

The National Grid Company plc

**Minutes of the
Grid Code Review Panel
NGT House, Warwick
25th November 2004**

Members/Alternates**Advisors/Observers**

Ben Graff	(BG))	(Chair)		
David Payne	(DP))	(Secretary)		
Patrick Hynes	(PH))		Jo Hutchison	(JH)
John Greasley	(JG))	National Grid		
Neil Sandison	(NS))	Network Operators		
Steve Argent	(SAr)		OFGEM		
John Norbury	(JN))	Generators with Large		
John Morris	(JM))	Power Stations with	Charlie Zhang	(CZ)
Richard Hyde	(RH))	total Reg. Cap.> 3GW	Campbell McDonald	(CMc)
David Ward	(DW))	Generators with Large		
)	Power Stations with		
)	total Reg. Cap.< 3GW		
Malcolm Taylor	(MT)		Gens without Large Power Stations		
David Nicol	(DN))	Relevant Transmission Owner		
Guy Nicholson	(GN)		Novel Units		

1 INTRODUCTIONS**2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

76 Apologies were received from:

- Ian Gray (DNO)
- Mike Kay (DNO)
- Jean Pompee (EISO)
- Nick Carter (Suppliers)
- Roger Salomone (BSC Panel)
- Stuart Graudus (NEC)
- Chandra Trikha (RTO)
- Claire Maxim (GENS – alternate)
- Rachel Morfill (NGC)
- Nasser Tleis (NGC)

3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS E&W MEETING (040923drpm)

77 The minutes were agreed as a true record of the previous meeting.

4 MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS E&W MEETING (not covered below)

4.1 Summary of actions (GCRP 04/27)

78 Action 1677 – Publication of Consultation responses. BG agreed to meet with MT immediately following the GCRP meeting.
(Post meeting note. BG/MT agreed that consultation responses would be added to the Grid Code website as appropriate.)
Action Complete.

79 Action 55 – RoCoF reporting. RM had indicated that the relevant procedure would be available by the end of 2004.

80 GN felt that it was not clear from the paper GCRP 04/24 what type of events had triggered the incidents reported. Such clarity would be very helpful to developers of windfarms especially information related to fault ride through events. Although the imminent procedure (78 above) would probably add clarity it was agreed that RM should explain what events were covered by the paper for further discussion at the February 2005 GCRP meeting. MT felt that it would be important to include data from a wide range of sources such as European Transmission System Operators (ETSO) group and suggested that it would be useful to include such data in the paper.

81 **Action:** *RM to clarify the events covered by the RoCoF reporting paper GCRP 04/24 and consider inclusion of data from other sources such as ETSO.*

82 MT also questioned the accuracy of the data provided for an incident on 9 October 2003 and asked National Grid to confirm that the information was correct (Note. The data indicates a gain of 1000MW rather than a loss).

83 **Action:** *RM to confirm the accuracy of the information for the 9 October 2003 event.*

84 All other actions were complete and/or covered by other Agenda items.

4.2 Other Matters arising.

Damhead Creek

85 MT stated that at the October Operational Forum John Carnwath had provided a helpful and candid account of the events associated with the Damhead Creek incident. MT believed that this had been a unique incident and therefore it was important to learn from the experience and to capture all the relevant information arising out of the Ops Forum (e.g. PowerPoint presentations, discussion notes etc) in one place accessible publicly. MT also asked if there had been a formal report to the Authority on the incident that would be available publicly.

86 JG stated that NGC had not provided a formal report to Ofgem. JG agreed to consider how the key points debated during the Ops Forum Q&A session could be captured and published.

87 **Action:** *JG to consider how the key points debated during the Q&A session related to Damhead Creek from the October Ops Forum could be published*

5 GRID CODE DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (GCRP 04/28)

5.1 Report On Progress Of Consultation Papers (GCRP 04/28Table 1)

88 Table 1 of paper GCRP 04/28 detailed the current position with consultations. The following additional points were noted.

89 C/04 – OC8 and Management of Safety Keys – Version 2 of this consultation based on GB Grid Code text had been sent on 23 November with responses required by 17 December 2004.

90 DN expressed disappointment that a draft of the consultation had not been sent to Scottish Licencees for consideration prior to wider circulation, especially given the safety aspects of the consultation. PH stated that the point was noted but the STC process should pick up on any impacts with Licencees.

91 Transition Consultation T04/01. This consultation was concerned with provision of OC2 data under OC2.4.2.3(a) and OC2.4.2.4(b) and was issued on 15 November with responses required by 3 December 2004.

92 JM asked if references to Ofgem BETTA consultations could be included in the paper in future. BG agreed that an additional table could be included but containing caveats that as these would be Ofgem consultations, NGC would have no influence over the content or process of such consultations.

93 MT also stated that given the current large volume of consultations it would be helpful if his constituents could have access to information about such consultations through the Grid Code processes. BG agreed that National Grid could provide an information source up to Go-Live and asked DP to liaise with SA to consider the mechanics of such a process.

94 **Action:** *DP to liaise with SA to consider practical approach to provision of information on Ofgem consultations through the Grid Code processes and to include an appropriate table in the next GCRP Consultation progress paper.*

5.2 Other Issues (GCRP 04/28Table 2)

95 JN requested that the issue of treatment of Multi Unit BMU's (paper GCRP 04/22) should be added to the Issues List. MT added that the Review date for this issue should be by March 2005. JG stated that NGC would looking to discuss the issue with the industry early in 2005.

96 **Action:** *DP to add Multi Unit BMU's issue to Issues List for review by March 2005.*

5 LEEMPS WORKING GROUP REPORT

97 PH explained that it had been hoped that the joint working group final report would be completed for this GCRP meeting. However there were a number of outstanding issues that needed further discussion. In particular the issue of OC5 and compliance with requirements and compensation for parties where there is no direct relationship with NGC required further consideration. The next working group meeting would be early in 2005 and it was expected that the final working group report to the GCRP would be available for the February GCRP meeting.

98 JN agreed that issue of testing and compensation for generators with no relationship with NGC was one of the most important issues.

7 OC1/OC2 WORKING GROUP REPORT

99 At the November meeting GCRP members had agreed that a working group should be set up for a zero based review of OC1 and OC2. JG explained that the working group had now been established with good industry representation and two meetings had been held since the November GCRP meeting.

100 The first meeting had considered the background to the review, the Terms of Reference and NGC proposals and how OC1/OC2 could be developed.

101 The second meeting had given the opportunity for working group members to provide feedback on the proposals. Work had also started on identifying key areas where information was required under OC1 and OC2. NGC had taken an action to justify the need for information.

102 JG explained that it was expected to present proposals to the GCRP at the May GCRP meeting followed by wider industry consultation. There was a need to consider associated IT changes and cost/benefit. However it was hoped that the proposals could be ready for implementation by Autumn 2005.

103 On a related subject DW noted that a recent e-mail communication about TOGA had indicated that there would be a delay in the implementation of this process. DW asked if there would be any further information on the availability of the system for testing. MT asked if RM could provide an update of the current position for inclusion with these minutes.

104 **Action:** *RM to provide an update on the current position with TOGA.*

(Post meeting Note: National Grid is currently working to resolve external access and environment issues. These are taking longer than expected. We anticipate that these will be resolved soon and will be contacting individual generators in the near future to commence testing and trialling).

8 GOVERNANCE OF ELECTRICAL STANDARDS PROPOSAL (GCRP 04/29)

105 MT explained that certain NGTS's are specified in Connection Offers and as these have an impact on Users they would appear to be contenders for inclusion within GES.

106 BG explained that the 18 NGTS's currently under GES were identified when the development work for GES was carried out. Those 18 were identified as the most relevant to Users but the implication of the references to other NGTS's included in each of the 18 were not recognised at the time. BG suggested that a GCRP working group could be set up to consider the most efficient way of dealing with this issue.

107 BG proposed that a Grid Code Review Panel Working Group should review the current 18 NGTS's to decide:

- were the cross references in each NGTS required:
- could text be included in place of the cross references
- was there a need to expand on the current list.

- 108 GN suggested that NGC prepare proposals and present to the GCRP at the earliest opportunity.
- 109 JN felt that the problem had arisen out of shallow connections making the requirements on Users difficult to understand. JN suggested that a solution could be to prepare and refer to a single NGTS's relevant to Users.
- 110 It was also pointed out that the Scottish companies were putting forward a list of standards for inclusion in GES which would need to be considered. This was also included in the latest Ofgem consultation.
- 111 BG agreed with the suggestion that a GCRP Working Group did not in fact need to be set up and to liaise with appropriate staff in NGC to consider how the standards could be improved. It was expected that a progress report could be prepared for the February GCRP meeting with the aim of presenting final proposals to the May GCRP.
- 112 **Action:** *BG to liaise with appropriate NGC staff to take issue forward.*

9 BSC/CUSC MODIFICATION PROPOSALS (GCRP 04/25)

BSC

- 113 Nothing additional to report at the meeting

CUSC

- 114 CAP076 – Treatment of System to Generator Intertripping Schemes. The CAP076 working group had discussed the issues and had expected to report to the CUSC Panel in November. However due to a large volume of work associated with the alternative proposals the reporting period had been extended to the December CUSC Panel. Final Grid Code text drafting would depend on the actual CUSC proposal going forward. However it was expected that BC1, BC2 and OC2 would be affected.
- 115 It was expected the consultation on the consequential Grid Code changes would take place from mid January. A draft of the consultation paper would be circulated to GCRP members for comment at the appropriate time.
- 116 **Action:** *JG to circulate draft consultation paper on consequential Grid Code changes associated with CAP076 prior to wider circulation.*
- 117 MT stated that Category 3 Intertrips referred to SQSS and Category 4 referenced DAR. MT asked if there was a standard that linked SQSS and DAR and if so this should be added to the list of standards under GES. JG indicated that this would be investigated as part of the CUSC assessment process.

9 REPORT FROM SCOTTISH GCRP

- 118 It was reported that the last Scottish GCRP meeting had been cancelled. However DN indicated that the Panel was working with Ofgem to prepare GB Consultation on Generic Provisions.

10 TRANSITION

- 119 PH noted that Transitional Consultation Document T01/04 had been issue (see 90 above).
- 120 PH also noted that NGC was working with Ofgem and Elexon to consider more detailed Cut-Over provisions. It was generally expected that Scottish parties would continue to work to Scottish rules up to midnight prior to Go Live and the GB Grid Code would become effective from midnight. It was not expected that significant Grid Code text changes would be required.
- 121 CZ noted that Ofgem was holding a Transition seminar for E&W Users to talk through BETTA. DN noted that Scottish parties were having a number of similar meetings.

12 ANY OTHER BUSINESSAOB1Emergency Instructions

- 122 CZ expressed the view that the reference to Maximum Generation Service in BC2.9.1.2 was in fact a circular reference as this section listed some circumstances in which an Emergency Instruction might be issued but the need to request provision of Maximum Generation Service was itself an Emergency Instruction. CZ felt that consideration should be given to a review of this reference.
- 123 JG pointed out that BC2.9.1.2 was a non exhaustive list of Emergency circumstances and the Balancing Principles Statement covered the enactment of Emergency Instructions.
- 124 Following extensive discussion it was agreed that no further review was required at this time.
- 125 JN asked if there was any value in considering a category of Emergency Instruction to enact the CUSC rights that National Grid has to disconnect a party that did not require the issue of Bid Offer Acceptances. JG agreed to consider and bring back for discussion at the February 2005 GCRP Meeting.
- 126 **Action:** *JG to consider a further category of Emergency Instruction for discussion at the February GCRP meeting.*

AOB2

- 127 DW noted that E.ON Netz had published an interesting report associated with windfarms in 2004 and suggested that GCRP members would find the report useful. DW offered to provide a website link to the report and a copy of the report. (**Post Meeting Note:** *DW provided the copy and the link after the meeting.*)

13 DATE, TIME & VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

- 128 Thursday **24 February 2005**, starting at **10:30 am**, at a venue to be advised.