

ENA Electricity Networks and Futures Group

DER TECHNICAL FORUM

MINUTES

Tuesday 30 November 2021

MS Teams Meeting

ATTENDEES

Name	Initials	Company
Christopher McCann	CMC	ENA
Mike Kay	MK	ENA
Sarah Carter	SC	Ricardo
Anuj Chhetri	AC	Northern Powergrid
Miles Buckley	MB	SPEN
Peter Twomey	PT	Electricity North West
Dick Allen	DA	BHA
Ian Wassman	IW	AMPS / Comap Controls
Ian Nicoll	IN	Qmulus Ltd
Alistair Shearer	AS	BU UK
Jason Kirrage	JK	Solar Edge
Graham Bone	GB	Infinis
Richard Harrison	RH	Clarke Energy
Lukasz Bochinski	LB	UKPN
Hui Heng	HH	SSE Networks

Registered office Energy Networks Association Limited, 4 More London Riverside, London SE1 2AU
 t. +44 (0)20 7706 5100 e. info@energynetworks.org energynetworks.org

Andy Hood	AH	WPD
Megha Goyal	MG	PSE2 Consulting
Tim Ellingham	TE	RWE
Matthew Porter	MP	PSE2 Consulting

APOLOGIES

Name	Initials	Company
Steve Withell	SW	SPEN
Gill Williamson	GEW	Electricity North West

MEETING NOTES AND ACTIONS

1 Welcome, Introductions and Acceptance of Agenda		CMC
<p>Previous minutes were accepted.</p> <p>Accompanying meeting slides should be referred to for detail.</p>		
Actions	None.	

2 Special Interest Session on Modelling and Simulations		MK
<p>The special interest session key outcomes were discussed as detailed on slides 4-16.</p> <p>One of the actions was to draft a high level note on the purpose etc of sharing models. This was included in the slides, but would be circulated for noting and/or comment.</p> <p>The following points were specifically noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement for the DNOs to be provided with models (Type C and D) in the DNO specified modelling software could lead to practical difficulties where the DNOs use older style software. • Examples of where this has been a problem (and any resolution) would be helpful. • There may be a requirement to produce a model for the DNO in one software and a model for the ESO in another which is inefficient. • The older power system analysis packages used by some of the DNOs were developed for conventional synchronous generation and are less suitable for modelling the active response of the converter controllers. • The danger of a monopoly situation of all network licensees standardizing on one analysis software may be counterbalanced by the benefits of standardisation and the use of compiled models meaning a number of parties can produce models. <p>AC commented that NPG were using legacy software, but were actively moving to DigSILENT which would address the inverter model suitability issue for the NPG licence areas.</p> <p>MP has drafted a note detailing the issue with the older software, which he thought he would be able to share with the Forum. .</p> <p>A further special interest session will be arranged in a couple of months.</p>		
Actions	<p>Circulate notes of special interest session, and one page summary of purpose, with the DER TF Forum minutes.</p> <p>03/12/21</p> <p>Consider sharing note about issues of older software</p> <p>03/12/21</p> <p>Consider further the challenge of both DNO and ESO requiring models in different software.</p> <p>24/12/21</p> <p>Share examples of problems sharing models and resolution</p> <p>24/12/21</p> <p>CMC/MK to arrange next special interest session meeting</p> <p>24/12/21</p>	<p>CMC</p> <p>MP</p> <p>MK</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>CMC</p>

3 Battery Energy Storage Systems		MK
<p>The BESS discussion session was summarised. The notes from that session will be circulated with the notes of this meeting. There will be another meeting towards the end of January to feedback on progress</p>		
Actions	<p>Circulate notes of BESS session with this meeting 03/12/21</p>	CMC

4 New issue - AMPS		MK
<p>Issues #118 – #121 which have been raised by AMPS were reviewed. The initial response as detailed on slides 20-025 has been sent to AMPS. IW is expecting that AMPS colleagues might wish to discuss some aspects in greater detail with CMC/MK.</p> <p>In respect of issue #121 MP noted that some older CHP sets have steam turbines which can run without the gas turbine using auxiliary firing. MK stated his opinion that if the bulk of normal operation (say >95% of operating time) was as an integrated unit, it would be appropriate to consider as a single PGM. However, it was noted that they are not currently economic, hence it is unlikely any would be connected to the system under G99, but if they are then this issue might need to be revisited and clarified.</p>		
Actions	<p>AMPS to consider any response.</p>	IW

5 Previous issues		MK
<p>Issue 110 is associated with modelling and simulations and is being addressed by the modelling session at (2) above. This issue will be closed.</p> <p>Issues 113 and 114 both relate to BESS installations and have been picked up by the BESS session (3) above.</p> <p>Issue 112 on registered capacity has been further looked at and an additional set of examples produced as detailed on slides 31 – 39. Further comments from stakeholders in this area would be welcome.</p> <p>The challenge with embedded generation in an industrial site was discussed together with the distinction between registered capacity and export capacity. It was agreed that a further set of examples showing how registered capacity of a facility should be determined for multiple PGMs and facilities with significant internal (non-parasitic) loads.</p> <p>The suggested clarification in the slides will be added to the 2022 revision of the DG connection guides.</p>		
Actions	<p>MK to close #110. 03/12/21</p>	MK
	<p>Create additional examples in respect of Registered Capacity 31/01/22</p>	MK

6 G100 and Fast Track		MK
<p>The deadline for the G100 consultation review was noted as being this Friday, 3/12/21. The fast track consultation responses are under review by the ENA.</p>		
Actions	No immediate actions	

6 GC0117		MK
<p>MK updated the meeting about the GC0117 modification and noted the implications of reducing the large threshold to 10 MW for the whole of GB in respect of provision of ESO compliant metering, compliance with CUSC, inclusion in the balancing mechanism and provision of data to the ESO etc. It is currently unclear if this is a retrospective change. This was noted as potentially affecting the DNOs ability to apply active network management schemes. The Grid Code Review Panel consultation is expected in the new year.</p>		
Actions	No immediate actions	

8 Distributed Restart Project		MK
<p>MK is representing ENA on the Distributed Restart project and he provided a short update on the project. The project's webpages are here: https://www.nationalgrideso.com/future-energy/projects/distributed-restart</p>		
Actions	No immediate actions	

9 EU Developments		MK
<p>MK updated the meeting about relevant EU network code developments as per slide 49.</p>		
Actions	No immediate actions	

10 Distribution Code Compliance		MK
<p>The draft Dcode has been prepared and will be presented to the next DCRP. It is then expected to be submitted to Ofgem for approval.</p>		
Actions	No immediate actions	

11 AOB		
<p>MP asked about treatment of IDNOs in respect of standards such as P28 which applies to DNO customers, but not in the same way to the network companies. PT, MB and AH agreed that IDNOs are not treated as a customer in terms of IDNO compliance, although customers of the IDNO would have to comply with such standards. There is no essential difference between the technical standards applied by DNOs and IDNOs – the Distribution Code and its Annex 1 documents are shared by all distribution network licensees.</p> <p>JK noted that there was a mismatch in the requirements in the G98 and G99 compliance forms in respect of harmonics and the latest EREC G5. DNOs are asking for harmonics up to 100 and for technicalities such as dual harmonics. Jason will formulate his question and the DNOs will consider a common approach.</p>		
Actions	JK/DNOs to engage re harmonic compliance requirements	JK/DNOs

Next meeting		
The meeting agreed to a next meeting around the end of February 2022.		
Actions	Arrange next meeting 10/12/21	CMC