that might undermine the ability to deliver an optimal electricity network in a timely manner.

Action: NGET to circulate the draft report on Gap Analysis for SHET and SPT.

ENTSOE

NGET has provided an update on the ENTSOE activities highlighting that the Generation Code and the Demand Code has been agreed and that the HVDC code is currently open for discussion with a Call for Evidence already sent out. It was mentioned that the HVDC code will apply to all HVDC systems including those owned by TOs.

7. Date for next meeting

It was agreed to meet in three month time however the exact date have not been finally confirmed yet.

Action: Agree the date for next meeting by mid May.

List of actions:

1. **Once the final structure and appointments have been announced, a note will be circulated to SPT/SHET.**

To be sent before the July meeting – email sizes causing a problem.

2. **Confirm with John Twomey if there is any update on Ofgem's situation in relation to confidentiality arrangement/business separation arrangements OFTOs have.**

John Twomey – Ongoing

Follow up action: If no clear response has been received from Ofgem, we need to raise the point again with them.

3. **NEGT to suggest a structure (and a diagram clarifying interactions/reporting for the JPC and subgroups) and circulate the structure to SHET/SPT for discussion.**

A structure has been proposed – To be discussed under a separate agenda item. ToRs updated to reflect the new structure



JPC Structure
Proposed



2013 06 25 JPC ToR
Draft New Structure

4. **Discuss with Louise Wilks and check if there is any material to present to the JPC on ITPR and offshore coordination in general.**

Louise Wilks will update the JPC on ITPR on a separate agenda item

5. **NEGT to provide a draft ToR for the Offshore Coordination subgroup for all parties to comment.**

Keith Dan has circulated a ToR – To be discussed under the relevant agenda item



Draft ToR for JPC
Offshore Coordination

6. **Revise the ToR for the JPC and the subgroups to reflect the discussions. The target is to agree the ToRs for the JPC and two of the subgroups (IP/MG) by mid May.**

ToRs attached

Subgroup leaders to provide an update under a separate agenda item



JPCIP -Draft ToR v4



JP ETYS
subgroup-DraftToR



2013 07 04
JPCMG-TDraftORs



JPCOA draft ToR d3



\\
NGDSSWRK002.uk.cc

7. **Need to identify relations and interactions between the JPC, STC Section C, and the NAP.**

See attached for information



STC-C to NAP to JPC
interaction Jul2013

8. Provide a map for the NAP process.

See attached for information



Network Access
Policy map Jul2013

9. Show the time line for a sample connection project with different stage where the CPR subgroup discusses/provides support to the project. *Bieshoj*

See attached for information



CPR Subgroup -
Additional Information

10. NGET to confirm that generation backgrounds were sent.

Action closed: Richard Proctor to provide an update during the meeting if required

11. All parties to confirm that the process of data exchange is on target.

Action closed: Richard Proctor to provide an update during the meeting if required

12. NGET to provide information about sensitivities used by NGET around the two generation scenarios for both SPT and SHET.

Action closed: Richard Proctor to provide an update during the meeting if required

13. NGET to circulate the draft report on Gap Analysis for SHET and SPT.

This is the latest draft version that has recently been circulated to the ENSG for comment, so it is yet to be finalised and approved in the next couple of weeks.



ENSG Cross
Networks Project rep

14. Agree the date for next meeting by mid May.

10th of July 2013

15. ETYS study guidelines needs more clarity on losses

Richard Proctor to amend the guidelines to provide the clarity required.