Power Potential
Regional Market Advisory Panel

29 April 2020

Participants:

Panel Chair	Dame Fiona Woolf	Chair, Regional Market Advisory Panel
Panel Members	Julie Finkler	BEIS
	John O'Toole	Gresham House
	Fernando Morales	Highview Power
	Goran Strbac	Imperial College London
	Andrew Robbins	Innogy
	Rickard von Poten	Lightsource BP
	Louise van Rensburg	Ofgem
	Sammy Blay	Reactive Technologies
	Dimitrios Agriostathis	Vattenfall
	Ned Ponsonby Semih Oztreves	Zenobe Energy
Representing National Grid ESO	Julian Leslie	Head of Networks
Representing UK Power Networks	Sotiris Georgiopoulos	Head of Smart Grid
Power Potential project team attendees	Dr Biljana Stojkovska David Preston Dr Rita Shaw Kellie Dillon Tim Manandhar Sima Davarzani Mike Robey	Project Lead, National Grid ESO Commercial Lead, National Grid ESO Project Lead, UK Power Networks DER Relationship Manager, UK Power Networks Lead Smart Grid Technology Engineer (Power Potential and ANM design authority), UKPN Smart Grid Technology Engineer, UK Power Networks RMAP Secretariat, National Grid ESO
Apologies	Alastair Martin Chris Buckland Ian Larive Alex Howard Frank Gordon	Flexitricity Lightsource Low Carbon Origami Energy Renewable Energy Association

Notes and actions:

2	**Progress on previous actions** **February action:** DER invited to liaise with UKPN (Kellie) if they wish to arrange a date/ time to test their speed of response, ahead of these tests occurring during commissioning. **Ongoing offer** **February action:** Agreed to share the newsletter with all RMAP members. **Complete** **February action**: Kellie to forward the 4 previous issues to all RMAP members. (action completed 12 February). **Complete** **February action:** Project team to review communication activity to share the project's progress with a wider audience. **Ongoing. Covid-19 response has taken priority. Project team to follow-up.**

February action: David to investigate this request (for a breakdown of NGESO's synchronising costs) and to report back.

David reported that it was difficult to reverse engineer the combination of manual and automated processes used.

The tagging of syncing actions is a process that is undertaken by the Performance Review Team in Wokingham post event. They are tasked with determining how the costs of tagged actions are split across Thermal, Voltage and ROCOF ensuring that discrete costs can be published appropriately.

They look at the BOAs (Bid Offer Acceptance) and control room feedback from the day to allocate to one of these reasons. The action is also then allocated to a specific area or group dependent on the reason (these may differ based on the reason – i.e. a voltage group differs to a thermal group)

A system then takes all of this information and compares the actions against other units that were available within the area / group that were available to solve the specific issue in that area / group within any Settlement Period to determine whether it was an "in merit" or "out of merit" action. This determines whether the unit would have been taken for margin and work out the additional costs to the next in the stack so that an accurate cost of the additional action can be shared.

In summary, the tagging process involves manual and automated actions as well as exposure to geographic groupings specific to the reason, alternatives in the BM that will change SP to SP as well as account for in and out of merit actions.

February action: All encouraged to explore the data available via the hyperlinks on slides 36 and 37

David reported that five years' historical data has now been published on the National Grid ESO data portal: https://data.nationalgrideso.com/constraint-management/outturn-voltage-costs

February action: NGESO to provide further feedback on Dungeness and Shoreham.

February action: Biljana to follow up the questions on stability and voltage with Control Room engineers.

Biljana summarised the voltage and stability steps undertaken, beginning with offline studies to establish the voltage required. Network Access Planning then consider what actions and machines are needed to meet the requirements for SQSS. In the south east this is typically met by Grain, Coryton South, Damhead Creek, Medway Power. South east plant decisions are also influenced by south central requirement e.g. Didcot. RoCoF is then considered, and traders evaluate interconnector flow to meet RoCoF requirements. Finally, the Control Room makes selections based on factors including the requirement, Mvar range, downward margins and stable export margins.

Generally, the process goes:

1. **Voltage plant**
2. **Plant for inertia**
3. **Plant for system margin.**

	February action: Biljana said that NG ESO will continue working on this will share a document providing all details from the presentations on Wave 2 and Wave 3. The DER would be able to use the Wave 2 example and Wave 3 information to prepare for the trials. **Biljana advised that the team were still working on this and that it would be shared ahead of the W2 trials.**
	Project update Rita and Biljana presented an update on project progress including the revised trials plan, reflecting the impact of the Covid-19 restrictions. Goran noted that he felt that the project is in the right place to deliver this proof of concept and to validate the software solution.
	Active Power Biljana presented the updated approach to delivering the active power service within Power Potential.
	Feasibility Study for Development of an Aggregator Solution Tim and Sima presented the findings of the study and invited questions and comments. Fiona supported the identification of the importance of identifying and applying recognised standards to the design. Sammy welcomed the study and also supported the approach on standardisation was positive. Sammy noted interest in exploring business models to deliver this service. Suggested Q3 2020 as an appropriate feedback timescale. Ned agreed that this is of interest. Rita encouraged more feedback from RMAP members and noted that the findings will also be shared with other interested stakeholders.
	DER payments Ned raised concern on the payment schedule, noting that Zenobe had undertaken works in 2019, that given the delays to the project schedule will now only be reimbursed through the Optional Technical Trials in 2021. Cash flow is the concern. Ned asked for RMAP views; could payment be linked to commissioning, instead of completing the Technical Trials? David asked for others' views and he emphasised that the slides reinforce the programme's commitment to payment as outlined in the contracts once technical trial tasks were completed. David asked if this change would be requested formally. Rita offered to provide a revised forecast for when payments are expected to be provided to participating DER, in line with the revised project delivery plan. **See overleaf for action and project team response**

Action: Share revised delivery forecast for DER payments

13 May update:

- Based on a 1st September start for Optional trials, this would shift the timescale for the participation payments to early November 2020 - early January 2021. For a DER providing 24/7 availability in the trials, the first payment would be in the first week of November. The exact payment timings would depend on when DER offer sufficient availability to meet the payment thresholds; the project team can advise any DER based on their specific circumstances.
- The timescale for payments for the Wave 2 Market Trials would be in line with accepted availability and utilisation in a given month being paid 24 working days following month end.
- The calculation and timing of trial payments is set out in the DER Framework Agreement and Market Procedures.

Ned indicated that they wouldn't walk away if this could not be changed, but that he was looking for RMAP consensus on recovering some costs after commissioning. David noted a difficulty on this (advanced payment) approach was that payments during the Technical Trials were linked to each site's delivered availability during the trials.

John agreed that it would be beneficial to recover some costs this year (cashflow).

Any Other Business

David advised that NGESO launched a new product, 28 April, **Optional Downward Flexibility Management** (ODFM), for periods of low demand such as being currently experienced. It provides an opportunity for embedded generators to provide a service reducing supply onto the network and for sources of demand to provide a service increasing their take from the system for at least three hours. ODFM is for sites not currently participating in Balancing Mechanism market and that have no DNO restriction on their site. Further details available at: https://data.nationalgrideso.com/plans-reports-analysis/covid-19-preparedness-materials?from=10#resources (see page 2 of the available files)

Biljana shared that the **Distributed ReStart Project** has specified very similar technical characteristics required for DER to participate in their project to that required for Power Potential. Distributed ReStart trials will be taking place in Scotland and RMAP members with sites in Scotland are encouraged to contact the project: box.BlackStartNIC@nationalgrid.com

Goran noted growing stakeholder interest in both Power Potential and the Distributed ReStart projects.

RMAP agreed that the next meeting should be scheduled for July 2020.
Action: Mike to schedule.