

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Meeting name: GC0154 – Interconnector ramping Workgroup Meeting 9

Date: 23/02/2023

Contact Details

Chair: Jessica Rivalland, National Grid ESO Jessica.Rivalland@nationalgrideso.com

Proposer: Louise Trodden, National Grid ESO Louise.Trodden@nationalgrideso.com

Key areas of discussion

GC0154 seeks to provide clarity to stakeholders by incorporating Interconnector ramping requirements into the Grid Code in line with the requirements of SOGL A119. This includes fulfilling both the Compliance and Operational aspects.

The purpose of this Workgroup was for the workgroup members to provide feedback on the CBA process and to shortlist the methodology and criteria for the CBA.

Ofgem Role and Responsibilities

The Ofgem rep provided a presentation on the process involved in decision making to help support previous concerns raised at workgroups. We require all the information to make an informed decision and look at the views of all industry not just that of the ESO from feedback gained as part of the process including consultation responses and report content including voting results. The presentation shared on the call can be found here.

Feedback and CBA process

The Proposer advised that the current feedback has been anonymised and shared to the workgroup via an excel document. A workgroup member raised that not all feedback has been responded to and more detail would be required for each response. The proposer will link in with KVH offline to go through concerns.

A request was made by a workgroup member for the progress of the CBA to be shared with the workgroup as it goes along and how the CBA is going to be utilised following completion.

The proposer advised to the workgroup that the process shared is very high-level and that the CBA is the first stage and there are further discussions to be had after this.

A request has been made for the information on the discussion that have been had with the EU TSO's to be shared with the workgroup including who and the responses. An ESO Workgroup member advised that updates have been provided to the EU TSO's SOC group.

A request for the feedback and discussion ESO have with EU TSO's to be documented and provided to the workgroup. An ESO rep agreed for a slide to be shared with the workgroup to include dates and details of the conversations had with EU TSO's.

CBA Shortlisting Methodology and Criteria

The Baringa representative ran through their presentations. The following questions and feedback below were captured that was provided by the workgroup; this will be reviewed:

- There is a need to recognise there is an unconscious bias in the criteria that complexity is negative reason to neglect the option. I would disagree. the technology is inherently flexible and using that complexity of what it can be doing within a settlement period via staggering ramps, including frequency response and inter-tripping of ramp in event, net overall ramps whether regional or national are all ways of resolving this issue.
- It was raised that it should not be complexity bad, it should be is the benefit of a complex option sufficient to try and achieve it and that benefit needs to be assessed on the overall cost to GB.
- A Workgroup member advised that it was worth confirming nothing we can do will ever remove risk of frequency events, we can only risk impacting frequency and reserve holding related to ramping. Frequency is being managed second by second, hence why the staggering of the ramp within the settlement period makes a difference to that.
- It was noted that the solution of a problem is the focus, we must raise the standard. The only way of doing this is improving the tools. The Interconnectors flexibility and speed are already available.
- It was stated that Harvey balls methodology for the CBA is fine however, as any web link to it will tell you it's a qualitative approach, designed to rule things in or out. it's not meant to be used to quantitatively score, as far as I can tell. It is preferred that instead of looking at totals and trying to arbitrarily cut off within that we focus in on the factors that would rule out an option; what they are; and do we all agree that option is being ruled out on that basis.
- It was asked, why do market options score red on grid code when they require no grid code change, they may require changes to CUSC? but they are not changing ramp rates, they are reflecting the result of market actions using them within a cost reflective arrangement on the day.
- A concern was raised that the CBA has not been scored in comparison to the exiting situation as the baseline. Ease of writing in the grid code is given the same weighting as one line for consumer benefit!
- It was stated that complexity should have no weight against the consumer benefit. Especially when it comes down to solutions that have bene used elsewhere e.g., EU coupling and Nordic market model.
- A workgroup member expressed the "Ease of" criteria should be on a secondary level. The solution of the problem and what we are prepared to accept should be

the main drivers. Or we can say let's do what is simple. Even if it does not address the issue?

- It was highlighted that given the importance of the CBA, should it not be the working group to score the criteria list that the working group agrees with?
- A workgroup member raised that, we have a market today which settles every half hr based on PNs and ramps between them, no new grid code is needed for each new generator with a given acceptable ramp rate today. We can keep grid code as it is; reflect the costs of that within a ramping market and allow interconnectors and others contributing to a high ramp rate occurring at a given time to either resolve positions, accept a given limit proportionately at that time or reflect that cost to those driving it? none of that changes the grid code. It just reflects the operational costs and consequences of a collective ramp.
- A question was asked by a workgroup member if the matrix used is a simple sum number that you assigned based on Baringa's experience?
- A concern was raised that it feels like there are some criteria that have been missed. Extra CBA scoring lines could include maximising the benefits of flexible assets for end consumers, option sends positive signals for future IC investment, supports Gov't Wind ambition via required infrastructure, efficient market design.
- A workgroup member asked, it is not a "Ramping" market it should be the "Desired Response" is what we need. Can someone explain what a "ramping market" is?
- It was raised that, what the interconnectors can do should be part of the options. Today the CBA is focused on ramping. Looking at the past, which is a superseded view on how to operate.
- A question was asked, has it been assessed how will each solutions affect the Imbalance collectively? Reducing the ramping rate to half makes the imbalance double regardless of who has to pay the bill. Workgroup members that have a vote should have a say in scoring.
- It was suggested that the scoring to be completed at the end of the meeting instead for parties to reach out to Baringa directly.
- An ESO rep wanted to address the comments received on via the above and emails however it would be good to see a clear question and or a suggestion. They reiterated that to move forward with a solution a CBA is needing to be completed.
- A Workgroup member agreed. if we want to assume the market needs to work with new interconnector capability these will need capturing somewhere in Grid Code either mandatory or as ancillary services.
- There was a request for all options to be listed and ensure that these are included in the CBA.

A team's poll was sent by the chair to all workgroup members to complete as an ask of their preferred 2 options with a favoured option. However, workgroup wanted to complete the initial feedback that was circulated and then the poll will be shared by email and for the workgroup to complete this by tomorrow (24 February 2023).

Next Steps

- The chair will send an email to the workgroup with the poll to be completed by 24 February 2023.
- The next workgroup will be once the CBA has been completed, a poll on available dates will be issued for this and the request will be for the next workgroup will be an in-person session.

Actions

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
4	WG8	RJ	Provide explanation behind criteria	14/02/2023	Closed
6	WG9	LT	To link in with KVH to explain feedback responses	ASAP	Open
7	WG9	ESO reps	ESO will produce a slide to show the forum dates with details and to circulate.	ASAP	Open
8	WG9	JR	To issue out an email with the poll with options for WG to complete	24/02/23	Open
9	WG9	ESO & Interconnectors	A separate discussion with ESO and interconnectors to be set up prior to the next workgroup.	ASAP	Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Jessica Rivalland	JR	National Grid ESO	Chair
Ruth Roberts	RR	National Grid ESO	Technical Secretary
Louise Trodden	LT	National Grid ESO	Proposer
Agir Mertcan	AM	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Andre Canelhas	AC	GridLink Interconnector	Workgroup Member
Andrew Larkins	AL	Sygensys	Observer

Antonio Del Castillo Zas	ADCZ	NGESO	Workgroup SME
Benjamin Marshall	BM	National HVDC centre and SHE Transmission	Workgroup Member
Daniel Newby	DN	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Ewa Krywkowska	EK	NGESO	Workgroup SME
Iqra Latif	IL	Eleclinks	Workgroup Member
Jack Grant	JG	BritNed	Observer
James Hill	JH	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Kick Vanhouten	KVH	BritNed	Workgroup Member
Lijia Qiu	LQ	Nationalgrid Ventures	Workgroup Member
Ilias Varsos	LV	Eleclinks	Observer
Meerav Shah	MS	Baringa	CBA Consultant
Monne Depraetere	MD	Nemo Link	Workgroup Member
Oliver Garfield	OG	NGESO	Workgroup SME
Ronan Jamieson	RJ	Baringa	CBA Consultant
Vera Stam	VS	BritNed	Workgroup Member Alternate