

Primacy Rules for Service Conflicts Use Case Prioritisation Supporting Slides Open Networks WS1A P5

December 2021



Finalised Primacy Principles

The table below shows the finalised set of Primacy Principles, as previously discussed in the Focus Group and the product workshops:

| Each Primacy Rules must (in priority order) | |
|--|--|
| Deliver the least Whole Electricity System cost to consumers | |
| Facilitate Fair, Accessible and Efficient Markets | |
| Be clear, transparent, consistent, inclusive and deliverable | |

Underpinning these principles, there is a requirement to ensure the ESO and DNOs can continue to (in priority order):

- Efficiently manage national system balance and overall operability
- Ensure Transmission Network Security, and
- Ensure Distribution Network Security.



Use Case Scoring Criteria: Negative Criteria

| Criteria | Reason for Criteria | Services Removed |
|---|---|---|
| Has the service ceased or will cease in the next 12 months? | Rules are unlikely to provide benefit as the service will close ahead of product delivery. | ODFM |
| Is the service rarely procured? | We want to focus on the highest value services. We have therefore deprioritised the rarest ones. | GTLF,BM Start Up, Additional GTs, Demand Turn Up |
| Is the service very specific to a particular technology/generally only at Transmission level? | As above | Pumped Storage – specific services |
| Emerging Services. Those in development either through the main businesses or via innovation. | The details of these services are too uncertain to develop defined rules. For those under innovation, they may not eventually be deployed. | Dynamic Moderation, Dynamic Regulation, Quick Reserve, Slow Reserve, Distributed Restart, the Non-DSO Services, DNO led Reactive Power services, RaaS. |
| No potential for conflict. | Where there is no potential for conflict, then there is no need to develop Primacy Rules. | The interaction of DNO outages and services on different assets. |



Use Case Scoring Criteria: Positive Criteria (1)

The table below show the final set of positive criteria used to initial condense the number of Use Cases:

| Criteria | Definition | Reason for Criteria | Scale |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Procured Volumes | Amount of service procured by the ESO/DNO available to them at any given time. | Focussing on the largest services. | 1 is low volume 5 is high volume |
| Complexity of solution delivery | How easy is it to implement basic (Minimum Viable Product) Primacy rules for the Use Case combination? | Focussing on deliverables solutions first. | 1 is long delivery time and high complexity. 5 is short delivery time and low complexity. |
| Likelihood of conflict | Based on the operating scenario, how often are Use Cases likely to coincide? | Focussing on the highest volume of conflict first. | 1 is not very likely (emergency circumstances). 5 is very likely (in steady state/Pre-Fault). |
| Existing Mitigation Actions | Based on service stack-ability and other mitigations (e.g. existing data sharing). | Focussing on areas with no current ways of managing conflict. | means good mitigations already exist. means no mitigations exist. |



Outcome of Use Case Scoring

| | | l In-Development Services | Service | Sustain (GTU/DTD) | Sustain (GTD/DTU) | Secure (GTU/DTD) | Secure (GTD/DTU) | Dynamic (GTU/DTD) | Dynamic (GTD/DTU) | Restore (GTU/DTD) | Restore (GTD/DTU) | Generation led ANM (export limitation) | Demand led ANM (import limitation) | (Planned) | DNO Outages (Unplanned) |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|--|-----------|----------------------------|
| | Service Area | Service | validation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Same Asset | вм | The Balancing Mechanism (BM) | 0 | 11 | 10.5 | 12 | 10.5 | 11.5 | 10 | 10.5 | 9 | 16.5 | 5 15.5 | i 15.5 | 5 15.5 |
| Same Asset | вм | Balancing Mechanism Wider Access | 0 | 11 | 10.5 | 12 | 10.5 | 11.5 | 10 | 10.5 | 9 | 16.5 | 5 15.5 | i 14.5 | 5 14.5 |
| Different Asset Same Area | ВМ | The Balancing Mechanism (BM) | 0 | 15 | 14.5 | 16 | 14.5 | 15.5 | 14 | 14.5 | 13 | 16.5 | 5 14.5 | ; o | 0 |
| Different Asset Same Area | вм | Balancing Mechanism Wider Access | 0 | 15 | 14.5 | 16 | 14.5 | 15.5 | 14 | 14.5 | 13 | 16.5 | 5 14.5 | ; c | 0 |
| Different Asset Same Area | Reserve | STOR | 0 | 15 | 14.5 | 16 | 14.5 | 15.5 | 14 | 14.5 | 13 | : 15.5 | 5 12.5 | ; o | 0 |
| Different Asset Same Area | Frequency Response | Firm Frequency Response (FFR) | 0 | 14 | 13.5 | 15 | 13.5 | 14.5 | 13 | 13.5 | 12 | . 14.5 | 5 13.5 | ; 0 | 0 |
| Different Asset Same Area | Frequency Response | Mandatory Response Services | 0 | 14 | 13.5 | 15 | 13.5 | 14.5 | 13 | 13.5 | 12 | 14.5 | 5 13.5 | ; 0 | 0 |
| Different Asset Same Area | Constraint Management | DER TCM (RDPs) | 0 | 14 | 13.5 | 15 | 13.5 | 14.5 | 13 | 13.5 | 12 | : 15.5 | 5 12.5 | ; o | 0 |
| Different Asset Same Area | Inertia | Stability Pathfinder | 0 | 14 | 13.5 | 15 | 13.5 | 14.5 | 13 | 13.5 | 12 | 15.5 | 5 13.5 | ; O | 0 |
| Different Asset Same Area | Capacity Market | | 0 | 15 | 14.5 | 16 | 14.5 | 15.5 | 14 | 14.5 | 13 | 16.5 | 5 14.5 | ; 0 | 0 |



Use Cases to take forward

We can only take subset of the highest use cases forward. This should balance deliverability and ambition to solve the widest number of cases.

The ones we propose to take forward are:

- STOR and generation-led ANM on different assets in the same area.
- DNO services and the transmission constraint management service on different assets in the same area.
- The BM and generation-led ANM on different assets in the same area.*

*We foresee significant complexity in this use case and so we aim to investigate potential rules and systems in ED1 with implementation expected to in ED2. Due to its scale and importance we will be taking it forwards so that progress can be made, with testing and implementation of the rules expected in the subsequent increments.

We hope that initial selection will then help unlock an number of others.



Next Steps

- Develop the Primacy Rules Framework.
- Create the first Rules for the chosen Use Cases

| Ref | Product Element | Sep-21 | Oct-21 | Nov-21 | Dec-21 | Jan-22 | Feb-22 | Mar-22 | Apr-22 | May-22 | Jun-22 | Jul-22 | Aug-22 | Sep-22 | Oct-22 | Nov-22 | Dec-22 | Jan-23 | Feb-23 | Mar-23 | Apr-23 |
|-----|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 0.1 | Develop and agree Primacy principles and a prioritised list of likely use cases | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Develop draft Primacy Rules | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.2 | Develop the necessary processes and information sharing needed to support the rules | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.3 | Implement the designed processes and information flows | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.4 | Test the rules | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.5 | Review the rules and processes and establish roll out process | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.6 | Publish V1.0 of Rules, proposed review periods and target date for roll-out at scale | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.7 | Establish Governance process for Primacy rule reviews | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.8 | Implement Rules and Processes across DNOs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |