

DCUSA SIG Sub-Group for DIF 59 - Meeting 02

26 June at 10:00am: Microsoft Teams

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Gareth Rushton [GR]	Dyball Associates
Chris Allanson [CA]	NPg
Alessandra De Zottis [ADZ]	Sempcorp
Ian Brothwell [EB]	Bryt Energy
Karl Maryon [KM]	Haven Power
Emslie Law [EL]	SSE
Rajni Nair [RN]	Citizens Advice
Gemma Slaney [GS]	WPD
Clive Hallam [CH]	DCC
Edward Coleman [EC]	Statkraft
Kevin Mukuzvazva [KM]	Fulcrum
Sven Hoffman [SH]	WPD
Andrew Dyball [AD]	Dyball Associates
Andrew Mead [AM]	Dyce Energy
Alison Beard [AB]	Gemserv
Richard Hartson [RH]	SSEN
Claire Addison [CA]	Flexitricity
Jennifer Smith [JS]	Hudson Energy
John Noad [JN]	nPower
Julia Haughey [JH]	EDF Energy
Derek Weaving [DW]	British Gas
Chris Allmark [AM]	Fulcrum
Coilin Pain [CP]	ENGIE

Jordan Crase [JC]	Gemserv
Paul Farmer [PF]	Shell Energy
Code Administrator	
Angelo Fitzhenry (AF) (Chair)	ElectraLink
Richard Colwill [RC]	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Kevin Woollard [KW]	British Gas
Peter Waymont [PW]	UKPN

1. Administration

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the members to the meeting.
- 1.2 The Group reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance”. All members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.

2. Minutes

- 2.1 There were no comments or questions and the Group approved the minutes of the last meeting as an accurate record. A version of the minutes can be found in Attachment 1.

3. Review of Draft Change Report

- 3.1 The Working Group reviewed the draft CP, which was circulated prior to the meeting and an updated tracked version of the CP for review can be found in Attachment 2. The key points to the discussions can be found below:

- At the last meeting, it was noted that there needed to be more detail in the CP to articulate that this technical solution would only be used as a last resort in the event that market mechanisms fail or do not deliver to the extent anticipated. The below paragraphs were added to the CP to address these concerns

The Distributors recognise the important role that flexibility services providers and market solutions will play in delivering efficient future networks. In the event that market mechanisms fail or do not deliver to the extent anticipated the Distributors will still need to protect physical assets from overload caused, for example, by the take up of low carbon technologies (LCTs) by domestic customers. This change proposes a Distributor smart intervention as a last resort, emergency measure, to protect customer’s security of supply and the network assets. This proposal is not to enable the Distributor to become a flexibility service provider or to subvert market solutions.

This change proposal anticipates the take up of LCT and their connection to the smart metering infrastructure. Future generations of smart meters will be available with Han Connected Auxiliary Load Control Switches (HCALCS) that would facilitate smart load control and innovative flexibility service products. This change seeks to give Distributors access to the HCALCS for priority demand control purposes.

- One member raised that it would be useful to have some context regarding anticipated frequency and duration of need for the smart meter curtailment mechanism. It was noted that due to the lack of experience of contracting DSR to mitigate overloads on the LV network, there is limited data available and therefore there is no directly compatible data to support any predictions of how often a market failure would require a Distributor to use the technical solution proposed. For duration, it was noted that it is possible to provide a better prediction of the likely time and duration of use as Distributors do have an understanding of load profiles and the impacts that EV charging, for example, might have on them. An action was taken to investigate adding some extra content regarding this.

Post meeting note - some extra content has been added to the CP as below:

Due to the lack of experience of contracting DSR to mitigate overloads on the LV network, there is limited data available and therefore there is no directly compatible data to support any predictions of how often a market failure would require a Distributor to use the technical solution proposed. However, WPD has contracted and dispatched DSR comprising LV domestic customer devices (via an aggregator) to mitigate constraints on their EHV network and to date, the experience has been positive, with a 93% level of reliability.

It is possible to provide a better prediction of the likely time and duration of use however, as Distributors do have an understanding of load profiles and the impacts that EV charging, for example, might have on them. Typically, the risk periods on a day-to-day basis for Distributors coincide with the traditional tea-time period of peak demand (approximately 5pm to 7pm on weekdays). Any action by a load control system is likely to be limited to around this time, the exact duration depending on the background level of demand and the amount of (in this case) EV charging demand. In this scenario, it is likely that the Distributor would be reducing the peak power delivery but not the overall energy delivery so a reduced peak would result in a longer duration for that peak.

- It was acknowledged that the DCUSA CP Working Group will need to consider how vulnerable customers are treated, for example, when the consequences of not contacting them could be worse than utilising the last resort solution.
- One member was keen to understand how the use of this technical solution would be monitored, for example, to ensure that the system is not misused. It was noted that it is proposed that the Distributor would report on the use of the technical solution to Suppliers and Ofgem. At this stage, the Distributor would provide justification for why they used the last resort measure, and this would provide opportunities for the use to be monitored. Further consideration of this would be needed once the DCP 371 Working Group is established.
- It was noted that at present customer tariffs are based on the Supplier having full control of the customers load. It was agreed that a CP needs to be raised in parallel to DCP 371 regarding what impacts the solution will have, when used by Distributors, on customer tariffs and Supplier billing, After discussions it was agreed that a further meeting would be needed to discuss and fully understand this issue. RH and EL took an action to produce a draft CP ahead of this meeting.

ACTION 02/01: Sub-Group to review updated version of DCP 371 and provide comments by 12pm Tuesday, 7 July.
ACTION 02/02: Produce a first draft of the CP outlining the impacts this technical solution may have on customer tariffs and Supplier billing if used by a Distributor in the future.

Next Steps

- 3.2 The next step is to finalise CP and submit to the DCUSA Panel on 8 July. The DCUSA Panel will review the CP on 15 July and if approved an invitation to join the DCP 371 Working Group will be sent out on 17 July.
- 3.3 An additional DIF 59 Sub-Group meeting has been scheduled for 16 July to progress the drafting of the second CP relating to impacts on customer tariffs and Supplier billing. The aim will be to submit this CP to the August DCUSA Panel for approval to progress to a Working Group.

4. Any Other Business

- 4.1 There was no other business and the meeting was closed.

5. Date of Next Meeting:

- 5.1 The next DIF 59 Sub-Group is scheduled for 16 July 2020.

Appendix 1

New and open actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
02/01	Sub-Group to review updated version of DCP 371 and provide comments by 12pm Tuesday, 7 July.	All	
02/02	Produce a first draft of the CP outlining the impacts this technical solution may have on customer tariffs and Supplier billing if used by a Distributor in the future.	RH and EL	

Closed actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/01	Secretariat to update draft Change Proposal for and circulate to DIF 59 Sub-Group for review.	ElectraLink	Completed
