



Open Networks Project

Advisory Group Meeting Response (02 Aug 18)

02 August 2018

Energy Networks Association

Document Ref: ON-PRJ-AG Response (02 Aug 18)

Restriction: N/A

Introduction

The Advisory Group meeting for the ENA Open Networks Project was held on 2nd August in London. Products from workstreams 1 and 2 as well as the Project Scope 2019 were presented to the group for input. An update on stakeholder engagement and the latest consultation plan was also shared with the group.

Comments from these feedback sessions were captured in the meeting and this paper captures the key comments and how they have been addressed in in the project.

This paper sits alongside the published updated versions of the project material.

Breakout Session 1: T-D Process (Workstream 1)

The project team presented the following:

- **Product 10: Facilitating Connections – Existing Practices for Flexible**

Presented Open Network's response to the Call for Evidence and take stakeholder feedback on next steps.

- **Product 8: System Wide Resource Register**

Discussed initial proposal on the form of this resource and works register and take stakeholder input to inform further development of this proposal.

Stakeholders generally agreed with the summary of our findings from the Product 10 call of evidence on the treatment of flexibility in the connections queue. The group agreed with the next steps and expressed support for publishing a guide document for clarifying current connections processes across networks. These consultation slides have now been published and can be accessed here.

As part of the Product 8 discussions, stakeholders were asked whether or not they would support the implementation of a central system wide resource register and what areas of information they would value. The table below captures a summary of the questions that we asked and the responses provided by the stakeholders:

<i>Product 8: System Wide Resource Register</i>	
Questions	Advisory Group Feedback
Support for implementation	General agreement with the concept of having a central system wide resource register. No real preferences stated for ownership of this register
Key areas of information for stakeholders	General agreement with format of register that was presented. Visibility of connection queue in terms of the number of parties involved would be useful in making a decision on development projects.
Sources of industry data available	Useful references were made to existing sources of information such as FITS register, Electralink and government bodies tracking green kwh.
Preferred approach to implementation including ownership	The views around implementation were that it needs to be a phased approach and consideration needs to be given to the cost associated with implementation as stakeholders may have a different view based on the cost.

	No preferences were stated for ownership of this register.
--	--

The ON project has taken this feedback on board to inform further development of requirements under Product 8.

Breakout Session 2: Customer Experience (Workstream 2)

The project team presented two products from the Customer Service workstream for feedback:

- Good Practice Ahead of Connection Applications (Workstream 2 Product 1)
- Explanation of 'Terms and Definitions' (Workstream 2 Product 3)

<i>Good Practice Ahead of Connection Applications (Workstream 2 Product 1)</i>	
Advisory Group Feedback	Open Networks Workstream Response
On how DNOs are best approached to discuss potential connections, a combination of bookable surgeries and ad hoc meetings was preferred.	Good practice will be to offer both of these options to meet and discuss connection applications.
It would be good to have consistency across heat maps in the use of colours to indicate available capacity for example.	Good practice should clearly indicate the assumptions and parameters that sit behind the RAG status. For amber and green status, quantified information that shows the extent of the headroom would be considered good practice.
Heat maps should be more clear with regard to available capacity for demand as well as generation.	Heat maps were initially developed to provide information for generators but some DNOs now also provide information for demand. Good practice will be the provision of information for both generation and demand connection preferably incorporated onto the same map.
Can contracted generation information be shown on the heat maps?	Good practice will be for heat map information to be based on connected, contracted and connection offers issued. For example, SSEN shows the connected and contracted generation at each substation via their heat map.
It's good to assess different capacity options for a particular site and turn one of these into an application process. What about different locations though? Some developers might be looking at a particular area of land and may want to explore which locations within this area would be best.	Good practice will be for 3 different capacity options to be considered for a defined area of land. In the initial optioneering, it may also be possible to provide information on specific locations within a bigger area, but this will depend on the complexity of the network locally.
Who will hold the DNOs to account for good practice?	Please feedback shortfalls in performance to the relevant DNO. If performance is not improved, there are existing channels for stakeholders to flag performance to Ofgem.
Is there a way to indicate service opportunities on heat maps?	It is not proposed to include service opportunities on the connection capacity heat maps at this stage. Workstream 2 Product 4 is

	considering how best to communicate service opportunities and will consider this further.
Could there be a product that provides a single national heat map and then have the functionality to focus on regions without having to go to another place.	This type of functionality is beyond the scope of Workstream 2 Product 1. Wider information provision for DER including connection queue information is being considered in Workstream 1 Product 8, a system wide resource register.
As well as optioneering, having a touch point a couple of weeks into the connection process is also beneficial for customers especially with the associated fees. How can this be covered?	When discussing a connection application with a DNO, please flag if an update would be helpful during the connection process. Generally, DNOs will be able to provide this.
What about access to information? On UKPN's site, you need to be a registered in companies house to view a heatmap. Is this necessary?	Generally, information is accessible without registration. This specific point on access to its DG mapping tool has been raised with UKPN.
Based on heat maps, we have thought that some places look promising, only to find ourselves stuck within a queue. Can there also be visibility of any SoW queue?	Good practice will be to cover 132kV down to the HV busbars of primary transformers and to include any known transmission constraints.

Explanation of 'Terms and Definitions' (Workstream 2 Product 3)

Advisory Group Feedback	Open Networks Workstream Response
Should every network company provide a link to this glossary on their websites? Unless people can find it easily, it will be ineffective.	We haven't gotten that far yet but it's a good idea to link to a live version of the document on the DNO websites.
Does this cover Northern Ireland as well?	There has been input from (NIE – Andrew Cupples). We'll do a further check to confirm that the definitions hold for Northern Ireland as well.
You may still get variations in the definitions by different DNOs and over time.	It is proposed that this will be a live document that is reviewed annually.
Is this going to be imposed onto the DNOs (i.e. will they need to provide this as a glossary with their documentation)?	It is not proposed to impose this on DNOs, but the document is being promoted with the relevant teams within each DNO.

Breakout Session 3: Project Scope for 2019

The project team asked stakeholders for their views on the direction of travel and areas of focus for Open Networks in 2019 and below are the comments that we received that we will factor into our scope development for next year:

Project Scope for 2019	
Advisory Group Feedback	Open Networks Workstream Response
It is important for the project to focus on the low hanging fruit next year to make short term improvements.	We recognise the need for delivering improvements in the interim whilst a decision on the market models can be made for the future. As part of our SGAM modelling work this year, we have identified the market agnostic/ no regrets areas of work that are common across all Future Worlds and these would form a significant part of our scope for next year.

<p>A consultation would be needed on the initial results of the Impact Assessment before next steps are agreed.</p>	<p>We recognise the need for stakeholders to provide input to the Impact Assessment work. The project has now engaged Baringa to undertake this independent analysis. As part of Baringa’s methodology, stakeholders will be given the opportunity to feed into the process. We recognise the need for a public consultation on the findings of the Impact Assessment, whether it is through ENA or Ofgem.</p>
<p>General agreement with the direction of work under WS1 this year, including the work in FES and flexibility products.</p> <p>Stakeholders discussed interaction with other energy vectors (particularly gas) has not been a focus to date and should be considered as part of the scope for 2019.</p> <p>Stakeholders would value a consultation on the programme of work for 2019, similar to the one for this year.</p>	<p>We agree with the comments that have been provided and will be feeding these into our scope development work for next year.</p> <p>The intention is to consult on the programme of work for next year in Q1 2019 to ensure that stakeholders get the opportunity to shape the scope.</p>