

Power Potential Regional Market Advisory Panel

Outcomes, 26th June 2019

Participants:

Panel Chair	Dame Fiona Woolf	Chair, Regional Market Advisory Panel
Panel Members	Julie Finkler	BEIS
	Alistair Martin	Flexitricity
	Fernando Morales	Highview Power
	Andrew Robbins	Innogy
	Valentina Giornetti	Lightsource
	Ian Larive	Low Carbon
	Edwin Tammas-Williams	Ofgem
	Alex Howard	Origami Energy
	David Middleton	
	Sammy Blay	Reactive Technologies
	Toby Reid	Veolia
	Ned Ponsonby	Zenobe
	Representing National Grid ESO	Paul Lowbridge
Representing UK Power Networks	Ian Cameron	Head of Innovation
Power Potential project team attendees	Dr Biljana Stojkovska	Project Lead, National Grid ESO
	David Preston	Commercial Workstream Lead, National Grid ESO
	Dr Rita Shaw	Project Lead, UK Power Networks
	Mike Robey	RMAP Secretariat, for National Grid ESO
Apologies	Hanae de Rochefort, Association for Decentralised Energy; Doerte Schneemann, BEIS; Goran Strbac, Imperial College London; Louise van Rensburg, Ofgem; Frank Gordon, Renewable Energy Association; Sotiris Georgiopoulos, UK Power Networks	

Actions

	SLIDES CIRCULATED 27 June
1	Project team to advise when participating DER will have access to the DER User Interface, so that DER can develop their own procedures and train staff ahead of the trials.
2	Project team to provide 6-8 weeks' notice of trial start to aid DER in scheduling appropriate shifts and to provide training opportunity on the DER User Interface at least 4 weeks before trials.
3	Project team to investigate and advise if there will be an IDD (interface design description) doc to interface between DER systems and the DER User Interface
4	Project team to provide update to RMAP following the July Steering Committee meeting to discuss the impact of delays and options for the trials to maintain project learning.
5	Next RMAP meeting to be scheduled in September.
	Actions arising from Origami presentation:
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ David requested that the Transition Team discuss this with Ian C (re: Asset Register project)
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ian C to share the feedback on standardisation with the Open Networks Team

Panel discussion

Agenda Item	Panel Members	Panel comments and questions
Origami presentation	<p>Biljana</p> <p>Fiona</p> <p>Alistair</p> <p>Biljana</p> <p>Rita</p> <p>David M</p> <p>Ian C</p> <p>Andy David P</p> <p>Alistair</p> <p>Alistair</p> <p>Andy</p> <p>David M</p> <p>Ian C</p> <p>Ian C</p> <p>Sammy</p> <p>David M</p> <p>Ian</p> <p>Paul</p>	<p>Transition project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are services all active power? – Project can include reactive within one of the proposed services (authorised supply capacity). • Market Rules – clarified the scope of this workstream is market rules for the project trials • Queried unintended consequences around Active Network Management. Project team aware of issues around ANM and are investigating options. <p>Fusion project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the benefits be transferable beyond the trial area? The project informs the ENA’s Open Network project, which will make broader recommendations. <p>Local Energy Oxfordshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lots of cross-learning with Transition project in particular. <p>Overall Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do the projects link to each DNO’s network management systems? Transition project is looking at this within its Whole System Co-ordination workstream. • A particular challenge is customer data confidentiality considerations, whereby DNO, who have contact details for DERs / flexibility providers within their operating areas but are unable to share these with the project partners that are trying to engage stakeholders. This risks excessive engagement and marketing costs. Keen to share stakeholder engagement experiences with Power Potential. • NGESO & UKPN NIA-funded Asset Register project is seeking to overcome issues with identifying DER / flexibility providers. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Action: David requested that the Transition Team discuss this with Ian. • Money talks – emphasise the financial opportunity to secure engagement • Two things have helped address these challenges for NGESO Balancing Services: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Longer contracts (the 15 year contracts offered for STOR in 2010 triggered great interest in the product that has endured) ii. Using intermediaries like Flexitricity to reach further and deeper into the pool of potential participants • Agree, there is a role for aggregators, but this takes time and there is a need to know what the value of the opportunity is first to be able to engage in detail. • Queried consumer demographics and engagement. Fusion will look at domestic participants, though not thought to be a demographically diverse area. LEO project, to be confirmed if domestic participants will be involved. • The DSO – TSO boundary is also an unresolved issue. What will be the extent of the DSO role? • Standardisation is another significant theme. Each DNO has their own approach, and often have several approaches. Providers don’t want to sign multiple contracts. A standardised approach and use of common Framework Agreements would be beneficial. • Yes, agree the need for standardisation and most services are broadly similar. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Action: Ian will share this feedback with the Open Networks Team • Are licensed suppliers being actively engaged? • EDF Energy’s R&D function is involved in the LEO project • Licensed suppliers also involved in UKPN’s Project Shift and also recognise the need to work with third party intermediaries • Yes, support these views. NGESO learning from customers through approaches such as Power Responsive and this has contributed to NGESO’s work to standardise and simplify services. But there are also a growing number of participants and customers want to understand who to trust, how to navigate intermediaries and identify what best suits them. Data confidentiality can be a barrier, but trust is key.

Agenda Item	Panel Members	Panel comments and questions
Walk-through of Power Potential Interfaces and Processes	<p>Andy</p> <p>Andy</p> <p>Andy</p> <p>Ian L</p>	<p>Walk-through of Power Potential Interfaces and Processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarified that slide 15 presents GSP-level data to NGENSO's PAS system and this is not individual DER values at point of connection • When can participants get access to the Power Potential User Interface so that DER's own procedures can be written, to train staff and to match to shift patterns? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A workshop will be scheduled to walk-through the detail of the User Interface and Market Procedures. The project team are resolving issues with the system ahead of scheduling the workshop. ○ The project team asked how far ahead of trials should the workshop be scheduled? ○ ACTION: 6-8 weeks' notice of trial start for scheduling shifts. ACTION: And at least 4 weeks ahead of trials for the training workshop. The training needs to be on the real version of the system that will be trialled. • How much bulk upload is possible? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is possible to bulk upload availability and volume for the whole trial period. This advance bulk upload can then be edited if required ahead of the closing time for bids for any day. • Is there an IDD (interface design description) document specifying how to interface between the DER User Interface and DERs' own systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not yet. Project team to investigate and advise if there will be an IDD doc to interface with DER systems. Acknowledged could be a BAU development. ACTION • Is it important how many Mvar we make available? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In wave 1 of the trials Mvar volume isn't specified – make available the whole unit. DER just advise for each settlement period of their expected MW operating level and if they are available. ○ In wave 2 and 3, DER can load their Mvar limit for each service window if they don't want to make their whole unit available.
	<p>Julie</p> <p>Julie</p> <p>Toby</p> <p>Sammy</p> <p>Sammy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When will the trials start? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The project team previously communicated indicative dates for the wave 1 trial start between 27 Aug and 30 Sept and wave 2 to start as 15 Dec. These are indicative dates and the project team will provide updates on these following the next project steering committee. • Is dispatch manual? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No, it will be automated • Is the project duplicating NGENSO's PAS system settlement function? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the Power Potential trials, settlement is between UKPN and each participating DER as that is who the service contract is between. (This is unlike STOR, for example, which is outside the scope of this project, where contracts and settlement are between a DER and NGENSO). • What is the role for UKPN in the finances for the service? Is it just passing the money on (from NGENSO and on to each DER)? What about UKPN costs to operate the service? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ During the trial, the project partners' cost for undertaking the trials are covered by NIC funding from Ofgem. • Queried what changes have been made to the Grid Code to avoid DER being charged for excess reactive power <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The project has not changed the Grid Code, but has identified the clauses in the DCUSA (Distribution Connection and Use of System Agreement) which reassure DER that they won't be penalised whilst delivering the Power Potential services during the trials (see appendix to the Market Procedures).

Agenda Item	Panel Members	Panel comments and questions
	<p>Fiona</p> <p>Andy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any issues worth sharing with the panel for advice? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not technically, but the project team is interested to hear of any impacts that a change in trial start date might create. ○ The project has significant issues to still get through before the trials and is fully committed to proceeding to trials. The project team is looking at options and these will be agreed through the project's Steering Committee and then shared with participants and RMAP. • Summer holidays, particularly school holiday period, may create issues with scheduling site commissioning.
	<p>Ian L</p> <p>Fiona</p> <p>Andy</p> <p>Andy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project needs a critical mass or participants, is that behind the delay? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Technical readiness and customer readiness are both key for establishing the trial start date. ○ The Market Procedure document identifies the goal of having 5 participants for the trials. These don't necessarily all have to be ready at the very start of the trial and the project team has an approach to take for late-comers joining the trial. ○ Integration of the systems is a particular challenge, but no customers are yet ready to participate. • What percentage of participant contracts are outstanding? This was a big issue at the last meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ About 60% are now signed and the remainder are fully aware and working towards signing. Plus, the project is open to additional participants joining. ○ The project team is aware that delays impact customers; for some it creates a cash flow issue with a delay to trial payments being received and for other DER the delay is providing more time for them to get ready and participate in the trials. • Price discovery needs multiple participants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, this is key for the commercial trials in wave 2. Wave 1 is passive (commercially) for participants, but it is trialling the end-to-end system technically. Tests of the end-to-end system are also a key part of the test phase before the trials. • The project needs real live customer trials of the system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, we're learning pre-trial and also learning by doing once the trials start. This is complex and challenging. From a networks point of view the trials are taking place on the live system, so important to get right.
	<p>Andy</p> <p>Ian C</p> <p>Alex</p> <p>Andy</p> <p>Paul</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-billing is new, so it sounds like there will be issues to work through and test and trial this. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, this is a new approach and a key priority to test this. • Wave 1 of the trials is essentially a technical compliance trial of the whole end-to-end system. And integration is the key challenge for the project. • How is the project considering BAU interest against the scope of the trials? For the Interim Solution for the wave 1 trials, are there more options to simplify this? Can we compromise on the scope of the Interim Solution further to keep on track with the project schedule? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What would the panel consider could be de-scoped? • Must not trip the DER. If preparations take another month, that's fine. Do not risk tripping the DER. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The project will not risk the system or DER assets • These are good challenges for the project team to take away and review. I used to lead NGESO Settlements and the project could possibly do manual settlements for a little time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, this is a fair challenge for wave 1. It would be much more of an issue to de-scope settlement for wave 2 of the trials. ○ Settlements are not currently seen as the delaying factor ahead of the trials.

Agenda Item	Panel Members	Panel comments and questions
	<p data-bbox="359 230 422 253">Fiona</p> <p data-bbox="371 454 410 477">Ian</p> <p data-bbox="359 589 422 611">Fiona</p> <p data-bbox="359 678 422 701">Fiona</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="480 230 1428 443"> <p>• What are the implications of delay on trial learning?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="576 253 1428 320">○ For some aspects of the technical learning from Wave 1, trials are best to undertake in summer as opposed to winter. <li data-bbox="576 320 1428 443">○ However, Wave 2 and 3 will continue to give technical learning during the commercial phases of trials. Overall project learning is the priority. We must have DER ready and systems delivered to deliver on that learning. <li data-bbox="576 454 1428 577"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="576 454 1428 577">○ The Steering Group has not yet had the chance to discuss the impact of delay or options including whether there should be any de-scoping. This will be discussed at the July meeting and the project team will bring back the outcome of this to RMAP. <u>ACTION</u> <li data-bbox="480 589 1428 678"> <p>• We can hear that you're fully committed to the project and RMAP are keen to be kept informed on the outcome of these discussions. Do draw on the panel's advice.</p> <li data-bbox="480 678 1428 712"> <p>• Also, recommend September for the next RMAP meeting. <u>ACTION</u></p>