

## Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

### Minutes and Actions Arising from Meeting No. 46 Held on 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2010 By Teleconference

#### Present:

David Smith	DS	Panel Chairman
Stewart Whyte	SW	Panel Secretary

#### National Grid

John Greasley	JG	Member
Steve Curtis	SC	Member
Tom Ireland	TI	Member
Ben Smith	BS	Presenter (Item 2 – Black Start)

#### Generators with Large Power Stations with total Reg. Cap.> 3GW

John Morris	JM	Member
John Norbury	JN	Member
Campbell McDonald	CMc	Member
Jim Barrett	JB	Alternate Member
James Anderson	JA	Alternate Member

#### Generators with Large Power Stations with total Reg. Cap.< 3GW

Tom Davies	TD	Member
------------	----	--------

#### Generators with Small and Medium Power Stations Only

Barbara Vest	BV	Member
--------------	----	--------

#### Network Operators in England and Wales

Mike Kay	MK	Member
Alan Creighton	AC	Member

#### Network Operators in Scotland

#### Relevant Transmission Licensees

Graham Vincent	GS	Member
----------------	----	--------

#### Generators with Novel Units

Guy Nicholson	GN	Member
---------------	----	--------

#### Ofgem Representative

#### Non Embedded Customers

Alan Barlow	AB	Member
-------------	----	--------

#### BSC Panel Representative

Kathryn Coffin	KC	Alternate Member
----------------	----	------------------

### 1. Introductions/Apologies for Absence

1498. The Chair introduced the teleconference based Extraordinary GCRP meeting which had been arranged to cover the agenda items that there had not been time to cover at the November 2010 GCRP meeting. Apologies for absence were received from Neil Sandison, Guy Phillips and John Lucas.

### 2. New Grid Code Development Issues

#### Black Start– consequential changes from P231

1499. BS presented this item to the Panel regarding changes required to OC9.4 to bring the Grid Code in line with the Balancing and Settlements Code (BSC) as a result of the P231 modification. The aim of Modification Proposal P231 was to improve transparency of the arrangements and obligations associated with a Black Start or Fuel Security Code (FSC) event held within the BSC. P231 was raised by National Grid and the solution was based on the discussion from Issues 32 'Black Start' and 33 'Fuel Security'. As a result of introducing P231, the BSC now provides clearer processes for the industry to follow in the event of a Black Start or FSC direction. BS outlined what a Black Start and FSC were.
1500. BS invited the Panel to agree that the changes discussed are required in order to bring the Grid Code in line with the BSC in relation to P231. KC felt that there was still some inconsistencies between the proposed Grid Code text and the original P231 modification. Elexon and National Grid shall discuss these discrepancies bilaterally. BS shall send an email update to the Panel following discussions between National Grid and Elexon to sort out differences between Grid Code proposed text and P231 proposals. KC shall circulate a link to the P231 consultation so GCRP members can familiarise themselves with this modification.

**Action: National Grid (BS)**  
**Action: Kathryn Coffin (KC)**

### 3. Simultaneous Tap Changing

1501. SC presented a guidance document produced by National Grid for power station control engineers on the utilisation of simultaneous tap change instructions, in line with BC2.A.2.6. The document is designed to be guidance for control engineers at power stations so that in the event of a simultaneous tap change instruction being sent by National Grid's ENCC, the power station knows the appropriate action to take.
1502. JM asked if compliance with instructions would be tested and if so, could this be included in the document. SC made the Panel aware that there may be an assessment of what stations are most effective when sent the instruction.
1503. JN queried why the simultaneous instruction was required and asked if this could be included in the document. He noted that when National Grid wished to include the Target Voltage instructions into its contingency planning the guidance document for that contained a clear justification of why the instructions would be beneficial to the transmission system. JN has sent an email outlining some of these issues to Steve Curtis via Tom Ireland. SC will respond directly about these queries. GN also sent an email to the Panel on his thoughts regarding the document for National Grids consideration.

**Action: National Grid (SC)**

### 4. System Incident Report

## Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

1504. SC gave a summary of the SIR, updated for 2010. One major ROCOF in 2010 was added to the report; this was a high frequency event that occurred as a result of 1000MW trip while exporting to France on 9<sup>th</sup> January. The main conclusion from the report is that, currently embedded ROCOF operation following a large loss is not a significant issue for the rates of change of frequency experienced during normal operations and represents little risk to the system. Gn commented that the report was modified in 1998 to take account of significant system incidents as well as ROCOF events. GN also proposed some amendments that could be made to the report to increase its usefulness. TI said he would consider the proposals for the evolution of the report. The report will continue to be presented to the Panel, on a continuing annual basis.

**Action: National Grid (TI)**

### 5. Revision of CC.7.7 (Maintenance Standards)

1505. This paper was presented to the Panel by CMc who proposed that a revision of the Connection Conditions CC.7.7 Maintenance Standards is required to ensure Generators in Scotland and Offshore are notified in an efficient manner of changes to system fault levels. This is to afford them a similar notification and protection given to similar Generators in England and Wales. GV stated that the SO would need to be involved and also enquired where the E&W process was written down.

1506. CMc stated that although this information is currently available in the Seven Year Statement (SYS) this is not sufficient because of new users design connection revisions and subsequent plant and apparatus changes. JN was wholly supportive of this issue and further stated that this issue also applies to harmonic data as well. JN is going to put together a one pager on the harmonic data for the Panel. JG stated to the Panel that he would prefer the harmonic data to be addressed by the G5/4 working group so that it did not detract from the issues presented in this paper.

**Action: John Norbury (JN)**

1507. CMc invited the Panel to agree a joint Grid Code, CUSC and STC Working Group to propose changes to industry codes to establish good industry practise for health and safety of Users plant, apparatus and personnel on a transmission site. The Panel felt that due to the nature of this matter it was wholly in the realms of the Grid Code and therefore this issue should go to a Grid Code Working Group only. TI shall send round a TOR for the Grid Code working group.

**Action: National Grid (TI)**

### 6. Meeting dates 2011

#### ▪ Meeting dates 2011

1508. TI presented the meeting dates for 2011.

- Thursday, 17<sup>th</sup> February
- Thursday, 19<sup>th</sup> May
- Thursday, 22<sup>nd</sup> September
- Thursday, 17<sup>th</sup> November

All meetings shall be held at National Grid House, Warwick. The new meeting dates were agreed by the Panel. A further meeting shall be included in 2011 following the discussion in the meeting governance review, and is expected to be held in early July.

#### ▪ Meeting Governance Review

1509. In recent GCRP meetings some Panel members have raised issues over the length of the meeting and the depth of discussion on some matters. During 2010 the volume and complexity of the issues brought to the meetings steadily increased

## Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

resulting in insufficient time to consider all issues. As a direct consequence of this, and Ofgem's Code Governance Review initiated in 2007, National Grid produced a paper on GCRP meeting governance with the intended impact that GCRP meetings conclude all business satisfactorily and the GCRP meetings aligns with best practises of other codes.

1510. TI talked through the two staged improvement approach to GCRP meetings. The first stage of the approach shall be implemented immediately with feedback being sought from the Panel. Stage 1 proposes: to ensure minutes are thoroughly commented upon prior to meeting where they are to be approved; consultation update and development issues paper to be discussed only by exception; working group updates limited to progress; avoid detailed "workshopping" of issues in GCRP meetings – using one off meetings if the Panel feel they are warranted; firmer adherence to core GCRP business; clear and timely brief papers to be produced with clear unambiguous recommendations; to ensure efficiencies meeting attendance should be limited to members with alternates attending in place of the member or an advisor; clear and concise presentations with specific recommendations; and summary of actions paper edited to include a status indication. Stage 2 of the proposal was to increase the number of meeting dates. TI told the Panel before more meetings were considered as an option the effect of stage 1 proposals would be evaluated. The Panel said they would be happy for stage 2 to be implemented immediately. TI stated that he was happy with this and would arrange an additional meeting for July 2011, accordingly.

**Action: National Grid (TI)**

1511. JN commented that he felt that rather than trying to align the GCRP with other Panels, the GCRP should infact serve as a role model for other groups. GN commented that he was moderately happy with the proposals with the exception of the proposed change to the attendance of alternate members. BV commented that National Grid needed to get their house in order with respect to the administration of the GCRP meetings, stating that this would greatly help increase the productivity of the meetings. BV gave the example of National Grid using presentations to, in her belief, side step the need to have a paper ready for papers day (10 days prior to the meeting). The impact of this being that Panel members had less time to prepare to discuss issues on the matter and hindered decision making at the GCRP meetings. TI will produce a paper that details the new GCRP approach for the February meeting, focusing on refining and defining Code administration activities.

**Action: National Grid (TI)**

### 7. Impacts of Other Code Modifications or Developments

#### ▪ BSC

1512. The BSC is currently going through a governance review and P243 "Publication of Generator Forward Availability by Fuel Type" went live and as such BMRS is now publishing output useable by fuel type.

#### ▪ CUSC

1513. CAP 182 "Frequency Response from Interconnectors" was withdrawn because of changes in Europe with respect to Interconnectors being defined potentially as Transmissions System Operators (TSOs).

#### ▪ Cross Code Forum

1514. TI gave an update of the recent Cross Code forum, of which, there has been good continued industry support and attendance.

### 8. A.O.B

#### ▪ SSE issue

1515. SSE has experienced a number of issues regarding the cancellation of outages affecting Hadyard Hill windfarm recently. These being that outages have been planned up until 2 days ahead and have then been cancelled. SC stated that an outage was considered a planned one up until day ahead. CMc would like to see a report of how many planned outages went ahead. SC shall look into this and produce a report for CMc focused on outages and their cancellation affecting Hadyard Hill.

**Action: National Grid (SC)**

- **Special Actions**

1516. CMc enquired about National Grid's use of special actions (as per BC1.7.1) as some sites were being sent daily special actions. CMc would like National Grid to specify how it makes decisions on what constitutes a special action, the timescale for instruction and the effect on the settlement and despatch process. SC will address these issues and why special actions are required.

**Action: National Grid (SC)**

- **Europe**

1517. The topic of Europe was discussed at the Panel meeting. BV had attended the EURELECTRIC and ENTSO-E working group day in early December. IN BVs opinion this only served to reaffirm to her that the GCRP had to get involved. Discussions were had on the ENTSO-E drafting and the process for implementation was discussed by the Panel. The particular concern had by some Panel members was the impact on UK companies who have to adhere to the new network codes. Some Panel members felt that the pilot codes had over stepped the FWGL set down by ERGEG. JG stated there were the appropriate checks and balances in place and that ERGEG would ultimately decide if the FWGL have been met.

1518. BV stated that she was unhappy with the pilot codes and their impact on UK companies. BV would like DS to facilitate the writing of a letter to Philip Lowe of the EU commission on behalf of the GCRP, in his role as GCRP chairman; expressing unhappiness with the end to end ENTSO-E process. JG stated that it may be beneficial to be more specific as much of the ENTSO-E process and the process for establishing Network Codes was already enshrined within the EU 3<sup>rd</sup> Package of proposals. JG reminded the Panel that these codes are still very much only pilot codes and that there is still time to engage with specific comments on the drafting during the formal consultation process. BV reiterated that it was the whole process that she was unhappy with.

**Action: National Grid (DS)**

### **9. Next Meeting**

1519. It was proposed that the next Panel meeting would be the 17<sup>th</sup> February 2011 which will be held at National Grid House.