Entry Customer Forum

MINUTES

Tuesday 28 March 2023 at 12.30PM – 2.00PM

MS Teams Meeting

ATTENDEES

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Initials** | **Company** |
| Charlotte Marcel | CM | ADBA |
| Lee Firth | LF | Biomethane Assist |
| Matthew Joinson | MJ | Cadent |
| Tina Hawke | TH | Cadent |
| Alison Cartwright | AC | CNG Services |
| Philip Kershaw | PK | CNG Services |
| James Earl | JE | ENA |
| Matt Rosenfeld | MR | ENA |
| Nick Primmer | NP | Future Biogas |
| Rebecca Hailes | RH | Joint Office of Gas Transporters |
| Shane Rafferty | SR | Mutual Energy |
| Ben Hanley | BH | NGN |
| Emma Buckton | EB | NGN |
| Paul Worthington | PW | Orbital |
| Andrew Brown | AB | SGN |
| Elysia Roy | ER | SGN |
| Joel Martin (Chair) | JM | SGN |
| Russell Brown | RB | Thyson |
| Catherine Litster | CL | WWU |
| Helen Fitzgerald | HF | WWU |

MEETING NOTES AND ACTIONS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Welcome / Introductions** | **JM** |
| JM introduced himself as the new chair of the Entry Customer Forum. JM relayed apologies from SE. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2. Action Log Update** | **MR** |
| The group’s open actions were reviewed:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | 31-May-22 | DN to develop a generic capacity study for all gas networks to follow | DN | Ongoing |

JM updated that DN had consolidated the GDN’s individual (similar) methodologies into a standard template. AC added that with all the possible options (e.g., including reverse compression) it would be preferable to get this consistent, however concerns were raised that a greater commercial understanding of e.g., reverse compression, was necessary before they could be recommended in such a study.**Action: MR to table a session for the GDNs to look at DN’s capacity study template in more detail, assess what should be added/removed, and whether to adopt this consistent methodology.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | 29-Nov-22 | ALL to hold a review of meeting frequency in March 2023. | ALL | On agenda |

The group decided to keep the current meeting frequency (bi-monthly).**Action: MR to update the 2023 invitations accordingly.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 31-Jan-23 | Invite an IGEM representative to attend the EnCF. | EB | Created |

MR had reached out to the generic IGEM technical inbox and was awaiting response; EB had received and reached out to an IGEM contact and was likewise awaiting response.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4 | 31-Jan-23 | GDNs to review the outcomes of the Biomethane Investor Workshop and form an action plan. | GDNs | Created |

JM outlined that a GDN session to discuss this was tabled. EB noted that the key points addressed by the stakeholder survey were, in some form, being dealt with by the EnCF/Technical Working Group already.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | 31-Jan-23 | Cadent to present a deep dive on the technical specifications, and separately provide an update on the Reverse Compression site at Doncaster to share learnings to the group. | EB | Created |

SE had outlined by email that RC was on paternity leave, but upon his return, he would circulate the specifications on April 10th, with a deep dive scheduled on April 14th. AC explained that she would appreciate a wider stakeholder session (rather than a networks-only session), and wished to ensure that these compressors would be cheap, readily available and easily maintainable, rather than “one-offs”.**Action: MR to follow up on a wider stakeholder engagement session on Cadent’s reverse compression site (in addition to the April 14th deep dive).***Post-meeting edit: SE/RC confirmed that the planned sessions are not networks-only.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3. EnCF Action Plan Tracker** | **ALL** |
| 1. CV Blips and Flaring – Lack of CV Flexibility during plant start-up

RB updated that he had run through the draft document with each GDN early in the new year, and had created a flowchart of how the system would behave (i.e., to show each of the elements to take the gas to reject, export…). Having obtained some real data from NGN, the next steps were to test the outcomes of some typical days with CV blips. RB added that the solution was designed to be flexible, and capable of maintaining the structure with e.g., different timings between GDNs.Flowchart available here: [CVBlipsProposalRev0 (huddle.net)](https://my.huddle.net/workspace/39153162/files/#/110529292)**Action: Once the NGN data has been tested, MR to set up a session with GDNs and RB to review the CV Blips solution and if/how the GDNs intend to implement it, to report back to the EnCF.**1. Biomethane blending – GDN inconsistencies with blending

TH updated that Cadent’s blending document had been shared amongst the GDNs, feedback had been received, and the document was pending approval with Cadent’s internal governance. MJ provided a timeline of c.4-6 weeks for this process, at which point the document will be available to view.HF asked the group if there were any projects in progress which did not use a Tee Blender; JM mentioned an existing blending point which injects biomethane through a flange with multiple gas points, but that SGN had none relying on gas blending in the pipe itself (RH: “fortuitous co-mingling”) without a blending asset.1. SGS Issues

JM reported that the networks were in the process of refreshing the SGS Dashboard with 2023 Q1 data, and that from 2021 to 2022 there had been an increase in letter of approval deviations. CL and JM agreed that staff turnover was a likely cause of these deviations, and so new training programmes were needed, explaining what biomethane producers needed to do and why.RB offered to lead this piece of work, with backing from the GDNs and DFOs.**Action: JM to provide RB with some anonymised SGS issues and high-level bullet points of what is required re: training programmes to address letter of approval deviations.**1. Standardisation – ME2

BH updated that GDN comments had been collated and the scope set. NGN were waiting for prices back, at which point there would be a working group meeting to select the vendor (within the next month or so).JM clarified that this item sought to take ME2 out of the OAD, wherein it may sit under IGEM, GIS or Joint Office governance, but that this would *not* require any change to the UNC (and hence no Mod).1. Operator Competence Accreditation

TH outlined that this item was still on hold. CM expressed ADBA’s interest in involvement herein.1. Standardisation – Review of Capacity Studies

Covered in the review of the action log.1. In-Grid Compression

Technical specifications were covered in the review of the action log (due April 10th) from RC.JM reported that JB was separately progressing UNC Mod 808 to address the commercial/regulatory angle from the perspective of IGTs; RH outlined that this was going smoothly; the Mod would be sent out to consultation soon, and legal text would be on the way shortly.From a GDN perspective, MJ and JM agreed that more work was needed to assess the commercial and regulatory aspects, as well as feasibility (i.e., the extent to which reverse compression would relieve capacity constraints). EB added that a Cadent tool was in development to outline scope for the GDNs, highlighting e.g., how many compressors would be needed over the course of a day. 1. Capacity/Low Flow through NTS Meter

AC recapped that this item related to certain limits on flow through the NTS, giving capacity constraints. It was recognised that some meters were/would be seeing this as industry turns off/moves to hydrogen, and so the group sought to understand if anything else could be done to alleviate this issue.JM outlined that (TH: only in some cases) upgrading from orifice plate meters to USMs would be a solution.SR expressed keenness in hearing these considerations, as many of the individual distribution networks in Northern Ireland were hitting minimum flows.RH clarified that JB had asked for this topic to be discussed at Distribution Work Group, but that there was no UNC Mod on this subject; the group recalled that JB had sent a letter to Steve Brown (Ofgem) on the subject, but noted that he was awaiting response.Letter available here:[NTS Exit Metering to LDZs and biomethane (huddle.net)](https://my.huddle.net/workspace/39153162/files/#/110529323)1. Gas Entry *via* IGT Pipelines

JM provided context to this new Action Plan item; a UNC Mod had been drafted to facilitate gas entry into the total GB system *via* IGT pipeline to the GDN, and this draft had been sent to the Joint Office for a critical friend appraisal. Comments were being taken from the other GDNs. The Mod would be raised at the April UNC Panel. A tripartite agreement would be necessary between the IGT, DFO and GDN involved.Link to the UNC Mod here: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0842>1. Standardisation – Central Feedstock Register
2. Standardisation – IO Schedule

TH explained that these items were still on hold, as they were lower priority; JM proposed archiving both.As a follow-up to the Feedstock Register, CM noted that ADBA had had, but no longer maintained a “feedstock market” (as it had to be manually updated). AC signposted Lucy Hopwood (NNFCC) as a possible reference point on the subject. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5. 0818 - Releasing of unused capacity under a specific set of circumstances** | **EB** |
| EB requested support for Mod 0818; the Mod had been through consultation, was through to panel and sitting with Ofgem (however Ofgem could still receive letters of support). RH echoed this call; some of the shippers holding capacity were not keen on the Mod, so it had not progressed with unanimous support.Slides available at: [EnCF Mod 0818 (huddle.net)](https://my.huddle.net/workspace/39153162/files/#/110529290) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6. GS(M)R Amendments** | **ALL** |
| *On the need for a safety case for pipelines conveying biomethane:*AC and JM pointed out some ambiguity in the wording, e.g., the scope of “on-site” pipework, the case for offsite biomethane where the pipework was not adopted, “upgrading” and “blending” biomethane. Nick King and Tony Pym were to have a meeting with the HSE to ensure that the intentions were correct.CM added that ADBA had met with the HSE the previous day, and written a blog on first interpretations and better understanding the boundaries. She added that the HSE were drafting guidance and looking to publish pre-summer, so there was time to feed into the HSE questions, case studies, etc.CM also clarified that sites coming online before October 2024 would be subject to this amendment.**Action: CM to circulate to the group (*via* MR) the blog text from ADBA’s meeting with the HSE on the GS(M)R Amendments***On the relative density requirement ≤0.700:*LF outlined that the grid entry units did not have alarms or trips that divert gas at the point where relative density was recorded. JM noted that Dave Lander (involved with the IGEM gas quality working group that proposed this change) was surprised that this was coming into effect so soon.The group agreed – based off separate analytics from LF and RB – that it was near impossible to exceed this relative density without other separate layers of protection kicking in first, even with the worst conditions allowed by the GC. The group also agreed that it was the responsibility of the GDNs to demonstrate that they can act within GS(M)R.**Action: GDNs to determine if it is necessary to write to the HSE about the April 2023 implementation of the relative density change.***On the lowering of the Wobbe Number limit:*It was unclear at this stage whether this change would require much more than number changes on the systems, or whether e.g., pack file changes, end-to-end checks, software changes to re-configure hard-coded limits would be required.**Action: GDNs to investigate the level of difficulty associated with adapting systems for the lowering of the Wobbe Number limit.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **7. Biomethane Investor Workshops** | **EB** |
| EB updated that Tim Charters, the group’s previous contact in DESNZ, had left and passed over contact to one of his colleagues. The next steps were to pick up the Investor Workshops with her and set up a face-to-face following the GGSS Mid-Scheme Review.**Action: EB to set up a DESNZ-GDN Catch-Up.**EB also suggested a deep dive on “smoother connections and turnaround times”, as this topic had also been raised at the Investor Workshop without much elaboration.RB identified propanation as another issue arising from the stakeholder survey which was not being addressed by the forum. MR explained that, following a deep dive by the Technical Working Group, more information-gathering was being carried out to address issues relating to propane contamination (sitting with CS and BO), and JM explained that Cadent’s blending proposal would go some way to reducing the amount of propanation required (however, work was not being done to address the 7-8% directive limit itself). |