

DCRP_19_03_03		Subject:	SQSS Review Panel
		Author:	Alan Creighton
		Date:	13 March 2019

Gents

Below is my informal DAR from the SQSS Review panel.

- Most notable item is that the SQSS change to re EREC P28 is ready, but not yet sent to Ofgem, it won't be included in the 1 April 2019 SQSS publication.

Other interesting snippets highlighted in yellow

Regards Alan

Attendees:

Rachel Woodbridge Stocks	NGET	
Alan Creighton	Northern Powergrid	DNO
David Lyons	Blue Transmission	(OFTO)
Bless Kuri	SHETL	
Le Fu	NGET	
Rashpal Gata-Aura	NGET	
Simon Lord	Independent Power	Generators
Chrissie Brown	NGET Chair	
Bieshoy Awad	NGET	SO
Diyar Kadar	Scottish Power	
+ others (1)		

Apologies:

Xiaoyao Zhou	NGET	
Shilen Shah	Ofgem	
Greg Heavens	NGET	
Mike Lee	OFTO	
Cornel Brozio	Scottish Power	
Brian Punton	SHETL	
John Sinclair	BB	OFTO

DCRP_19_03_03		Subject:	SQSS Review Panel
		Author:	Alan Creighton
		Date:	13 March 2019

Issue	Paper No:	Summary
1 Welcome		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next meeting will be the first post business separation. NG representation will be clarified before then. Two TO and two SO seats
2 Approval of minutes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OK, subject to a few comments
3 Actions		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not discussed as most are on the agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 27.9 Chapter 7 Review 28.5 EREC P2 29.2 GSR22. Ongoing. BA to progress before the next meeting 29.5 SQSS Implementation 29.6 Chapter 7 Variations to connection Designs 29.7 Chapter 7 Substation bays & minimum requirements 29.8 Chapter 7 Dynamics and Short Term Ratings
4 Draft Modification Report		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
5 Modification Proposals / Withdrawals		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
6 WG Update GSR 0022 Review of Security and Economy Required Transfer Conditions		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing. BA to progress before the
7 Standing Items Chapter 7 Guidance document		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SQSS is difficult to interpret so the idea behind the guidance is to add clarity. There are three areas where there does seem to be disagreement between NGESO and Users. Design Variation (Customer Choice), and the need for the User to provide a CBA. Where the variation doesn't impact any other User, then the User should be able to have a choice. How might this apply to a single connection to a new offshore windfarm rather than having redundancy – not at all as NGESO would still need to

DCRP_19_03_03		Subject:	SQSS Review Panel
		Author:	Alan Creighton
		Date:	13 March 2019

Issue	Paper No:	Summary
		<p>cater for a double cct loss, so wouldn't impact on say Operational Costs. General principle is that the Users can have whatever security they want as long as there are no adverse implications for customers generally</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dynamic and Short term ratings. General principle is that the asset owner should establish the continuous, cyclic and emergency ratings that are appropriate to their assets. The ESO will instruct the windfarm to comply with the asset owners rating. So, if the rating was a cyclic based on an assumed output then the windfarm operator would be constrained if the export profile is different. If a low rating is used then the SO may be OK to operate the windfarm above the declared rating. Some concern about the transfer of the assets from the developer / asset builder and the OFTO particularly where they have a different view of asset risk. Different organisations may have a different view of the asset rating / risk. The assessment of rating / risk is not an SQSS issue. DL asked how onshore TO assets are ascribed a dynamic rating. AMC agree with principle that the asset owner needs to establish the rating of assets –poss more transparency as to how these ratings are established would really help. BK – main issue relates to the basic size of the assets and how it continuous rating relates to the declared export from the windfarm. OFTO have 'standard' ratings and 'enhanced rating' that might take into account say the ambient temperature. Asset monitoring will typically enable higher ratings. CB had an action from previous to discuss further with Ofgem. Conclusion is that the issue is one of cable rating / cable risk rather than one of SQSS. Substation Bay. This relates to the need or otherwise for two bays per connection. Link to GSR014. The SQSS min requirement is 1 bay, but may be two bays depending on an economic assessment. In GSR014, Ofgem agreed with NG. If the developer wants a second bay, it's User Choice, so the User needs to pay for this via an upfront charge. SQSS RP needs to be clear which parts of the 'guidance' has consensus across ESO and the industry and which part is ESO view. Two sections of the same document. CB to circulate a revised draft for comments.
7 Standing Items Modification register		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not discussed
7 Standing Items P2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AMC provided an update
8 AOB		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new version of SQSS is planned to go live on 1 April to incorporate GSR0016, 18, 23, 24SQSS GCS025 re P28 change is ready to go to Ofgem, but has not been sent yet. It will not be included in the 1 April

DCRP_19_03_03		Subject:	SQSS Review Panel
		Author:	Alan Creighton
		Date:	13 March 2019

Issue	Paper No:	Summary
		update to SQSS
9 Next meeting		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2019 dates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wednesday 8th May 2019 ○ Wednesday 10th July 2019 ○ Wednesday 11th September 2019 ○ Wednesday 13th November 2019