

SQSS Workgroup Vote

GSR027: Review of the NETS SQSS Criteria for Frequency Control that drive reserve, response and inertia holding on the GB electricity system

Please note: To participate in any votes, Workgroup members need to have attended at least 50% of meetings.

Voting stages

- 1) Vote on whether the Original Modification Proposal better facilitates the Applicable SQSS Objectives better than the Baseline (the current version of the SQSS).
- 2) Vote on which of the options is best.

The Applicable SQSS Objectives:

- i) facilitate the planning, development and maintenance of an efficient, coordinated and economical system of electricity transmission, and the operation of that system in an efficient, economic and coordinated manner;
- ii) ensure an appropriate level of security and quality of supply and safe operation of the National Electricity Transmission System;
- iii) facilitate effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity, and (so far as consistent therewith) facilitating such competition in the distribution of electricity; and
- iv) facilitate electricity Transmission Licensees to comply with their obligations under EU law.

Workgroup Vote

Stage 2a – Assessment against objectives

To assess the original compared to the baseline (the current SQSS).

You will also be asked to provide a statement to be added to the Workgroup Report alongside your vote to assist the reader in understanding the rationale for your vote.

AO = Applicable Objective

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AO (i)	Better facilitates AO (ii)	Better facilitates AO (iii)	Better facilitates AO (iv)	Overall (Y/N)
	Rob Wilson / Rob Westmancoat – National Grid ESO				
Original	Y	Y	-	-	Y

Voting Statement:

This modification facilitates a more transparent and engaged solution to the question raised in the E3C and Ofgem final reports into the events of 9 Aug 2019 of how to determine an appropriate level of security of supply, balancing the cost and benefit of this to consumers. In requiring the periodic production of a report to determine this which will be subject to consultation and approval it also gives future flexibility.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AO (i)	Better facilitates AO (ii)	Better facilitates AO (iii)	Better facilitates AO (iv)	Overall (Y/N)
	Dr. Isaac Gutierrez / Paul Crolla – Scottish Power Renewables (UK) Limited				
Original	Y	-	-	-	Y

Voting Statement:

At this time we are minded that the proposal is marginally better than the baseline but the methodology described in the FRCR report has yet to be carried out and has yet to prove that it will cause the system to be operated in a more secure than the baseline, it is likely to be that the system will be able to be operated more economically if less rare events are secured against. It will be up to the SQSS panel to consider whether the recommendations of the FRCR will result in a more secure system.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AO (i)	Better facilitates AO (ii)	Better facilitates AO (iii)	Better facilitates AO (iv)	Overall (Y/N)
	Andrew Russell / Simon Lord - Engie				
Original	Y	Y	-	-	Y
<p>Voting Statement:</p> <p>Objective (ii) is addressed. This modification will modernise the SQSS, making it fit for purpose by establishing a clear process for considering reliability vs cost and incorporation of the latest risks of the changing system including consequential losses. Through its application it will drive changes to the response / reserve / inertia / largest loss holding policies of the ESO.</p> <p>An enhanced understanding of security and supply with controlled costs should naturally support objective (i).</p>					

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AO (i)	Better facilitates AO (ii)	Better facilitates AO (iii)	Better facilitates AO (iv)	Overall (Y/N)
	Mike Gordon / Mike Lee – Transmission Investment Services Ltd.				
Original	Y	Y	-	-	Y
<p>Voting Statement:</p> <p>The Original Modification Proposal better facilitates the SQSS Objectives by facilitating an explicit and transparent assessment of consequential losses comparing risk, consequence and cost. Whilst the assessment findings sit outside the SQSS in a separate report (The FRCR) this is acknowledged as appropriate for the time being due to the changing nature of the risk year by year making establishment of a fixed and enduring assessment result impractical for the medium term.</p>					

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AO (i)	Better facilitates AO (ii)	Better facilitates AO (iii)	Better facilitates AO (iv)	Overall (Y/N)
	Andy Vaudin / Paul Mott – EDF				
Original	Y	Y	-	-	Y
<p>Voting Statement:</p> <p>The modification should enable the ESO to hold reserve, response and inertia at costs appropriate to the assessed risks on the system.</p>					

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AO (i)	Better facilitates AO (ii)	Better facilitates AO (iii)	Better facilitates AO (iv)	Overall (Y/N)
	Mark Duffield – National Grid Interconnectors				
Original	Y	Y	-	-	Y
<p>Voting Statement:</p>					

By introducing a more responsive and well governed process to allow the SQSS to better respond to the evolving challenges of system operability while assessing the costs and benefits to the GB consumer of any changes, I believe the proposed amendment does indeed better facilitate the Applicable SQSS Objectives (i) and (ii).

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AO (i)	Better facilitates AO (ii)	Better facilitates AO (iii)	Better facilitates AO (iv)	Overall (Y/N)
	Chris Proudfoot / Alastair Frew – Drax Group				
Original	Y	Y	-	-	Y
Voting Statement:					
The treatment of losses on the system has become more complex, this methodology will make it clear which losses are being considered and why.					

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AO (i)	Better facilitates AO (ii)	Better facilitates AO (iii)	Better facilitates AO (iv)	Overall (Y/N)
	Alan Creighton – Northern Powergrid				
Original	Y	Y	-	-	Y
Voting Statement:					
The proposed solution will help establish the appropriate level of reserve, response and inertia holding via a transparent process.					

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AO (i)	Better facilitates AO (ii)	Better facilitates AO (iii)	Better facilitates AO (iv)	Overall (Y/N)
	Le Fu – NGET				
Original	Y	Y	-	-	Y
Voting Statement:					
The modification introduces a transparent and engaging process to enable ESO achieving the balance between safe operation of the network and cost to achieve it via holding frequency response and reserve. Thus, it better facilitates the Applicable SQSS Objective (i) and (ii).					

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AO (i)	Better facilitates AO (ii)	Better facilitates AO (iii)	Better facilitates AO (iv)	Overall (Y/N)
	Robert Longden / Tom Edwards – Cornwall Insight Ltd.				
Original	Y	Y	-	-	Y
Voting Statement:					
The Methodology and associated Report will facilitate a clear understanding of the approved cost/risk trade off used by the ESO in managing the system. It will also allow informed discussion					

as to how that balance might be adjusted based on experience and assessment of identified future risks.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AO (i)	Better facilitates AO (ii)	Better facilitates AO (iii)	Better facilitates AO (iv)	Overall (Y/N)
	Cornel Brozio / David Adam – SP Energy Networks (SPT)				
Original	-	-	-	-	N

Voting Statement:

As outlined in the SPEN workgroup consultation response, we do not believe that the case for this SQSS change has been made. Noting that the ESO should already manage frequency control costs and risks in an economic and efficient manner, we welcome more open and transparent decision making by the ESO. This can be achieved without an SQSS change via the proposed FRCR, governed by a NOA-type process and mandated by a licence condition.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AO (i)	Better facilitates AO (ii)	Better facilitates AO (iii)	Better facilitates AO (iv)	Overall (Y/N)
	Grace March – Sembcorp				
Original	Y	Y	-	-	Y

Voting Statement:

This report will explain the efficient and cost-effective management of the system, in terms of security of supply, and will allow clear discussion of the risks of power outages and costs to consumer.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AO (i)	Better facilitates AO (ii)	Better facilitates AO (iii)	Better facilitates AO (iv)	Overall (Y/N)
	Garth Graham / Andrew Colley – SSE Generation Ltd.				
Original	Y	Y	-	-	Y

Voting Statement:

No Voting Statement provided.

Stage 2b – Workgroup Vote

Which option is the best? (Baseline or Original proposal).

Workgroup Member	Company	BEST Option?	Which objective(s) does the change better facilitate? (if baseline not applicable)
Rob Wilson / Rob Westmancoat	National Grid ESO	Original	(i) and (ii)
Dr. Isaac Gutierrez / Paul Crolla	Scottish Power Renewables (UK) Limited	Original	(i)
Andrew Russell / Simon Lord	Engie	Original	(i) and (ii)
Michael Gordon / Mike Lee	Transmission Investment Services Limited	Original	(i) and (ii)
Andy Vaudin / Paul Mott	EDF	Original	(i) and (ii)
Mark Duffield	National Grid Interconnectors	Original	(i) and (ii)
Chris Proudfoot / Alastair Frew	Drax Group	Original	(i) and (ii)
Alan Creighton	Northern Powergrid	Original	(i) and (ii)
Le Fu	NGET	Original	(i) and (ii)
Robert Longden / Tom Edwards	Cornwall Insight Ltd.	Original	(i) and (ii)
Cornel Brozio / David Adam	SP Energy Networks (SPT)	Baseline	n/a
Grace March	Sembcorp	Original	(i) and (ii)
Garth Graham / Andrew Colley	SSE Generation Ltd.	Original	(i) and (ii)