# Notes LFG meeting 11th December, Infinis's Offices, Northampton

#### **Attendees**

Alex Down BiffaAndrew Leeding Infinis

Andy Leech Renewable Power

Bob Gregory Gregory Environmental Consulting

Chris Parry In own capacityDavid Cross Aurora Energy

David Reay
CPL Activated Carbon

Graham Ball Enovert
John Cove Suez
Mark Langabeer Veolia
Mark Rutherford Flogas

Mike Guy Arevon EnergyStuart Markham EDL Energy

Tim Otley Suez
Gaynor Hartnell REA
Steve Shaw (chair) Veolia

### **Introductions and H&S arrangements**

Steve Shaw explained the context to the REA LFG group starting up again. Commercial issues were coming up at the LGIG and it wasn't always the appropriate forum to discuss them. Last time the LGIG and REA meetings were held so close together it was inefficient for people. Agreed to hold meetings back-to-back in the future, when possible. (LGIG meets twice a year, LFG quarterly)

Introductions were made.

## Minutes of last meetings, corrections, actions and matters arising

All actions from the last meeting were either carried or on the agenda, with the exception of inviting Stuart Wilson (Infinis) to speak to about their engine overhaul facility and potential external offering. **Action: invite him to the next meeting or organise meeting at the facility if possible.** 

GH reported that the EA could not provide the collated engine and surface emissions data back to industry, in spreadsheet form, as it only has the info as separate PDFs itself. The group discussed why the data might be important – and concluded it was important to be able to proactively identify trends and be prepared on potential impacts and the effect of future regulations including the MCPD or similar. Agreed to send spreadsheets of data to REA going forward. REA to make it anonymous, add it to existing data (which C Parry had pulled together) and then report on trends. This would be a good project for an intern. GH to produce a project description for circulation. Action Alex

<u>Down to locate this data and forward to GH</u>. Noted, it would be important to note if each site is active, or closed. <u>Action: Template for data requirements to be developed and circulated to group so all data is received in the same format to make future analysis easier.</u>

There was a discussion on progress made with biogas use in accredited LFG engines, and some scepticism about the ability to start doing this, now that the RO had closed to new entrants. Others reported on their progress in doing this and had been told that a change of accreditation of an existing engine to enable it to be dual-fuelled was possible at any time and would not be regarded as a new application. It was noted that this had been done in Northern Ireland already. Action: GH to send the Ofgem correspondence around about dual fuelling.

Other items discussed under this agenda item (actions from previous minutes) covered under headings below.

## **Proposed new Training Courses**

GH reported that she had discussed EA training needs with Dave Browell, who had then participated in the two day training course run in November at Seghill. He didn't feel this course was suitable for the initial training required by EA (some things covered in insufficient detail, other areas too detailed) and nor was it worth adapting. He was interested in what industry had developed for the next level of training provision. After a discussion of the training needs and capabilities within some of the larger waste management companies, plus their liability wrt the training levy, it was concluded that a trailblazer apprenticeship was a good idea. Veolia had developed some in the past. Action: Mark Langabeer to look at Veolia's existing trailblazer apprenticeships, and he and Tim Otley to consider how to take collaborative apprenticeship scheme forward.

## **MCPD** update

Andy Leeding gave update on the MCPD discussion at LGIG. John Henderson of the EA had presented at July meeting, prior to launch of final guidance and application process in September. There had been a concern that there would be a significant number of LFG engines that might be caught in tranche B, however, it seems that this is not the case. No applications for LFG engines had been made. Infinis has applied for a number of its other sites, (complex, bespoke permits required) and the EA is working through these at present. Infinis will have to do two LFG sites, as they have non-LFG power response on those sites which brings the LFG engines into scope. EVs have been assigned to them, and they would need to be complied with by 2025. It was noted that the main concern was adding additional capacity at existing sites, or swapping engines around and that the additional regulatory aspects of MCPD may restrict the industry's flexibility.

GH offered that if any operator wanted to pose a theoretical question to the EA on situations in which MCPD could potentially apply, and wanted to do so anonymously, they could do so through her.

#### **DNO** clawback

The members gave an update on activities and plans with respect to utilising their generator connection capacity. Andrew Leech asked if anyone had experienced issues with the new G99 engineering standard (a 300 page document). The effectiveness of type-approved relays was an issue (apparently they don't work) and different DNOs have different policies towards their use. The

question is - will changing the relays and getting the site reapproved be necessary when moving engines?

Some participants had been forced to go down that route because of the number of trips. The impact on some engines of a more rapid change than previously seen was discussed – it could have a negative impact (e.g. reported experience of an alternator shaft being twisted).

Action: Stuart Markham will discuss this with their electrical engineer and report back.

Action: Andy Leech and Tim Otley to write list of questions and send to GH. These to be circulated to the members for any additions, and then the REA to put this to the ENA's Distributed Generation Working Group (a forum of DNOs and embedded generators).

# Significant review of charging

Andy Leech gave an update on the demise of various embedded benefits and the current consultation (TNUOS (triad benefit) GDUoS & BSUoS) and how this would be lost by behind the meter generation too. Those standing to gain from these changes would be domestic (non PV-owning) consumers and utilities. The net impact of the savings to the consumer of the embedded benefit cuts is reported as between £2 - £22 per household per year. The changes are summarised in the following article <a href="https://www.current-news.co.uk/news/ofgem-proposes-fixed-residual-charges-and-an-end-to-embedded-benefits">https://www.current-news.co.uk/news/ofgem-proposes-fixed-residual-charges-and-an-end-to-embedded-benefits</a>

Action. GH to make sure all those on LFG group are also on the REA's generator large scale power group and therefore get the updates from Frank Gordon. GH to ask Frank if he has summarised the latest consultation. (He did – see https://mailchi.mp/r-e-a.net/next-cfd-allocation-round-budget-confirmed-881389)

It was noted that National Grid is doing a seminar on 9<sup>th</sup> January on the proposal that RE should be allowed to enter the capacity market.

### **REA Policy Board feedback**

GH to send around mini Business Plan for comment, and for LFG group to set out its policy asks for the executive to lobby on. These were agreed at the meeting to include; embedded benefits; regulatory burden; retention of generating connection capacity in preparation for utilising at a later date.

# <u>Action – GH to circulated draft mini Business Plan around REA group for comment.</u>

#### **OEM supplier strategy**

The conference call to decide on a course of action wrt engine OEMs maintaining control over engines even when fully purchased and no longer covered by warranty had been postponed and took place at the meeting.

Many felt this was a significant issue for them at present, or would become so in the future when current arrangements with OEMs come to an end. People agreed to go to their company and find out the current state of play, and set out in a collective document what their issues are. This could then be turned into a report; along with an analysis of how the costs imposed by the OEMs compare with alternative options the industry has (such as other providers / replacement of control systems).

First action SS to start a list of issues and send these to GH for circulation around the group. GH to collate issues. This then to be reviewed with view on engaging a consultant to write up the report. This would get the issues in front of OEMs without naming individual companies.

#### Action – SS to provide a list of potential issues for GH to circulate to the group.

## Engine maintenance and knowledge sharing - Linkedin Group

REA to set up a new LinkedIn group instead and try it out. This had been created, but could not be demonstrated at the meeting. Action: GH to invite all REA members to join the group and the members to start trialling it. It was agreed there was scope for asset swapping and spare part trades. Infinis had just done an inventory and has a significant amount of equipment it is unlikely ever to use.

# **ICoPs updates or review**

The group listed the relevant ICoPs, and concluded that the DSEAR ICoP which had been published in 2006, was the most in need of updating. An invitation to quote on updating the guidance to be sent to Morag Armstrong of Wood Group, Siria Certification (if it still exists) and Bob Gregory.

The principle of sharing the cost of the update pro rata according to LFG generating capacity was agreed. If this works well, we could follow the same process with other ICoPs.

Action: Andy Leeding to do a first draft of a tender.

Action: Mark Langabeer to discuss REA's proposal to update the DSEAR ICOP with Sam Corp of ESA.

## **Date of Next Meeting**

<u>Find a date in March</u>, and see if the LGIG wants to meet at the same time. Venue to be decided. Note we cannot have the agenda item AOB on future agendas, because of the need to comply with Competition Law. <u>Action: before next meeting read out Competition Law Compliance DOs and DON'Ts.</u>