

This document is classified as **White** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Information can be shared with the public, and any members may publish the information, subject to copyright.

SECMP0046 ‘Allow DNOs to control Electric Vehicle chargers connected to Smart Meter infrastructure’

May 2020 Working Group – meeting summary

Attendee	Organisation
Alison Beard (Chair)	SECAS
Jordan Crase	SECAS
Eessa Mansoor	SECAS
Joe Hehir	SECAS
David Walsh	DCC
Remi Oluwabamise	DCC
Francesca Barrick	Ofgem
Richard Colwill	Electralink
Joachim Brandt	Gemserv
Paul Fitzgerald	SSEN
Bob Hopkins	SSEN
Sven Hoffmann	WPD
Gemma Slaney	WPD
Eric Taylor	SLS
John Noad	Npower
Matthew Alexander	SSE
Emslie Law	SSE
Elias Hanna	Lands & Gyr
Mahfuzar Rahman	Scottish Power
Paul Saker	EDF
Patrick Caiger-Smith	geo

Recap on previous SECMP0046

SECAS presented a brief recap on SECMP0046. This covered the background to the issue, why the issue is expected arise, and the solution outline to resolve this issue.

Discussion of Refinement Consultation Themes

SECAS and the Proposer identified eight themes from the Refinement Consultation. These were presented to the Working Group attendees along with some discussion points:

Theme 1: Electricity Distributor can perform load control through communication with the Supplier within a sufficient time frame

SECAS discussed with the Working Group that in previous Working Groups a Supplier led solution was discussed and discounted. Whilst the time for the Supplier to curtail the Electric Vehicle charging could be fairly quick the solution it was discounted due to the time delay between Electricity Distributor identifying the correct Suppliers for a set of MPANs on a feeder and communicating with the Relevant Supplier. The Working Group agreed that this was the case.

Theme 2: The proposed solution would negatively impact the uptake of Smart Meters and the transition to Electric Vehicles by consumers

The Working Group were presented with two discussion points for this theme; Suppliers can already utilise this solution, and under current arrangements supply would cut electricity to the whole household on the feeder if an overloading event were to occur.

A Working Group member mentioned that as a Supplier, the usage of this mechanism by them would be outlined in the contract between themselves and the Consumer. It was highlighted that as a part of this SEC Modification that the Distributors would be gaining consent and notifying Consumers before this mechanism would be utilised by them. However, it was argued that the even if this were the case, the Consumers would still likely to contact the Supplier if the Distributor throttled the charging of EV, regardless of what information was communicated to them by the Distributor. To help mitigate this, SECAS suggested that the solution could explore a notification being generated to the Consumer's IHD when this mechanism was used.

There were some concerns raised that the Distributors using this mechanism would interfere with contract arrangements between the Consumer and Supplier i.e. tariffs. The Working Group were reminded that the established solution does include the boost button functionality for the Consumer to override the curtailing of EV charging, and a Working Group member commented that Boost Button functionality could be mandated for HCALCS through this Modification. Some concerns were raised that if the Boost Button functionality was available to all Consumers, it would be readily used and undermine the solution this Modification is proposing to implement. It was argued that there is evidence that shows this would not likely be the case, and that Consumers would not be concerned providing their EV is charged by the time that they need to use it.

Theme 3: Unsure that a solution is required

Some Refinement Consultation Responses believe there is a lack of evidence that a solution is even required. This was discussed with the Working Group and it was pointed out there has been work prior to this SEC Modification being raised that outlined a solution would be required. The Working Group agreed that there is a clear need for some sort of solution to be developed.

It was discussed that other market mechanisms would be the first choice to be used to resolve this issue. However, it was reiterated that the SEC Modification solution would only be utilised as a last resort when these other market mechanisms fail. There were some concerns that there was no guarantee that this would be the case as the surrounding governance is lacking. It was noted that a Change Proposal for the DCUSA was being raised to cover the wider governance of usage that the technical solution covered in this SEC Modification describes on this change.

Some comments were raised that this theme originated from a lack of understanding of the full issue. The Working Group reiterated that the uptake in EVs is occurring in rapid clusters on Feeders.

Additionally, there are cases where domestic EV chargers are being installed but the Distributors are not being informed as per the IET Standards, 'fit and inform'.

Theme 4: Potential to negatively impact market competition that could solve the issue

It was reiterated that the solution outlined in SECMP0046 is a last resort. Market mechanisms should be utilised and encouraged to resolve the issue, but the described solution would be available if these were to fail.

Some Working Group members were unsure as to how the market competition would be stifled by this. It was voiced that it may be individual companies that are impacted by this not the industry as a whole. Some Working Group members also commented that this may even promote competition in certain areas of the market.

Theme 5: Surrounding governance of usage is lacking

The Working Group agreed that the governance surrounding when and how the described solution would be used is lacking. It has been identified there are likely impacts on the DCUSA and the Proposer has agreed to start the DCUSA change process to address the governance needed to facilitate SECMP0046 solution. The SEC Working Group members were invited to be involved in the DCUSA Working Group.

Theme 6: Issues with the technical solution

Another theme identified in the Refinement Consultation responses was that there were some issues with the technical solution still to be resolved. These issues were discussed with the Working Group and narrowed down as follows:

- The governance surrounding Distributors having the ability to Install and join devices, and the wider impacts this could have
- How would this be rolled out and where do the obligations lie?
- What are the Device level impacts of this solution?

These points were discussed with the Working Group where comments were raised that the technical solution should keep complexity low as well as costs low. There were some further discussions regarding past technical governance and how this has changed with the SEC. It was argued that HCALCS are replacing Radio Teleswitches which Distributors were able to utilise to manage load. However, under the SEC, load management using HCALCS is Supplier exclusive under the current arrangements.

For clarity, these issues do not lie within the DCC Preliminary Assessment being wrong as this was assessed against the business requirements discussed at previous working groups. However, updating the business requirements may help resolve these issues.

Theme 7: Wider industry Ofgem consultation is needed

The Proposer has initiated discussions with Ofgem regarding SECMP0046 and what they would expect of it. The Proposer mentioned that Ofgem have had previous involvement in SECMP0046, and these further discussions would ensure that this Modification still aligns to what would be expected.

Where possible, these discussions will be captured in the Modification Report. This is to allow parties to understand the whole picture and how it is developing.

Theme 8: Disrupting the status quo of the direct Supplier - Consumer relationship

Impacts this solution could have on Suppliers and their Consumers were also discussed under other themes. This theme was presented to understand the impacts that changing the current arrangements would have, both positive and negative. There were comments from the Working Group that changes to the current arrangements may not be a completely bad thing and may even produce new opportunities. Although some previous discussions outline some negative impacts on Supplier – Consumer relationships, it was argued that not making these relationships prescriptive in how they are done as part of the solution may help mitigate this. This is not to say that the solution should not include potential methods on how this is done.

APC & SAPC

The Working Group were informed that the Distributors do not have the ability to use the APC or SAPC in the BEIS drafting for the November 2020 SEC Release. APC and SAPC are still considered in scope for this SEC Modification and the business requirements will be updated to reflect this.

A Working Group member pointed out that the SAPC does not need to go through the ESME and that this is an additional benefit that should not be lost sight of for this use case. The specific example of this is in the scenario of Change of Supplier.

Next Steps and further actions

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS to discuss with the Proposer the requirement for a notification sent the IHD when an EVs load is curtailed.
- SECAS to discuss with the Proposer making boost functionality on HCalc mandatory.
- SECAS to investigate the issues with the technical solution and discuss with the Proposer what their expectations would be.
- SECAS to update the business requirements and discuss with the DCC if a new Preliminary Assessment is required.
- The Proposer to start the DCUSA change process.
- The Proposer and SECAS to have discussions with BEIS and Ofgem.
- SECAS and the Proposer to discuss if another Refinement Consultation would be advantageous.