

National Grid Electricity Transmission Ltd

**Minutes of the
Grid Code Review Panel
National Grid Offices, Lakeside, Northampton
22nd September 2005**

Member		Alternate		Representing	Observer/Adviser
Ben Graff	BG			Chair	
David Payne	DP			Secretary	
Mark Duffield	MD			National Grid	Richard Scarth RS
Rachel Morfill	RM				Andrew Truswell AT
John Greasley	JG				John Hyde JH
Mike Kay	MK			DNO	
		Graeme Vincent	GV		
		Neil Sandison	NS		
		John Norbury	JN	Generators with Large Power Stations with total Reg. Cap.> 3GW	
John Morris	JM	Charlie Zhang	CZ		
		Campbell McDonald	CMc		
David Ward	DW			Generators with Large Power Stations with total Reg. Cap.< 3GW	
Malcolm Taylor	MT			Gens without Large Power Stations	
				Relevant Transmission Owner	
Guy Nicholson	GN			Novel Units	
Bridget Morgan	BM			Ofgem	
Kathryn Coffin	KC			BSC Panel	

1 INTRODUCTIONS**2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

239 Apologies were received from:

- Ian Gray (DNO)
- Stuart Graudus (NEC)
- Richard Hyde (Gens >3GW)
- Claire Maxim (Gens >3GW)
- Jean Pompee (EISO)
- David Nicol (RTO)
- Chandra Trikha (RTO)
- Charlie Zhang (Gens >3GW alternate)
- George Spowart (DNO – Scotland)
- Nasser Tleis (NGET)

3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY MEETING (050519drpm)

240 The minutes of the May meeting were agreed as a true record of the meeting.

4 APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY EXTRAORDINARY MEETING (050720drpm)

241 MT requested that Minute E23 was updated to reflect that Panel members wanted an explanation of why the Italian incident was considered a more appropriate incident for comparison than other scenarios. The second sentence of E23 would be modified to read as follows: 'As a considerable effort would be required to complete the survey it would be helpful to provide an understanding of the scenario'.

242 The minutes of the July meeting were otherwise agreed as a true record of the meeting.

5 MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS (not covered below)

243 There were no matters arising identified.

5.1 Summary of actions (GCRP 05/16)

243 Action 196 – BM stated that GCRP discussions had been reported back to Ofgem colleagues and reported that Ofgem intended to publish a document related to Transmission Charging for Embedded Generators by the end of September. It was expected that this document would reflect the issues related the definition of embedded generators in Scotland. BM also reported that a consultation related to a Distribution CUSC would be published shortly.

244 MT stated that the issue of whether generation would be transmission connected or distribution connected was of real concern for his constituents. In the post BETTA world it was not expected that determinations from Ofgem would be the normal approach for deciding how generators were connected. BM confirmed that GCRP discussion would be reported back to Ofgem and that the intention behind the papers to be published was to initiate discussion on the issue. BG reiterated that the issue had been discussed at the CUSC Panel and Distribution Code Review Panel and although flagged at the GCRP was not competent business at any of these three Panels.

245 All other Actions were complete or covered by other Agenda Items.

6 GRID CODE DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (GCRP 05/17)**6.1 Report On Progress Of Consultation Papers (GCRP 05/17Table 1)**

245 B/05 - OC1/OC2 Phase 2 – Short term Issues. The Authority had approved one out of four amendment proposed for implementation of 30 September 2005. The issue approved was related to an amendment to the definition of Output Usable.

246 C/05 – Re-Declaration of Availability of Frequency Sensitive Mode. The Report had now been sent to the Authority.

(Post Meeting Note: The Authority approved C/05 for implementation on 30 September 2005 shortly after the meeting).

247 G/05 – Time Extension for the requirements of Grid Code General Conditions GC15. The Authority had approved G/05 for implementation on 30 September 2005.

248 No further comments or issues were raised.

6.2 Other Issues (GCRP 05/17Table 2)

249 It was agreed the issue relating to Embedded Generation could now be removed from the list as the issues had been covered under LEEMPS.

250 JN suggested the Multi BM Unit Issue could be treated as a sub issue of the Time Tagging issue. RM responded that although this was a related issue and could be a solution to NTO/NTB it was not the only solution and it was not appropriate to tag to the Time Tagging issue.

251 **Action:** DP to update the Issues list as appropriate.

252 No further comments or issues were raised.

7. GOVERNANCE OF ELECTRICAL STANDARDS PROPOSAL (GCRP 05/18)

253 JH presented National Grid's proposal for a single Relevant Electrical Standards document to replace the existing 18 England and Wales NGTS's referenced in the current Grid Code. A review had been initiated following discussion of AEP paper GCRP 04/29 at the November 2004 GCRP meeting and subsequent discussion at the February 2005 meeting.

254 The proposed RES document would not apply to connectee substation self-build projects. It was not intended that the document would be exhaustive and could be modified under the governance procedures detailed in General Conditions GC.11. It was not intended that the document would apply to Scotland at this stage.

255 The clauses included in the RES had been determined by their material impact on System reliability and busbar protection. Equipment outside the bus-zone protection and equipment that National Grid provides as a 'black box' had not been included. Also National Grid procedures such as TP106 – Commissioning had not been included. Standards for equipment located in the bus-zone protection had been included along with certain policy and guidance documents.

256 JN noted that Users required a list of National Grids needs that may be specified in the Bilateral Agreement and it would be helpful to include TP106 if this document was to be referenced. JH replied that National Grid only required evidence that commissioning had been carried out. Most requirements had been included in the RES except for those required in exceptional cases. In addition any User with a valid requirement could request sight of relevant NGTSs through Victor Kubulis at National Grid.

257 JN suggested that there would need to be some discussion concerning the implementation of the proposed RES document, expressing concern that if the

RES Document was applied retrospectively some generators may need to apply for derogations. JH countered that the document only takes clauses from existing NGTSS and collates them without changing the requirements. Any generator already connected to the system could be deemed to complying with existing standards. Future plant would be expected to comply with RES. MK suggested that the current draft would only apply to existing plant where appropriate but where substantive modifications were undertaken then the RES should apply from that point.

- 258 DW asked if it was intended that the RES would be referenced in future agreements and stated it would be useful to make the RES available in advance of offers. It was recognised that the RES would not cover every situation. JH suggested that the RES should be referenced in Agreements as it contained the relevant standards. JN noted a concern that no new requirements should be included in existing Bilateral Agreements where these need to be changed as a result of the introduction of RES.
- 259 DW also noted that it would be helpful if the normal requirements for generator excitation systems could be included in the document such that requirements likely to be included in Agreements were available publicly. BG noted that changes to documents would be an iterative process and the focus of the RES had been on the NGTSS.
- 260 JN also felt that the inclusion of Policy and Guidance clauses in the RES was unnecessary and these should appear in a separate document. However DW welcomed the inclusion of such clauses and it was not unreasonable to expect requirements that were to be complied with were included.
- 261 JM pointed out that the current proposal added additional Regional Differences. BM noted that this would need to be considered and it should be highlighted in any Consultation that the RES only applied to England and Wales for the time being.
- 262 BG stated that in terms of process under the GES, GCRP members now had three choices:
- Having discussed the proposal the GCRP could now sign off the document for implementation,
 - GCRP could initiate a working group to consider the issues more deeply,
 - A consultation could be carried out to establish a consensus from the industry.

BG noted that Panel members had recognised the volume of work done so far and as the RES was a substantial document suggested that a wider consultation may be the preferred approach.

- 263 MT stated that the document presented represented a good step in the right direction towards transparency to new connectees and should result in a more efficient approach to connection. It was noted that there was a need to be aware of JN's concerns and also there was need for a consistency check on Bilateral Agreements to extract issues that could be included in RES in the future. JN noted the possible need for Grid Code changes to reference the RES. MD pointed out the CC.6.2.1.2 currently stated that Users should comply with technical standards or as specified in the Bilateral Agreements and therefore RES was given effect through Bilateral Agreements. RES would also be referenced in the General Conditions.

- 264 GCRP members agreed that the RES should go to wider industry consultation, the consultation taking into account the discussion at this meeting. It was expected that if there was a positive consensus the document could be signed off at the November GCRP meeting. Otherwise the Authority would need to make the decision.
- 265 MT formally thanked National Grid and JH in particular for the work carried out on this issue.
- 266 GN agreed that the approach of relating the RES to equipment within the bus-zone was sensible and it was not relevant for deeper connection. However GN was concerned that National Grid Standards could have an impact on the timescales associated with deeper User connections where new equipment was involved. GN felt that this should be considered. BG suggested that the GCRP should reflect on this issue and bring back to the Panel at a later date.

8. GOOD INDUSTRY PRACTICE FOR TRAINING OF SAFETY CO-ORDINATORS (GCRP 05/19)

- 267 RS noted that at the May GCRP it had been proposed to set up a group of Users to discuss Good Industry Practice for Training Safety Co-ordinators. This group representing DNOs, Transmission Licensees and generators had now met on three occasions and the final form of an appropriate document had been agreed. The group now sought agreement to publish the document on the appropriate pages of the National Grid website.
- 268 MT recognised the effort put in to get to this position and asked if there were legal requirements on parties that would mean more was required than making it available on the website. RS stated that the document was meant as guidance only and the User would be responsible for carrying out their own training. This would be noted in the preface to the document.
- 269 JN noted that the paper identified that 27 power stations had been represented on the User group and asked how this had been drawn to the attention of the sites that had not participated. RS explained that the list of AEOs used for Grid Code notifications had been used to notify the industry that the group was being set up. The power stations represented were 27 individual sites and RS was comfortable with the representation.
- 270 JN also suggested that it may be helpful to include the document as part of Eakring training courses. RS pointed out that Safety Co-ordinators training was included in Control Persons training and it was for Eakring to decide if this should be included in those courses. RS noted that the document had arisen out of a request from generators to provide information on National Grid's approach to training.
- 271 MK observed that the EA would formerly have carried out the co-ordination of this sort of work and the existence of the document would have been brought to the attention of all ESI member companies through that office. MK suggested that it was still appropriate for the ENA Safety Health and Environment forum to ensure appropriate liaison between network companies. MT offered to bring this to the attention of his constituents.
- 272 GCRP members agreed that the document should be made available on the National Grid website.

9. OC8 – LOCAL SAFETY INSTRUCTIONS IN SCOTLAND (GCRP 05/20)

- 273 MD stated that the changes proposed in the paper reflected existing practices in Scotland and aimed to clarify the procedures. OC8B had originally been developed from the Scottish Grid Code OC6. Two changes were proposed:
- To reference alternative procedures to the RISSP,
 - To enable more detailed site specific requirements to be referenced in the SRS.
- 274 JN noted that it would be helpful to indicate what procedures would be referenced in SRS.
- 275 NS noted that the changes recognised that specific procedures would be required for new build.
- 276 CMC noted the responsibility for plant safety and that the proposed Grid Code text would enable this responsibility.
- 278 GCRP members agreed that a consultation should be initiated.

10. MULTI UNIT CCGT's (GCRP 05/21)

- 279 RM explained that National Grid had been developing Reserve products to replace the existing process and this development had including holding fora with the industry. However further work was still required and National Grid sought to continue the existing process for the Winter of 2005/06. National Grid understands that this process is not transparent but SONAR had now been set up and MW availability above MEL data would be published to improve transparency.
- 280 MT commented that the use of SONAR mitigated the problem but did not present an enduring solution. The next Operational Forum would include a presentation on National Grid's review of Reserve and MT suggested that this issue should be included as part of that along with a sample of SONAR output and a proposed way forward for an enduring solution.
- 281 JN noted that the issue had arisen as a result of the 2 minute NTO/NTB requirement for Gensets introduced at NETA and expressed surprise that National Grid was now looking to contracts for a solution to what was really a Grid Code issue. RM recognised that NTO was not the preferred way forward. Although NTO/NTB allowed a more flexible approach, due to the high IT costs associated with the change and the relatively low volumes of additional MW that would be facilitated by such a change it was not felt to be practical.
- 282 GCRP members noted the continuation of the existing process for the coming Winter.

11. SIGNIFICANT EVENT REPORTING (GCRP 05/22)

- 283 RM presented the paper noting that there had been only three incidents in this period two of which were RoCoF incidents and one was a 3ph fault at Sizewell with no significant loss or tripping as a result.

- 284 GCRP members agreed a continuation of the reporting process.
- 285 With respect to the development of the report RM noted that National Grid was interested only in the incidents in Scotland that were not picked up on National Grid's monitoring systems. There had been discussion among appropriate GCRP members on the faults that should be reported and GN was expected to provide RM with specific points to raise. Following this a further draft of the reporting procedure would be available for discussion.
- 286 MT pointed out an error in the report that suggested that an incident on 21st May was a loss of load. RM agreed that this should indicate a generation loss in SHETL area.

12. REGIONAL DIFFERENCES WORKING GROUP UPDATE

- 287 MD provided a verbal update. The first meeting of the Working Group had taken place on 16 September 2005. The Regional Differences group would focus initially on the definitions of Small, Medium and Large Powers Stations. The group recognised that there was scope for harmonising the definitions.
- 288 The Scope of the Working group had been considered at the first meeting including how the work should be approached and agreeing to report to the February GCRP meeting. The next Working Group meeting would be held in Glasgow on 1 November. Each Transmission Licensee had agreed to consider the effect of changing the definitions on their systems including costs to determine what the potential for harmonisation was.

13. OC1/OC2 WORKING GROUP UPDATE

- 289 JG provided a verbal update noting that there were three issues to cover.

Consultation B/05

- 290 JG explained that the Authority had approved one of the four elements of the consultation. This was the change to the definition of Output Usable to clarify embedded generators submissions. This also resulted in the removal of a redundant clause in OC2. With respect to the remaining elements JG noted that the removal of Customer Demand Management had been broadly supported by respondents but the Authority had not been comfortable with its removal. National Grid did not intend to pursue this change.
- 291 The provision of outage data on a Generating Unit level had been rejected as the Authority felt that the consultation had not been sufficient in relation to Power Park Modules and the proposed drafting would oblige Power Park Units to provided data. JG stated that this had not been the intention of the proposals and National Grid intended to address this by re-consulting on this element.
- 292 **Action:** *National Grid to initiate a further consultation on provision of outage data at a Generating Unit level but excluding the need for data at a Power Park Unit level.*
- 293 The issue of the provision of Outage Data on a need to know basis had been opposed by most respondents.

BSC Discussion

- 294 JG noted that the Working Group under the Governance of the BSC had identified the need for associated BSC changes and discussion was underway at the BSC Panel. The discussion related to:
- Potential alignment of BMRS zones with OC2 zones. The Working Group had recommended that the BSC Panel initiate a review.
 - Publication of dis-aggregated Output Usable by generation type. A BSC modification proposal would be required..
 - Rationalisation of timescales within OC2. National Grid believed that it was imperative to rationalise timescales to facilitate a re-write of OC2 although the BSC Working Group were not convinced that the costs associated with BSC changes were justified.
 - Publication of additional demand data. The Working Group was not convinced that the costs were justified. National Grid was considering the publication of real time demand data and it was expected that this would be available by the end of September.

OC1/OC2 Working Group

- 295 JG noted that it had been proposed to re-convene the Working Group post the B/05 Consultation. However there was need to consider the impact of B/05 and the ongoing BSC discussions first. JG expected that further discussion should take place at the November GCRP meeting.

14. BSC/CUSC MODIFICATION PROPOSALS (GCRP 05/23)BSC

- 296 There was nothing additional to report at the meeting

CUSC

- 297 CAP104 - Amendment to System to Generator Inter-trip related terms concurrently defined in the Grid Code and the CUSC had been raised.
- 298 CAP97 - Revision to the contractual requirements for Small and Medium Embedded Power Stations under CUSC 6.5. had been raised. A working Group was considering this issue. No Grid Code impact had been identified. JN requested clarification whether any impact would arise, given that embedded generators may have to comply with additional technical obligations via the CAP097 route. MD noted it was not the intention of CAP097 that any site specific requirements would be anything other than specified in the Grid Code.

OTHER

- 299 GN noted that a DTI consultation had been initiated related to Offshore Networks and whether they were to be Licensed. It was possible that a Grid Code change could be required to take into account connection points on Offshore platforms.

15. PROPOSED PANEL MEETING DATES 2006 (GCRP05/24)

- 300 GCRP members agreed the dates proposed. With respect to venue BG noted that the Northampton offices was a good location and facilities and this would be considered for future meetings.

16. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

AOB 1

- 301 JN expressed concern that staff at some sites were unhappy with the recent approach to amend the Site Responsibility Schedules. The general feeling at these sites was that this approach of identifying equipment on a circuit basis rather than individual asset basis detracted from the purpose of the SRS. JN was concerned that this had not been discussed widely prior to introduction.

- 302 RS explained that the new approach had been rolled out following discussion with the Generation User Group and DNOs. These groups had indicated that the approach resulted in SRSs being easier to understand for those staff not familiar with SRSs. This issue had been raised at a previous GCRP meeting and it was suggested then that an information sheet should be included with SRSs. The site referred to by JN had not received a covering letter with the SRS but this had now been provided by the local Senior Authorised Person.

- 303 GN noted that there was an issue where a boundary situation existed. RS reiterated that it was intended that there was a flexible approach but a minimum of detail was required making SRSs easier to understand and improving Safety Management. RS stressed that the format of the SRS had not changed just the amount of detail required in column 1 of the SRS. RS was willing to discuss the issue further with JN outside the meeting.

AOB 2

- 304 JN raised an issue associated with Grid Code changes associated with Consultation D/04 – Refurbishment of generating plant. The Grid Code provisions now required that changes to plant or apparatus settings may require testing under OC5. This had led to a belief that modification applications were required before such changes could be made. This had implications for costs. JN did not believe that a modification application should be required and stated it would be helpful if clarity could be provided.

AOB 3

- 305 JN noted that with the implementation of intertrip provisions related to the CAP076 and associated Grid Code changes the standards adopted by National Grid illustrated the need to review relevant technical requirements for intertrips in particular with respect to what appears to be a standard obligation to operate within 140ms. JN felt it would be helpful if a standard could be prepared on how intertrips were expected to work.

306 JG was aware that companies had been in consultation with National Grid and correspondence was ongoing on these issues. JG agreed to consider if anything could usefully be provided.

307 **Action:** JG to consider if an intertrip standard could usefully be provided.

AOB 4

308 JN raised a general question associated with System Security issues. JN noted that various groups were considering these issues and asked if National Grid held any views on considering emergency provisions in the Grid Code. Currently there were many apparently dis-jointed references to NISMs etc.

309 JG responded that the Cash-Out Review had a wide ranging scope and it may be worth considering Grid Code changes after this group had completed its consideration in October. MT stated that at the first meeting of the Cash Out Review group he had asked if the work of the E³C (Electricity Emergencies Executive Committee) group would be considered, the concern being that although this was being addressed by the Cash-Out Review there was no apparent link to other work-streams. MK noted that work associated with Black Start issues was underway.

AOB 5

310 RM provided a short update on the Plant Resilience Working Group noting that useful discussion had taken place at the first meeting. National Grid had taken an action to consider the comments arising from the survey to determine if the questions could be better phrased. This would be discussed at the next meeting on 17 October.

AOB 6

311 RM noted that National Grid was carrying out a check of reactive capability data included on National Grid's database and Users may be approached for data to compare with the database information. This would commence at the end of September would be done through the normal operational contact numbers. JN requested that, if there was any doubt who to contact, National Grid contact the Trading Point or write to the Registered Office to obtain this information. MT suggested that GCRP generator representatives be contacted by e-mail so that they could be pre-warned about this exercise.

AOB 7

312 MT noted that under BETTA there were 3 organisations with License obligations associated with Security and Quality of Supply Standard and asked what were the governance arrangements for the SQSS. In addition if a User was affected by SQSS what say did they have.

313 BM responded that Ofgem recognised that that this was not clearly defined and John Scott had written to the Transmission Licensees requesting proposals on governance of the SQSS. It was expected that there would be industry participation in the arrangements. GN noted that the Offshore industry would have a view on the discussions.

AOB 8

- 314 BG noted that the National Grid website was being updated to reflect the new company name among other things. This would go live on 10 October.

17. DATE, TIME & VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

- 315 Thursday **24th November 2005**, starting at **10:30 am**, and will be held at NGT offices at Lakeside House, Northampton:

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

Tel: 01604 815000