

The National Grid Company plc

**Minutes of the
Grid Code Review Panel
St Catherines Lodge, Wokingham
19th May 2005**

Member		Alternate		Representing	Observer/Adviser	
Ben Graff	BG			Chair		
David Payne	DP			Secretary		
Patrick Hynes	PH			National Grid	Richard Scarth	RS
Rachel Morfill	RM					
John Greasley	JG					
Nasser Tleis	NT					
Mike Kay	MK			DNO		
Graeme Vincent	GV					
George Spowart	GS	Neil Sandison	NS			
Claire Maxim	CM	John Norbury	JN	Generators with Large Power Stations with total Reg. Cap.> 3GW		
John Morris	JM	Campbell McDonald	CMc			
David Ward	DW			Generators with Large Power Stations with total Reg. Cap.< 3GW		
Malcolm Taylor	MT			Gens without Large Power Stations		
Chandra Trikha	CT			Relevant Transmission Owner		
Guy Nicholson	GN			Novel Units		
Bridget Morgan	BM			Ofgem		
Kathryn Coffin	KC			BSC Panel		

1 INTRODUCTIONS**2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

182 Apologies were received from:

- Ian Gray (DNO)
- Richard Hyde (Gens >3GW)
- Jean Pompee (EISO)
- David Nicol (RTO)
- Stuart Graudus (NEC)
- Charlie Zhang (Gens >3GW alternate)

Post meeting note: It appears that the Supplier Representative seat on the GCRP is now vacant as it is understood that Nick Carter has moved on to different things.

3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS E&W MEETING (041125drpm)

- 183 DW requested that minute 163 was clarified to indicate that DecNet was an example of a system used by generators and not just Magnox.
- 184 Typographical errors were identified in minutes 137, 147 and 179.
- 185 With the above corrections the minutes were otherwise agreed as a true record of the previous meeting.

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

5.1 Summary of actions (GCRP 05/05)

- 186 All Actions were complete or covered by other Agenda Items.

5.2 Other Matters arising.

Governance of Technical Appendices

- 187 JN raised a concern associated with the governance of the Technical Appendices to Bilateral Agreements and the apparent NGC policy of including additional and unrelated requirements in the Technical Appendices whenever there was a need to update Bilateral Agreements. JN considered that the Grid Code was the appropriate document to detail all such generic requirements but suggested that for transparency Technical Appendices could be included as a CUSC exhibit on NGC's Industry Information website as a short term measure. DW supported this view as it was undesirable for requirements to be included only in the Technical Appendices. Only site specific requirements should be included in Bilateral Agreements.
- 188 PH stated that there was no NGC 'wish list' of requirements to be included in Bilateral Agreements but agreed that generally where requirements were generic they should appear in the Grid Code. However where there were site specific requirements these should appear in the Technical Appendices and this was stated in the Connection Conditions. The CUSC and Grid Code should work together but very detailed technical requirements should either be in the Grid Code or NGTS's covered by GES. NT also pointed out that the additional requirements related to the Generic Provisions work were only a temporary arrangement until the proposed Grid Code changes had been approved. This approach had been discussed and agreed with Ofgem at the start of the Generic Provisions process some 2½ years ago. However NT also agreed that generic requirements should be included in the Grid Code or relevant NGTSs.
- 189 MT pointed out that potential connectees would need as much transparency as possible and this should be a guiding principle. NGC agreed.
- 190 BG agreed that NGC would consider all points being raised by GCRP members.

Definition of Embedded Generators in Scotland under BETTA

- 191 With respect to Action 181, JN felt that the presentation made to the CUSC Panel had not added any further clarity to the associated issues. BG replied that the debate at the CUSC had shown that the issue was more complicated than originally thought as each affected group had its own interpretation.
- 192 CT explained that he had prepared the paper under discussion at the request of some generator members of the Distribution Code Review Panel (ie not the actual DCRP) and this had been presented for guidance rather than a statement of policy. These generator representatives had agreed that they would provide comments to the Scottish distribution licensees on the view presented in the paper but to date no comments had been received.
- 193 GCRP members expressed concern that there appeared to be no appropriate forum for the discussion to take place. DW felt that guidance from Ofgem would be helpful.
- 194 BG stated that although this was not relevant business for the GCRP this issue needed further consideration.
- 195 Following a request from MT, BM agreed to take the issue back to the relevant person at Ofgem.
- 196 **Action:** *BM to reflect the discussion related to the issue of the definition of Embedded Generators in Scotland under BETTA to colleagues at Ofgem.*

RoCoF (Significant Event reporting)

- 197 RM agreed that generators >5MW will be reporting back via the reporting process. However if this information had already been provided to NGC for other reasons it would not need to be reported again. MK agreed that there was probably minimal interest in events at less than 5MW.
- 198 RM expected to be able to provide examples of significant events to discuss with the group shortly.

5 GRID CODE DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (GCRP 05/02)**5.1 Report On Progress Of Consultation Papers (GCRP 05/06Table 1)**

- 199 No further comments or issues were raised.

5.2 Other Issues (GCRP 05/06Table 2)

- 200 With respect to the High/Low Frequency trip settings on small embedded plant issue, MK suggested that the lack of clarity identified in the summary was actually a 'perceived' lack of clarity.
- 201 JN pointed out that the Authority's report dated 20th September 2004 on F/04 'Development of a Maximum Generation Service' stated that any common specification of the electronic data communication facilities that may be used to instruct MGS that is developed could be considered in accordance with the

Governance of Electrical Standards procedure. JN requested that this suggestion be included in the Grid Code Development Issues list.

202 **Action:** *DP to update Issues List to include addition of any electronic communication facilities associated with MGS developed to be included in GES procedures*

202 No further comments or issues were raised.

6. GOVERNANCE OF ELECTRICAL STANDARDS PROPOSAL (GCRP 05/03)

203 NGC was now undertaking a review of standards but proposals were not sufficiently developed for presentation at this meeting. It was expected that a draft document containing the relevant elements of the existing 18NGTS's covered by GES would be available for presentation at the September GCRP meeting. The proposed document would also cover additional relevant issues taken from other NGTS's. It was expected that there would be some discussion on what should be considered relevant for inclusion in the document. It was pointed out that initially the document would only contain issues related to England & Wales standards but may eventually become a GB document following discussion with the Transmission Owners. The draft document would be circulated to Panel members for consideration well in advance of the September meeting.

204 GN supported the move to a common standard but noted that offshore developers may require different standards to onshore developers which would need to be reflected in any connection offers.

7. LICENCE EXEMPT EMBEDDED MEDIUM POWER STATIONS WORKING GROUP REPORT

205 PH reported that there had been no working group meetings since the February GCRP meeting. A draft report had been prepared and circulated to working group members. However it had not been possible to finalise draft Grid Code text proposals as this was dependent on the text associated with Generic Provisions should that be approved. As soon as a decision was made on Generic Provisions, draft LEEMPS text would be completed and a working group meeting arranged to approve the final report. It was expected that an extra ordinary GCRP meeting would be held, possibly in mid July, to discuss the final report in order to take this issue forward as soon as possible.

206 MK supported this approach as it was hoped to include BETTA modifications to the Distribution Code at the same time as including LEEMPS modifications. Therefore a summer consultation would be preferred.

8. OC1/OC2 WORKING GROUP REPORT (paper GCRP 05/07)

207 JG provided an update on the current status. NGC believed that it would be beneficial to take forward some changes to OC1 and OC2 in the short term and to continue to discuss the more fundamental change proposals for progressing in the longer term.

- 208 The paper detailed the proposals that could be taken forward in the short term and these were associated with:
- Definition of Output Usable
 - Removal of Customer Demand Management
 - Provision of Generating Unit level outage data
 - Zonal Boundaries
 - Provision of Year 1 Outage Plan to affected generators only.
- 209 With respect to Zonal Boundaries JG felt that as there was an impact on the BSC this issue may need to be taken forward separately in step with BSC timescales.
- 210 It was expected that a Consultation with proposed Grid Code changes would be issued in June. The working group would continue to consider the more fundamental changes to OC1/OC2. To that end it was proposed to resume the working group meetings after the September 2005 GCRP meeting.
- 211 JG also noted that the BSC Standing Issues Group had debated the issue related to Zones, Demand Data confidence levels. Further discussion was required and Elexon would consider the cost benefit of the various options.
- 212 JN expressed disappointment that an expected rationalisation of obligations on generators had not taken place. JG noted that at the working group meetings there had been no suggestions from generator representatives as to how such a rationalisation might be approached.
- 213 JN also observed that it was not clear what the role of OC2 was in respect of providing information for the BMRS. JN felt that data provided by Users under the provisions of the Grid Code should be required primarily for operational purposes and not for market information. JG stated that the proposed changes arose from a minimum Grid Code change approach and was not aware of any changes being proposed purely to provide information to the market. All such information was derived from existing OC2 requirements for the safe operation of the system.
- 214 GN expressed concern that NGC was looking to obtain data on an individual unit basis. JG stated that NGC needed to know when a unit was on outage rather than when synchronised and as a result needed a best estimate of output which generators were in the best position to supply.

9. TOGA

- 215 RM provided an update. The latest high level plan was now available (circulated to Panel members at the meeting) although it was recognised that this may vary as there were many ongoing problems being progressed. It was currently expected that the system would be released by late Summer/early Autumn 2005. RM accepted that this was not an ideal situation and it would be useful to set up a User Group to obtain input from users on problems being encountered. GCRP members could provide nominations to RM if interested in taking part in this group.
- 216 DW felt that it would be useful if a list of issues could be provided for users to comment on. RM felt that there was little value in this for the users prior to any user group meeting.
- 217 DW stated that Magnox now use TOGA as their method of submitting OC2 data, but would resort to using fax if the system failed or proved difficult. CM stated that

PowerGen had received a request to decommission existing systems in favour of TOGA. PowerGen was not prepared to do this given the current situation.

10. MULTI UNIT CCGT's

- 218 RM noted that following a paper to the September 2004 GCRP meeting suggesting interim provisions for collecting data, the Panel had expressed the view that an enduring solution should be brought before the Panel in early 2005. This issue was to be discussed at the June Operational Forum, however it was not expected that a final solution would be proposed for winter 2005/06. Therefore NGC may seek to continue with the existing process for this coming winter. JN emphasised the need for transparency with respect to the impact of NGC's actions on the Balancing Mechanism under the current temporary arrangements.
- 219 MT requested that any presentations made at the Operational Forum were made available on the Industry Information website as soon as practicable after the Operational Forum had taken place. This was agreed.
- 220 **Action:** *RM to ensure Ops Forum presentations on Multi Unit CCGT issue to be made available on the Industry Information website as soon as possible after the Ops Forum.*

11. FORMALISATION OF FREQUENCY EXCLUSIONS PROCESS (Paper GCRP 05/08)

- 221 RM explained that the proposals outlined in the paper arose from the approval of CAP 047 (Introduction of a competitive process for the provision of Mandatory Frequency Response). There was currently an informal process for generators to be excluded from frequency response provision in the event that there is a problem with plant in real time. NGC was now seeking to formalise this process through a change to the Grid Code. The Grid Code text proposed was based on the existing Grid Code text related to Reactive Capability changes.
- 222 MT asked if communications would be restricted to fax. RM felt that this was probably the most reliable method for real time operation and was consistent reactive redeclarations.
- 223 MT also pointed out that para 8 of the paper noted that in the event of extended unavailability there may be a need for NGC to clarify capability via the OC5 process. MT felt that it was not clear if there was an overlap between the two processes and suggested it would be useful to reference this in the paper.
- 224 JN stated that the proposed BC2.6.1(h) and associated proforma was seeking specific technical reasons to accompany the submission of revised Frequency Sensitive mode availability and suggested that it would be sufficient for Users to write 'For Technical Reasons' in the appropriate box rather than actual detail of the technical reason in the event of unavailability of Frequency Sensitive Mode. JN further suggested that it would be helpful to add an 'acknowledged by' check box on the proforma and also clarification that 'Limited Frequency Sensitive Mode must be maintained in accordance with...'

12. GOOD INDUSTRY PRACTICE FOR TRAINING OF SAFETY CO-ORDINATORS (Paper GCRP 05/09)

225 RS explained that as a result of a number of safety related near misses identified by generators NGC had been approached with respect to training procedures for Safety Co-ordinators. NGC had pointed out that it was the responsibility of individual companies to provide adequate training but had agreed to invite users to form a discussion group to discuss training issues and what constituted Good Industry Practice in this area. To that end GCRP members were asked to nominate any interested parties to attend such a discussion group. It was expected that three meetings would be required to identify issues. Nominations could be sent to Richard Scarth (richard.scarth@ngtuk.com). Three dates were proposed for the meetings:

20 July 2005
24 August 2005
21 September 2005

226 The venue was likely to be NGT House, Warwick.

13. BSC/CUSC MODIFICATION PROPOSALS (GCRP 05/10)BSC

227 MT noted that Ofgem decisions were expected shortly.

228 There was nothing additional to report at the meeting

CUSC

229 Nothing additional to report at the meeting

14. ANY OTHER BUSINESSAOB1

230 GN stated that the Ofgem consultation related to Embedded Exemptable Large Power Stations contained a provision for a review of Small, Medium and Large Power station definitions at some future date. GN asked if there were any timescales in which this review was to be initiated.

231 PH replied that the EELPS drafting contained a provision in the General Conditions of the Grid Code which had effect until 31 March 2006. Therefore that date was the focus for a review of Small/Medium/Large Power Stations. However National Grid felt that this timescale was unreasonable in which to progress this review and so the timescales themselves were under review. Additionally National Grid was in the process of preparing a list of Regional Differences and the issue of Small/Medium/Large Power Stations would take priority in this review. Following internal discussion and discussion with Ofgem on the way forward it was expected to bring proposals to the September GCRP meeting. This would also be added to the outstanding issues list

232 **Action:** *NGC to bring proposals for the review of Small/Medium/Power Stations to the September GCRP meeting.*

- 233 **Action:** *DP to add the issue of Small/Medium Power Stations to the Outstanding Issues list.*

AOB2

- 234 JM raised an issue related to Site Responsibility Schedules. The format of the SRS is detailed in the Grid Code. JM believed that although not a fundamental change the level of detail required in the Equipment List on the SRS had been changed by NGC. This change had not been formally brought to the attention of JM.
- 235 RS agreed that some rationalisation of the SRS process had taken place but only after discussion with the DNO and Generator group. There had been no format change to the SRS itself but the SRS would now concentrate on affected circuit names rather than lists of affected equipment. This reduced the complexity of the SRS. There had only been one negative reaction from users. RS also stated that a process existed for NGC to receive comments on how SRS 's could be made easier to understand.
- 236 JM felt that a guidance process appeared to be missing in this case.

15. DATE, TIME & VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

- 237 Thursday **22nd September 2005**, starting at **10:30 am**, and is expected to be held at NGT offices at Lakeside House, Northampton:

Address: Lakeside House, The Lakes
Bedford Road
Northampton
NN4 7SN

Tel: 01604 815000

- 238 It was noted that an **extraordinary GCRP meeting** may be required in **July 2005** to discuss the final LEEMPS working group report. Details of this meeting would be provided as soon as possible.