

Point of Connection Working Group

Working group set up under the ECSG to investigate the development of self-determined PoC	From	
	Date and time of Meeting	12 August 14:00-16:00
	Location	Ofgem offices

1. Present

Roger Reynolds (RR)	Korus
Bob Weaver (BW)	PowerCon
Geoff Fisher (GF)	SSE
Robert Burgoyne (RB)	GTC
Peter Thompson (PT)	CE Electric
Bill D'Albertanson (BDA)	UKPN
Ian Oliver (IO)	WPD
Stuart Duggan (SD)	RDNetwork Design
David Ball (DB)	ENWL
Phil Norrish (PN)	UPL
David Overman (DO)	GTC
James Duncan (JD)	GTC
Michael Scowcroft (by phone) (MS)	SP
James Veaney (JV)	Ofgem
Stacy Feldmann (SF)	Ofgem

2. Apologies

Gary Barnes (SP); Mike Cahill (Lloyds), Mark Johnston (CE)

3. Presentation on advantage of self-PoC and the experience in gas

3.1 DO and JD presented on the advantages of self-PoC and illustrated the process in gas.

3.2 Discussion ensued with some questions being raised:

- PN noted that it needs to be clear who will be able to do self-PoC
- Practical implications were discussed, however the group were reminded by JV that the purpose of this meeting was to discuss the scope of this working group rather than seeking to resolve all potential issues.
- It was recommended by DO that the working group should consider the work of the Extension of Contestability (EoC) working group.
- It was noted that there would need to be a DNO approvals process.
- It is queried whether GDNs approve the connection being proposed through self-PoC. JD confirmed that at acceptance, the GDN will give approval.
- A question was raised relating to source pressures and other such factors taken into consideration during self-PoC. It was clarified that minimum source pressures were

provided under the NP14 to allow for design. The source pressure data is further categorised between low and medium pressure.

- A question was raised regarding the earlier visibility by the GDN in order to anticipate capacity and interactivity as well as network management concerns. JD's response was that the upstream network operator needs to approve the self-PoC and approve the order of applications where interactivity is an issue.
- It was commented that there was specific GIRS accreditation in place to allow for self-PoC. These standards are well known by both parties and the level of rejection is minimal.
- It was clarified that whilst the gas model works, it is not necessarily the intention for this model to be mapped directly across to electricity. The differences between gas and electricity needed to be understood and for it to be established how far self-PoC could be implemented within electricity. It was further commented that self-PoC was also not intended to be a one-size-fits-all and that some areas of the market may not be as suitable for self-PoC as others.

4. Roundtable discussion on existing practices for third party design access, perceived barriers/issues and process in electricity

4.1. Issues/barriers

- Third party access to information issues. Possible customer sensitive data issues.
- Access to more detailed information than GIS mapping. Need to agree release of data and there may be costs associated with providing data.
- There is a fear from the DNOs that they will not get sufficient visibility early on regarding reinforcement and network impacts which could lead to delays.
- DNOs want to ensure that their responsibility for an efficient network is not compromised.
- The scope of where self-PoC can be applied needs to be clarified including which market segments and the scale of jobs that it applies to.
- It was discussed that if proof of concept testing were initiated, these trials could assess whether there was a point where any further expansion to self-PoC could compromise DNO's network responsibility.
- Felt there is a need to consider the timing of reinforcement and payments.
- It was questioned whether DG developments could be included in the scope of self-PoC as the impact of DG is still not fully understood. Discussion about this resulted in a response that DG would not be excluded from potential test schemes for proof of concept, but that the schemes suggested for testing would need to be selected on the likelihood of them being approved.
- It was noted that there may be some difference in self-PoC based on whether the site was green field or brown field.
- It was also commented that there would be differences at different voltage levels, LV/HV etc.

- It was agreed in this discussion that small scale schemes could be trialled at the outset to test proof of concept and that the focus could be on small wins that get the process tested. Initially, the work could focus on how accurate a self-PoC could be designed based on the initial information a DNO provides.
- It was noted later that likely schemes should be presented for trial in order to enable DNOs to coordinate. Similarly, it was felt that trials should be careful not to be limited in scope, for instance to DG related schemes etc.
- It was noted that efficiencies could not be gained unless all participants got involved.
- An action was taken for DNOs to signal their willingness to engage in trials and some details of scope and timelines they envisage. Some DNOs signalled their willingness at the meeting.
- Licensing issues were raised. It was clarified that licenses are required in gas in order to view maps provided by GDNs. DO confirmed that GTC has its own licences for this purpose and also clarified that a fee was paid to the GTs to access their software for self-PoC.
- PN commented that trials should not only be domestic but should also consider the commercial market and ICPs.
- An action was taken that for the next meeting, DNOs should indicate what they can trial and what they cannot.
- It was queried why this activity could not draw on existing third party access provided to DNO affiliates. It was clarified that the contractors were accommodated under the DNOs licence conditions.

Action	Responsibility
DNOs need to signal their willingness to engage in the trials and provide some details of scope and timelines	DNOs
DNOs should indicate what they can trial and what not	DNOs

5. Terms of Reference

5.1. Objectives

- It was suggested that trials to test proof of concept could be added as an objective of the group. It was stated that proof of concept testing could focus on considering what information is needed in electricity to allow for self-PoC, the details of the markets in which self-PoC could work and the extent to which ICPs/IDNOs could achieve replicable PoCs.
- It was clarified that the objectives under the draft ToR suggested a 2 stage process where Stage 1 was to identify customer benefit. It was agreed that this staged approach needed to be teased out further and this was taken as an action.
- It was queried what modelling tools DNOs used to create PoC. An action was taken for DNOs to clarify the modelling tools they use for LV, HV, DG and other categories. It was felt that there may be a common platform to facilitate this sort of work.

5.2. Scope and purpose of the group

- In relation to scope and purpose it was discussed that the group could have oversight on the trials being completed and could manage the issues and learning that came out of these.
- It was commented however that beyond the proof of concept testing and the issues and learning arising, it needed to be considered what the future scope of self-PoC and the group would be.
- It was agreed that further work on the ToR was needed in light of the discussion had at this first meeting.

Action	Responsibility
Group to tease out the ToR further relating to the proposal for proof of concept trials, the perceived benefits of self-PoC and following the discussions at the first meeting	DO to lead
DNOs to report on the modelling tools used	DNOs

6. Next Steps and Actions

6.1. The date of the next meeting was discussed but a final date was not agreed.

Action	Responsibility
Schedule next meeting	Ofgem