

Data Exchange Working Group

MINUTES

Meeting – Tuesday 21st May 2024, 14:30 – 16:00

MS Teams Meeting

ATTENDEES	INITIAL	COMPANY
Ian Povey - Chair	IP	ENW
Nataliia Myrhorodska	NM	ENA
Neal Wade	NW	NPg
Lee Saville	LS	NGED
Steve Mockford	SM	GTC
Chris Shepard	CS	GTC
Tan Yun Tiam	TY	SPEN
Jennifer Miller	JM	SPEN
Ryan Westland	RW	SSEN
Andrew Wilson	AW	NGED
Harshil Sumaria	HS	UKPN
APOLOGIES		
Alan Creighton	AC	NPg
John Smart	JS	SSEN
Vasso Liapi	VL	NGED
Phil Moseley	PM	NGED

MEETING NOTES AND ACTIONS

LEAD

Agenda item 1. Welcome and acceptance of agenda		IP
Members were welcomed to the meeting, and the agenda was agreed.		
Actions	None	
Agenda item 2. Confirm minutes of the previous meeting		IP
Previous completed actions were agreed and closed. For a discussion of other actions, see below.		
Actions	None.	
Agenda item 3. Discussion of trial		ALL
<p>Each representative of Data Exchange WG shared their experience of participating in the trial.</p> <p>Lee Saville (NGED)</p> <p>NGED reported the lack of measuring equipment at some connections and as a result some IDNO were unable to complete some of the schedules. For South Wales and South West, there was very limited IDNO contribution because majority of sites were either just loaded sites or they were less than 1MW.</p> <p>NGED considers that the cardinal point information needs to be agreed before completing Schedules 6 & 7.</p> <p>Neal Wade (NPg)</p> <p>NPg considers it necessary to simplify the requirements of EREC G111 for the IDNO`s. Gate data gathering would be useful. It was also noted that there are difficulties in common understanding what we`re trying to achieve.</p> <p>Interface between NPg and ENWL is a complex, it therefore makes sense to exchange data in the easiest way - to give NPg what they needed and give ENWL what they need, rather than strictly dogmatically following the schedules. Therefore NPg supports having flexibility between data exchange. Also, each participant in data exchange should have a common understand of the metod for calculating fault contributions.</p> <p>Tan Yun Tiam (SPEN)</p> <p>SPEN had a discussion with DNO/IDNO colleagues about the EREC G111 wording about Power Generating Facilities with a Registered Capacity of 5MW or more that have a direct connection to the DNO system. There is no clarity in which place 5MW should be measured. Should it be provided the circuit data in between the point of connections and the generator? Also, SPEN had discussion about short circuit contributions. Should it be provided a short circuit contribution for normal running arrangement or maybe for the worst-case scenario.</p> <p>SPEN noted that the Scottish Power Network is very complex so displaying data in schedules is also difficult. The network configurations are not regular, and have many interconnections with other networks. This means that generators or aggregated generation equivalents contribute to more than one point of connection. Therefore, there is a question is how to enter these data into schedules.</p>		

SPEN haven't yet received any document back from IDNO.

Jennifer Miller (SPEN)

JM had the problem in terms of determining cardinal points. Depending on how big a connection and how much generation is embedded in that connection. That arguably would change what your peak is, so SPEN recommends having a joint approach to this issue. Also, SPEN found a problem with providing information from small connections.

Ryan Westland (SSEN)

SSEN have got concerns about getting GSP peaks identified in the north because of the lack of metering data. The question was raised, whether it is appropriate to have the same schedules for the smaller IDNO sites or simply request an update on any new generation/load that has been connected; the DNO can make their own assumptions based on this information.

Harshil Sumaria (UKPN)

UKPN don't usually have the week 24 data until week 24 in terms of the loading. The DNO proposed to share the data for week 24 when it comes to week 50, maybe for the 2nd submission for the IDNO trial.

UKPN considers worth to have data a minimum threshold, either on voltage, so the voltage that it connects to or the size of the connection to reduce the amount of effort on both sides and make this more meaningful. Also UKPN found that some things on the schedule did not make sense e.g. the substation name or substation number, it is useful on larger scale sites, but we need to think carefully about small sites.

Ian Povey (ENW)

ENW have exchanged data with NPg, Scottish Power and with NGED. ENW have been unable to establish IDNO contacts to provide data. ENW used previous year's peaks to provide data. IP noted that there is a need to review the data exchange requirements between DNO/DNO and DNO/IDNO due to the different availability of data on small and large connections. Also, ENW faced the same problems as other participants in the trial data exchange.

Steve Mockford, Chris Shepard (GTC)

Engagement with the DNO overall has been good albeit in conclusion within GTC only dealt with one DNO (NGED). GTC considers it appropriate to determine a minimum voltage level when the schedules should be required.

GTC members had some challenges in completing the current portfolio of schedules for a DNO / IDNO data exchange, but there is still some value in maintaining a smaller portfolio of schedules for the DNO / DNO use.

GTC mentioned that a majority of the IDNO's build and operate predominantly domestic type networks with individual generation at the lower level, mainly G98 level. This is especially true in Scotland where as part of building regulations all new houses are required to have PV installed. The IDNO has clearly identified that the current process is very time consuming and in many cases the data is not available in the detail being asked for.

As a result of the evidence from the trial, for GTC it is clear that some data is required, but for smaller sized generation some general rules could be applied, hence the current portfolio of schedules requires a thorough review and update.

For larger sized individual generators, it is clear that there is real value in providing specific data exchange and therefore GTC can recommend that IDNO's specify a threshold at which data is provided (voltage and size of generator) and drastically cut the number of schedules being recommended?

Next steps		
<p>After passing the trail exchange period the WG will have a second look at EREC G111 and see how the document can be changed and restructured. Also, it should be clarified what level of granularity we need achieve for various size or voltage levels. The members agreed that the second draft should become not overly onerous for DNO/IDNO.</p> <p>It was agreed to put together all schedules and to work through each individual paragraph and the requirements.</p> <p>RW offered before the next meeting the DNO/IDNO to provide any suggestions on how the document can be restructured.</p> <p>It was agreed to quantify how many IDNO connections are at different voltage levels.</p>		
Action 1.1	After passing the trial data exchange to provide ENA with summary experience in filling schedules and process in general 05/07/24	ALL
Action 1.2	To provide any suggestions on how the document can be restructured 05/07/24	ALL
Action 1.3	To quantify how many IDNO connections are at different voltage levels and to send to ENA for further circulation among the WG members 12/07/24	IDNO
Action 1.4	To collect all responses (experience and suggestions) and circulated among the WG members 22/07/24	NM
Agenda item 4. Clarification for non regulated operators		ALL
The issue was raised in the discussion and discussed very superficially. Needs further clarification with the WG if further discussion is necessary.		
Action 1.5	Clarify who non regulated operators are / where they operate and the implications in terms of schedule requirements. 22/07/24	IP/ALL
Agenda item 5. AOB		ALL
None were raised.		
Action		
Agenda item 6. Next Meeting		CM
The next meeting will be held after passing the trail exchange period, approximately in mid-July. It was agreed that the meeting will be held face to face in the office ENA.		

Post meeting note. The next meeting is scheduled on 31 July.

A draft timeline for future steps was developed as shown below:

- 25 March Trial exchange period begin between DNO and IDNO parties,
- 21 June Trail exchange period end,
- w/c 28th June WG reconvene to assess findings.

Action 1.6	Review timing of the next meeting and arrange.	NM
-------------------	--	----

ACTIONS LIST

1.1	After passing the trial data exchange to provide ENA with summary experience in filling schedules and process in general 05/07/24	ALL
1.2	To provide any suggestions on how the document can be restructured 05/07/24	ALL
1.3	To quantify how many IDNO connections are at different voltage levels and to send to ENA for further circulation among the WG members 12/07/24	IDNO
1.4	To collect all responses (experience and suggestions) and circulated among the WG members 22/07/24	NM
1.5	Clarify who non regulated operators are / where they operate and the implications in terms of schedule requirements. 22/07/24	ALL
1.6	Review timing of the next meeting and arrange.	NM