



Open Networks Project

Advisory Group Meeting Response (04 June 18)

04 June 2018

Energy Networks Association

Document Ref: ON-PRJ-AG Response (04 June 18)

Restriction: N/A

Introduction

The seventh Advisory Group meeting for the ENA Open Networks Project was held on 4th June in London. Products from workstreams 1, 2 and 3 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 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 *Product 2: DER Services Procurement (DSO Service Requirements)* from the T-D process workstream (WS1) for feedback.

The below table shows the headline feedback received from the Advisory Group.

DER Services Procurement (DSO Service Requirements) – Workstream 1 Product 2	
Advisory Group Feedback	Open Networks Workstream Response
Stakeholder would welcome consistently defined services across DNOs that are based on minimum standards. Stakeholders advised that in defining the technical requirement for these services, we need to take a more open approach that does not prohibit innovation.	The ON project has taken this feedback on board for further development of requirements under this product.
Stakeholders expressed that in defining these products, we need to consider the requirements from a providers' perspective and need to balance that with the DSO perspective.	The ON project agrees that a balance needs to be struck and recognises that these DSO products need to be attractive to service providers to encourage participation in the market. In order to facilitate this, the ON project is holding a focus group session with key stakeholders to get their input into the design of the products.
Stakeholders asked why the initial focus is on active power requirements under this product and whether or not the project would consider voltage management and reactive power/	The main issues which are arising currently and in the near future at the distribution level are thermal constraints (congestion). Hence active power is the initial focus of DER services. Controlling reactive power and voltage will be important (especially at the higher distribution level voltages), and we envisage DSOs procuring services for these issues in the future.

Breakout Session 2: T-D Process (Workstream 1) & Customer Experience (Workstream 2)

The project team presented products from the T-D Process workstream as well as the Customer Experience Workstream for feedback:

- Good Practice Following Connection Applications (Workstream 2 Product 5)
- Call for Evidence and Webinar Update (Workstream 1 Product 10)

Good Practice Following Connection Applications (Workstream 2 Product 5)	
Advisory Group Feedback	Open Networks Workstream Response
How far into the future should P5 look? The work of the Charging Futures Forum (CFF) and Ofgem's Access Review were frequently mentioned.	This work may change the current framework, but WS2 P5 will continue to suggest changes required to the current framework.
Users don't really care about the interfaces on the network (e.g. IDNO-DNO, DNO-SO, etc). They want identical, consistent experience, whatever happens upstream.	Noted. P5 will attempt to make these interfaces work better for customers.
Should IDNOs, OFTOs, BNOs, private networks, community schemes and other groups be included in the interfaces considered?	Different interfaces and customer groups will be considered.
Is the interface between an IDNO and an embedded DNO the same? They likely have the same legal status, so should have the same process. Bear in mind the CiC CoP.	We will develop the product to give IDNO and DNO the same processes, as far as possible.
Visibility of the interactive queue would help make better decisions and would allow customers to challenge the interactivity queue. Information on why customers did or didn't proceed with schemes would be useful.	This will be looked at in WS1 P8.
If a customer has failed in interactivity, can they look to procure a service from an existing customer in order to offset any additional reinforcement?	This will be considered as part of the general ON and DSO development.
Temporary reallocation. It is difficult to invest on. Does anyone really want a 2 year access product?	This may be true, but may still be appropriate for some circumstances.
Temporary reallocation. Can we push back the connection date of customers higher in the queue? Not a complete reshuffle, but allowing customers further down the queue to connect, and giving time for reinforcement to be completed before customers higher up in the queue are allowed to connect?	This will be considered in the consultation.
Permanent reshuffle. Potential legal issues, so needs to be clearly set out and transparent in the connection offer from the beginning.	This will be considered in the consultation.
Can a transmission-style Connect and Manage scheme work for Distribution? On transmission, this allows customers who trigger reinforcement to connect prior to reinforcement works, provided that National Grid has visibility and control over the site, with paid constraints if NG requires the site to be off.	But where does the income come from to pay for these constraints? Increase in DUOS? Does it need User Commitment / securities? Change to the Electricity Act? Part of Ofgem's Access Review.
What outcome do we want? Should we prioritise generators with the greatest effect on climate change up the queue?	General consensus was that it was not appropriate for network companies to make these decisions, but for government to do it at national level with tariffs. Or through the EU Emissions Trading Scheme.

Breakout Session 3: DSO Transition (Workstream 3)

The project team presented *Product 5: Consultation on SGAM models (inc. review of landing page for SGAM models)* for feedback.

Consultation on SGAM models inc. review of landing page for SGAM models (Workstream 3 Product 5)	
Advisory Group Feedback	Open Networks Workstream Response
A number of stakeholders volunteered to participate in a Critical Friends review on the consultation document to ensure that the key messages are clear to a wide range of audiences.	Since the Advisory Group meeting, the product team have undertaken a Critical Friends review with the Advisory Group members who volunteered and others around the industry on the consultation document.
Stakeholders generally accepted the HTML views of the models and agreed that the actor centric landing pages are a more useful view from their perspective.	These HTML views are now being taken forward for the consultation. Video guides have been put together to help stakeholders navigate the models.