

Meeting Name CAP167 Working Group
Meeting No. 3
Date of Meeting 21st July 2008
Venue Holiday Inn – Warwick

This note outlines the key action points from the most recent meeting of the CAP167 Working Group.

| Attendees | | |
|------------------|-----------|--|
| Emma | Carr | Working Group Chair |
| Parry | Batth | Technical Secretary |
| Craig | Maloney | National Grid |
| Alan | Creighton | CE Electric - UK |
| Alec | Morrison | SSE Power Distribution |
| Dan | Randles | Electricity North West (ENW |
| | | |
| David | Walker | Tullo Wind Energy, Ben Aketil Wind Energy, Boyndie Wind Energy, Dunbeath Wind Energy etc and is supported by the Scottish Renewables Forum |
| Bill | Reed | RWE (representing John Norbury) |
| Leonida | Bandura | E.ON |
| Mo | Cloonan | (via teleconference) Community Energy Scotland (Observer) |
| Paul | McGimpsey | SP Distribution and SP Manweb |
| Ray | Hunter | RES |
| Robert | Longden | Airtricity |
| Cheryl | Mundie | Ofgem |
| | | |

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from John Norbury (who was represented by Bill Reed), Dave Wilkerson, Steven Pottinger and Paul Mott

2. Minutes of the 1st meeting held on 11th of July 2008. The minutes were agreed and will be placed on the National Grid website.

3. Agree Terms of Reference. The Terms of Reference were agreed by the Working Group.

4. Summary of Debate

30. Paul McGimpsey tabled a set of slides of CAP097 detailing consented generation in Southern Scotland deferred until 2018. The slide showed 71 MW of generation that has been consented with deferrals largely being due to MITS and on one occasion as a result of local transmission system works being required at the GSP. Paul felt that it was important to show this information.
31. Paul queried the process by which small distributed generation sites (currently captured by CAP097 and affected by the SoW process) could advance their projects following either (i) the completion of the transmission system works upon which the energisation of their connections had been made contingent, or (ii) upon the project gaining necessary consents. It was Paul's understanding that there was no mechanism currently for these projects to be advanced due to their non-inclusion in the development of the GB Queue. Action: Craig to raise issue within National Grid and ensure this is captured in the working group report [
32. Paul McGimpsey also tabled some slides detailing CAP167 principles regarding detailed guidance required from NGET for the DNOs (in full co-operation with the TOs) for SoW request. DNOs need this guidance as to when/when not a SoW is required. Some agreed that the reverse power flow should not be used as a trigger for a SoW. Instead, a **criteria** should be developed for SoW that is workable across the UK. Developers also needs this **criteria** in the form of a **guidance** to be better informed to assess whether or not to go ahead with a project.
33. Some believed that reverse power flow would need to be carefully debated as it could prove discriminatory, particularly if it is going to have an impact on the National Grid system. Paul stated that in Southern Scotland the existence (or creation) of a reverse power flow currently formed part of the criteria upon which SPD made an assessment of the circumstances in which a request for a SoW might be triggered. Paul further stated that he did not believe the existence of a reversed power flow was a reason in itself for distributed generation projects being delayed.
34. There was a short debate that locating distributed generation close to demand should be encouraged and should not necessarily be considered as having an impact on the National Grid system.
35. Paul's slides triggered further discussion on Craig Maloney's straw man. It was agreed that the **criteria** need to be further developed. This criteria will need to ascertain whether local generation will have an impact on the MITS. Some felt that more funding for the Constraints on the MITS would allow renewable to exist but it was accepted that more funding for constraints will mean someone will have to pay more for these constraints.
36. The debate led to an agreement that the **criteria and guidance** needs to be agreed between NGET/DNO/TO. The guidance should reflect what factors NGET have taken into account to arrive at the thresholds at individual GSPs and what impact would these thresholds have on the MITS. Some felt that a MW threshold may not be appropriate as local issues like volts, fault levels may be more important. However it was accepted that local voltages and fault levels could be interpreted into a MW threshold. It was also agreed that a lot of analysis will be required to assess a threshold for each GSP.
37. It was agreed that the current thresholds (<50MW NGET, <30MW SPT, <10MW SHETL) can be treated as default values if no wider or local GSP issues exist. This means that in SHETL, if there are no local or wider issues, the default value of 10MW applies and no SoW would be required. However, if there are local or wider issues then a local threshold would need to be assessed. [Note: the Group were not agreed on the need for the inclusion of the "wider" issues, e.g. MITS.] Changing the process for Statement of Works which includes wider works on the MITS, at a GSP and site specific requirements is out of scope for CAP167.
38. The **criteria** would need to take into account both technical and other factors, e.g., environment and carbon emissions.
39. Some agreed that at the moment there is no transparency for Significant Impact and any **criteria** developed would need to build in this transparency.
40. It was agreed that Craig Maloney's straw man criteria improves on the current situation in that it takes into account other factors than purely technical issues.

| |
|--|
| <p>41. It was agreed that the 'Process' needs to be defined before building a blueprint for the criteria. The process will decide the 'MW threshold' and whether it will have an impact on the MITS at the GSP or site specific requirements. However an action was placed on all to provide comments on the criteria before the next meeting on 30th of July 2008.</p> <p>42. A healthy debate took place that detailed a framework for the Process. The Process will define the Guidance by NGET as GBSO with appropriate assistance from the TO/DNO in determining the thresholds and justification per GSP. A detailed Process contribution from Crag Maloney will follow but the following bullet points summarise the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publish the Methodology Statement - CUSC/National Grid Website. This will be on view to potential developers/users to challenge DNO/GBSO. • Implementation of the Methodology in line with the proposed straw man. Assess timescales and criteria • Prior to the publication, carry out a review between GBSO/TO/DNO. To arrive at thresholds all three parties' viewpoints would be needed. • National Grid to publish Guidelines on National Grid Website to indicate thresholds per GSP supported by supplementary justification. • Carry out an annual review on all GSP thresholds. A review may also be triggered by an event, e.g., a user becoming available/unavailable. Each GSP will be the topic of discussion during the JTPL meetings between National Grid and the DNOs. • Disputes between NGET/DNO can be raised through the existing CUSC dispute process |
| <p>4. <u>Summary of Actions</u></p> <p>43. Provide comments on the Criteria by 30th of July 2008.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Action: All</p> <p>44. Provide details of the 'Process' for the next meeting</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Action; Craig Maloney</p> |
| <p>5. <u>Next Meeting</u></p> |
| <p>45. The next meeting of the Working Group is scheduled for 21st of July 2008 to be held at Holiday Inn at Warwick 10.30AM.</p> |