

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE NETWORK OPTION ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (the “NOA Committee” or the
“Committee”)**

Held in

**National Grid House, Warwick Technology Park, Warwick CV34 6DA
On**

Wednesday 10 January 2018 at 13:30

Present: Duncan Burt (Chair) – Acting Director of System Operations
Mike Breslin – Acting Head of Operate the System Electricity
Cathy McClay – Head of Commercial Operations
Julian Leslie – Head of Network Capability Electricity
Marcus Stewart – Head of Energy Insights

In attendance: Hannah Kirk-Wilson – Technical Secretary
Nicholas Harvey – Network Development Manager
Audrey Ramsay – Future Operability and Incentives Manager
Marc Vincent – Economic Assessment Manager
Kelvin Lambert – NOA Lead
Jason Hicks – NOA CBA Lead
Mark Pearce – NOA CBA Technical Specialist
Jingchao Deng – NOA Publication
Darshak Shah – Technical Analysis Lead
Kirsten McIver – Senior Design Engineer, SPT – for minutes 3.5 to 3.6
David Adam – Lead Design Engineer, SPT – for minutes 3.5 to 3.6
Bless Kuri – Transmission Planning Team Leader, SHET – for minutes 3.5 to 3.6
Paul Neilson – Technical Policy Manager, SHET – for minutes 3.5 to 3.6
Mark Perry – System Design Manager, NGET TO – for minutes 3.2 to 3.6
Le Fu – NGET TO NOA Lead, NGET TO – for minutes 3.2 to 3.6
Kathleen Baines – Load Related South Team Leader – for minutes 3.2 to 3.6
James Greenhalgh – Head of Investment Management – for minutes 3.2 to 3.6

Apologies: Roisin Quinn – Head of SO Strategy
Ofgem

1	MEETING GOVERNANCE
	[This section is redacted due to its administrative nature]
2	MINUTES OF THE NOA COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 13 DECEMBER 2017
	The draft NOA Committee minutes for the meeting held on 13 December 2017 (the “ Minutes ”), as circulated prior to the meeting, were taken as read. The committee members and attendees were requested to provide any final comments.

	There were no further comments and accordingly the Minutes were APPROVED as an accurate record and APPROVED for signature by the Chair.
3	ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE NOA COMMITTEE MEETING OF 13 DECEMBER 2017
3.1	General NOA publication and non-marginal option actions
	<p>The following document distributed prior to the meeting, relating to Action 1.1, was taken as read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOA 2017-18 Optimum Path Narrative 100118 <p>The chair requested matters to be highlighted the above paper and the following matters were highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee noted that the document needs to provide more of a narrative providing the context and drivers setting against which the results are presented rather than going straight to the detail of the results. • The Committee noted that the document needs to be brought up a level. • The Committee suggested that the acronyms and recommendations need to be recapped at the start of the document. • The Committee noted that the action remains open. • Action 1.1: Revise the document based on the comments from today and use for the next cycle. <p>The following document, distributed prior to the meeting, relating to Action 1.3, was taken as read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOA report extract – Chapter 5 <p>The chair requested matters to be highlighted from the above paper and the following matters were highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee noted the proposed wording for options which had been discussed at the NOA Committee • The Committee discussed the proposed wording which was felt a little cumbersome and simplified wording was proposed to be applied. Following this IT WAS RESOLVED that the action had been addressed and the Committee closed the action. • Action 2.1: Amend wording in NOA document for options discussed at the NOA Committee based on discussion. <p>The following document, distributed prior to the meeting, relating to Action 1.4, was taken as read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOA Committee Slides 100118 <p>The Chair summarised the discussion on the topic of the change in trips in northern England from West to East held at the NOA Committee meeting on 13 December. The Chair requested matters to be highlighted from the above paper and the following matters were highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee noted that the network is very sensitive to the flows for the critical trip moving East to West and vice versa, with only a 100MW difference in flow required for the critical trip to move. • The Committee noted that generation and demand mix, running arrangements and critical trips all influence network flows. • The Committee noted that had the trip not moved from West to East then

	<p>LDQB and the Mersey Ring Uprating (MRUP) would have been a proceed recommendation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee noted the sensitivity of the network in this area. • The Committee queried the process to manage this. The process of how the studies were conducted was explained and that sensitivity studies are conducted where there are large generation and demand changes close to a boundary when considering different scenarios. A process improvement has been implemented to manage such cases in the future. The Committee noted that this is an unusual case and that learning will be fed back into strengthening the process for next year. <p>In relation to LDQB and MRUP and following careful consideration of the evidence the NOA Committee RECOMMENDED a change to PROCEED both LDQB and MRUP investments. The Committee noted that the action was closed.</p>
3.2	Actions relating to the Lister Drive QB
	<p>The Chair summarised the discussion from the previous NOA Committee on 13 December 2017. The Chair requested an update with regard to Action 1.2 and the following matters were highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee noted that the costs submitted for the NOA were correct. • [Paragraph redacted due to commercially sensitive nature] • The Committee noted that the action is closed. • The Chair confirmed the Committee decision to proceed with LDQB to NGET TO due to the sensitivity of the network in the area to where the critical fault sits.
3.3	Actions relating to South Coast Compensation
	<p>The Chair summarised the discussion on the topic of the [redacted] first year spend for BNRC relating to Action 1.11 and requested NGET TO to provide a response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was highlighted that the cost due to be incurred on the project over the next year is internal cost [redacted due to commercially sensitive information] • It was challenged that the Earliest in Service Date provided by NGET TO for this option could be earlier [redacted due to commercially sensitive nature] • [Redacted due to commercially sensitive nature] • The Committee noted the work going on over the coming year to accelerate the development of schemes. The Committee also put the request to NGET TO to see different cost profiles for investments for a select number of schemes. • The Committee noted that there is a year-round requirement for this investment and requested NGET TO to consider the year-round assessments for this area of the network for next year. • The Committee noted that the action is closed.
3.4	Actions relating to East Anglia and Bramford Twinstead New Overhead Line (BTNO)
	<p>The following document, distributed prior to the meeting, was taken as read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOA Committee Slides 100118

	<p>The Chair summarised the discussion from the previous NOA Committee on 13 December 2017 and invited an update on the actions captured. The following matters were highlighted regarding Action 1.8 and Action 1.9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee noted that an additional 500MW of generation on top of that included in the Two Degrees scenario would be required to connect to make BTNO a critical option in this scenario. • The Committee noted that this closed Action 1.8. • It was also commented that the use of a commercial intertrip, in line with national planning standards, could be used to mitigate this additional generation and appears to potentially be a viable solution due to the radial nature of this part of the network. • The Committee noted that this closed Action 1.9. • The Committee noted the significant benefit an intertrip could deliver and recommend that an intertrip is considered as an option for this year. <p>The following document, tabled to the meeting with reference to Action 1.10, was reviewed by the NOA Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email titled <i>NOA Committee Action – B-T</i> relating to the BTNO scheme <p>The Chair requested matters from the above paper to be highlighted and the following matters were highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scheme is currently paused. • The spend would cover a project refresh including all the necessary activities required to restart the project. <p>In relation to BTNO and following careful consideration of the evidence the NOA Committee RECOMMENDED a change from PROCEED to DELAY for this option.</p>
3.5	<p>Actions relating to Eastern links</p>
	<p>The Chair summarised the discussion and actions relating to the Eastern links from the previous NOA Committee on 13 December 2017.</p> <p>The following document, distributed prior to the meeting, was taken as read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOA Committee Slides 100118 <p>The Chair requested matters from the above paper to be highlighted and the following matters regarding Action 1.6 were highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The approach taken to model the inclusion of an intertrip scheme was summarised. Whilst the scheme provides benefit of a reduction in constraint costs, boundaries B6, B7 and B7a are still heavily congested. This leads to no change for the reinforcements required for boundaries further south as the congestion remains on the northern boundaries. • The Committee noted that although the intertrip delayed some small schemes in some scenarios it had no impact on any critical schemes requiring a decision this year. • The Committee noted the plan to develop an intertrip scheme is to initially scope out the technical studies required overlapping with scoping out the economic studies. It was highlighted that the Committee would then be provided with an update on progress at the next meeting. • The Committee noted that the Eastern SWW project is also ongoing and consideration needs to be made as how to include an intertrip in that work. • It was highlighted that there is already an intertrip on B6 and as such the wording in the NOA report must reflect this. This existing infrastructure

	<p>could be used within a new intertrip scheme and in line with national planning standards.</p> <p>The Committee note that no intertrip was submitted for the analysis. After consideration of the evidence provided the Committee AGREED a request to proceed development of an intertrip in this area of the network.</p> <p>The following matters regarding Action 1.7 were highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential benefit that earlier delivery of the Eastern Links could deliver to the consumer was presented. This did not include consideration of an intertrip in this analysis. • [This paragraph is redacted due to containing commercially sensitive information]. • It was challenged whether further acceleration could be achieved in the design and build phase. [This sentence is redacted due to commercially sensitive information]. • Action 2.2: Disaggregate the benefit of the two links and conduct further analysis of what could be done to accelerate the programs. <p>After careful consideration of the value for consumers in accelerating the program, the Committee RECOMMENDED the TOs to proceed with the accelerated programmes for both E2DC and E4DC, although the Committee recognised this would be through a different regulatory process.</p>
3.6	<p>Actions on future meetings and NOA submission data</p>
	<p>Regarding Action 1.5, the Committee noted earlier discussions on the need for alternative spend profiles. The Committee noted the need to balance additional burden and the benefit that can be gained from different spend profiles on some investment options.</p> <p>The Forward Business Schedule was presented and APPROVED by the NOA Committee. The Committee noted that Action 1.12 is closed.</p> <p>It was noted that the NOA Committee had changed from the original scope, but this evolution is welcomed.</p> <p>The Committee noted that subsequently the Terms of Reference need to be updated.</p> <p>Action 2.3: Update the Terms of reference to reflect the change to the cycle of NOA Committee meetings</p>
4	<p>Formal noting of the NOA Committee’s decisions for the NOA 2017/18 recommendations.</p>
	<p>Mr Burt summarised the decisions of the meeting, which are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee RECOMMENDED a change of investment recommendation to “Proceed” for both LDQB and MRUP following consideration of the additional information requested. • The Committee requested NEGOT to consider year-round assessment of the South Coast compensation requirements for next year.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee RECOMMENDED a change of investment recommendation to “DELAY” for BTNO. • The Committee requested the development of intertrip schemes for the northern and East Anglia regions for inclusion in the next NOA. • The Committee requested that the TOs explore whether there is the possibility to further accelerate delivery of the Eastern link schemes.
5	Meeting Governance
	[This section is redacted due to its administrative nature]
6	Date of next meeting
	April 2018 – Date TBC
7	ANY OTHER BUSINESS
	As there was no other business the meeting was closed.

DRAFT