

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

Minutes and Actions Arising from Meeting No. 47 Held on 17th February 2011 at National Grid House, Warwick

Present:

David Smith	DS	Panel Chairman
Stewart Whyte	SW	Panel Secretary

National Grid

Graham Stein	GS	Member
Steve Curtis	SC	Member
Tom Ireland	TI	Member
Steven Lam	SL	Presenter (Item 2 – Reactive Despatch Restrictions)
Ben Smith	BS	Presenter (Item 2 – Black Start)
Shafqat Ali	SA	Presenter (Item 2 – Electricity Balancing System Group)
Thomas Derry	TD	Presenter (Item 4 – Grid Code Requirements for Electronic Communication Facilities between NGET and BM participants)
Mark Duffield	MD	Presenter (Item 9 – Two Shift Limits)

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

Alastair Frew	AF	Member
John Morris	JM	Member
John Norbury	JN	Member
Campbell McDonald	CMD	Alternate Member
Guy Phillips	GP	Alternate Member
Jim Barrett	JB	Alternate Member
Garth Graham	GG	Observer

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

Tom Davies	TDA	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

Neil Sandison	NS	Alternate Member
Dave Carson	DC	Member

Relevant Transmission Licensees

Brian Puntton	BP	Member
Alan Kelly	AK	Member

Generators with Novel Units

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

Ofgem Representative

Steve Brown	SB	Member
-------------	----	--------

Non Embedded Customers

None

BSC Panel Representative

John Lucas	JL	Member
------------	----	--------

1. Introductions/Apologies for Absence

1520. The Chairman opened the meeting by welcoming several new members to the Panel: Tom Davies replacing Dave Ward as the representative for Generators with Large Power Stations <3GW; Alastair Frew representing Generators with Large Power stations >3GW and Brian Puntton and Alan Kelly representatives for relevant Transmission Licenses. Sigrid Bolik is on maternity leave.
1521. The Chairman informed the Panel that following feedback from the Extraordinary GCRP (in December and various comments throughout the year the GCRP would be trialling a new administrative regime at the meeting.

2. New Grid Code Development Issues

Governance of GCRP meetings (pp11/01)

1522. TI presented the paper on Grid Code Review Panel meeting governance. This paper was a follow up to pp10/39 presented to the Panel at the EGCRP in December. The intent of the governance review is to shorten meeting length, make agenda items more succinct and allow the Panel to make more informed decisions. While the Panel accepted in December the need for a review they were not in support of all the suggested changes to GCRP meeting governance.
1523. The approach proposed to the GCRP was that all supporting documentation should be with the GCRP two weeks before each Panel meeting if a decision is required to be made – so that an informed decision can be made. Any Panel presentation that does not require a decision but is for the Panel, to note only, does not need to meet these timescales. MK requested that the paper and presentation templates be sent to the panel in a Microsoft Word format. TI told the Panel he would send the word documents to the Panel members.

Action: National Grid(TI)

1524. TI also agreed to develop a Terms of Reference pro-forma. The Panel discussed the GCRP Annual Business Matrix which is a proposed annual table of GCRP issues and standing items. The Panel agreed this would be a useful item to present each year at the first GCRP meeting.

Action: National Grid(TI)

1525. The Panel also agreed that due to the volume of Grid Code issues in the future the proposal to increase the number of GCRP meetings from 4 to 6. TI will amend the Constitution and Rules to increase the number of meetings although the Panel agreed not to 'hard code' the number of meetings to allow future flexibility. The Panel meetings, starting in 2012, in a calendar year shall be January, March, May, July, September and November. TI told the Panel that the 14th July had been added to the Panel dates for this year. DS and GG pointed out that there were BSC and E3C meetings on the same day. TI said he would circulate an email around the GCRP to suggest the 7th July as an alternative date. BV commented that these proposed changes are a positive improvement and thanked the Code Administrator.

Action: National Grid(TI)

Demand Control (OC6) (pp11/02)

1526. AC presented this item on demand control as required by OC6. Demand control is required by the Grid Code when there is insufficient Active Power being generated to meet the Demand, or in the event of a fault or operating problems on the NETS. Currently OC6 requires the DNOs to reduce demand by one of two methods i.e. Voltage Regulation or Demand Disconnection within 5 minutes of receiving instruction from NGET. The demand reduction required is a percentage, up to a maximum of 20%, of the demand at the time which should be achieved in 4 stages each of between 4 and 6%.

1527. Two DNOs conducted tests to quantify the effectiveness of voltage reduction to deliver demand control following questions raised as part of the Black Start exercise Phoenix. The historic expectation was that a 3% reduction in voltage would result in a 5% demand reduction with a further 3% voltage reduction yielding a total of 10%. The finding from these tests was that voltage reduction gives between 2.6% and 5% demand reduction. In addition the DNOs recently undertook a desktop exercise to establish the time in which the voltage reduction would be delivered. The results were presented in a graph contained within the paper; the results varied quite significantly from 7 to 13 minutes for 100% implementation time. JM queried why there was such a large variation in the performance across the DNOs. The reasons for this were presented as SCADA system operating times, propagation times and operating times of substation plant. Some Panel members asked whether demand reduction was a planned or unplanned action by National Grid. SC told the Panel that it would be an unplanned action by National Grid in the absence of any other options although it could also be used in as a planned action where the need to reduce demand following an incident could be foreseen.
1528. The paper proposed 3 option amendments to the Grid Code, for the Panels consideration which would address the technical non-compliance with the Grid Code as currently written.
- Option 1 was to reflect the likely performance of the voltage reduction schemes currently employed in terms of demand reduction and the implementation time.
 - Option 2 was to improve the performance of the voltage reduction schemes currently employed at a potential cost of £90M (based upon £30k per s/s at 3000 substations) which may result in an improved implementation time of 1-2minutes.
 - Option 3 was for the DNOs to achieve compliance by using demand disconnection only. The obvious disadvantage of this is that it means customers would be disconnected.
1529. The paper outlined potential Grid Code text for Option 1. The highlights of the Grid Code potential change were to include an option for the first two stages of demand control to be delivered by two 3% voltage reduction stages (rather than prescribing the demand reduction achieved) and increasing the implementation time from 5 minutes to 15 minutes. GS stated that this work was a big step forward in terms of understanding what demand control is available from the present systems. DS asked for this issue to be brought back to the May 2011 Panel meeting and in the interim period for NGET and the DNOs to meet to discuss further this matter.

Action: National Grid(GS/SC)

Black Start (pp11/03)

1530. Black Start appeared on the agenda following discussions between NGET and the BSCCo after the last GCRP, where National Grid presented its recommendations. BS presented the Grid Code changes required to OC9.4 to update the Grid Code to reflect changes to the BSC as a result of P231. GCRP members were invited to agree the Grid Code legal text provided and note that National Grid would raise a consultation. The Panel felt that for clarity it would be better if the text that states that the BSCCo shall determine the time when the Balancing Mechanism (BM) is suspended is left in the Grid Code.
1531. JN suggested that the proposed text to OC9.4.6 should also include a requirement for NGET to inform Users that the BM is suspended, since the proposed changes delete the current reference to suspension of the BM. JN also suggested that NGET be required to inform Users when PNs should be submitted, i.e. 10-hours before the expected return to normal operations. The Panel agreed that both these suggested changes should be incorporated in the revised text.
1532. The Panel discussed the merits in defining a Local Shutdown and how this differs from a Partial Shutdown. Currently if there is an issue affecting an isolated area of

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

the system becoming locally shutdown should the System Operator chose to utilise a black start generator in that area to energise that part of system the whole of the BM would have to be suspended under Grid Code. Some Panel members did not feel that suspending the whole of the Balancing Mechanism for a Local Shutdown would always be appropriate. The Panel felt there was benefit in this being further explored in a Working Group. DS said this felt more of a BSC issue than Grid Code and therefore suggested the Working Group be BSC led. JL said that it would certainly require Grid Code participation due to the technical nature of the matter. BS and JL agreed to decide whether this group is Grid Code or BSC lead.

Action: National Grid(BS) and Elexon (JL)

BMU configuration of PPMs Offshore (pp11/04)

1533. TI presented the TOR for the Configuration of Power Park Modules Offshore Working Group. The panel was invited to agree that a Working Group should be established, agree the TOR contained in the paper and agree timescales which the Working Group should report back to the Panel. The Panel agreed that a Working Group should be established and it should report back to the Panel in November 2011. JN suggested that the TOR should also recognise the operational requirements identified by the offshore generator, as part of the TOR objectives. The Panel agreed the TOR, subject to minor amendments and the Panel however the TOR should include Elexon's attendance being required.

1534. JB asked if this amendment to the Panel discriminated against onshore PPMs as onshore you cannot substitute PPMs between BMUs onshore. DS suggested the working group could address this discrimination element as well. CMD asked for onshore wind farms to be included in the review of BMU configuration of PPMs to ensure a consistency of treatment. JL told the Panel that P240 was not specific to offshore PPMs.

1535. Some Panel members asked for the working group to future proof the BMU configuration for different designs in the future. SC stated that while it is the will of the GCRP he can do it but felt scope of the working group could become unmanageable. GP asked what National Grid intended to do with the generating stations that were forging ahead building in lots of redundancy in the absence of the BMU configuration requirements for offshore. It was thought best to include GPs query in the working group. DS asked TI to send around the TOR for the working group and invite membership.

Action: National Grid(TI)

1536. The Panel discussed the Chairing of a Working Group. Some Panel members felt that only National Grid staff may chair the Working Group meetings. DS confirmed this was not the case and if anyone wishes to put themselves forward to chair a Working Group in particular this one, he would welcome the support.

Action: ALL

Revision of CC7.7 Maintenance Standards (pp11/05)

1537. A draft TOR for a Working Group on CC7.7 was presented by CMD. The panel was invited to agree that a Working Group should be established, agree the TOR contained in the paper and agree timescales by which the Working Group should report back to the Panel. The Panel agreed that a Working Group should be established and it should report back to the Panel in November 2011.

Action: National Grid(TI)

Operational Broadcast System (pp11/06)

1538. This paper proposed a change to the Grid Code in relation to the notification and delivery of NGET warning messages sent to Users. Two clauses in OC7 require the faxes specifically to be utilised. Currently this is achieved using the Operational Broadcast System (OBS). The reason for this proposed change is that the OBS is soon to become obsolete and it would provide flexibility in upgrading the OBS. The

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

proposed change relates to being able to communicate by email as well as by fax and telephone.

1539. Some suggestions at the Panel were via EDL, the green phone or a station email. MK asked if this was a tool to be used in stressed system situations. SC confirmed that it was in which case JM felt a secure communication medium was essential. CMD asked if the OBS replacement could be considered in the Electricity Balancing System replacement to harmonise communication systems to users. Regarding the proposed legal text to OC7.4.8.3, JN suggested substituting “made available” with “issued” and repositioning the phrase “as soon as possible”. SC shall send round a consultation document for the amendments to the Grid Code to allow alternative communication methods. The Panel should note that National Grid will replace the OBS in the future.

Action: National Grid(SC)

Electricity Balancing System Group (pp11/07)

1540. National Grid is replacing its Balancing Mechanism system, this is currently planned to go live in Q3 2013. The Balancing Mechanism system used by National Grid to balance the system and manage real-time electricity supply and demand. It interfaces with market participant systems and settlement systems, and delivers data to the Balancing Mechanism Reporting Service, Settlement Admin Agent and Energy Contract Volume Aggregation Agent. The replacement system is to be called the Electricity Balancing System (EBS).

1541. The GCRP was invited to establish an industry Working Group. JN pointed out that there were various stakeholder skills required for input to the group namely IS skills, Trading Point, Grid Code and Ancillary Service knowledge and requested clarification of what skills would be principally required by the group. Specialist areas such as IT system testing could be de-scoped from the initial terms of reference and a separate working group established to cover this very important area. CMD agreed with this view. SA informed the group that for go-live there will be no changes to the functionality of the EBS interfaces with market participant systems. TI stated that, following circulation of the revised terms of reference to the GCRP, he will establish a Grid Code Working Group for the EBSG in the near future.

Action: National Grid(TI)

1542. Some Panel members noted the similarity between the EBS and the OBS systems for practical communication with users. The Panel thought EBS could potentially be the vehicle for all communications. SC said that he was not clear why National Grid were proposing separate systems but was happy to take an action to update the Panel at the next meeting.

Action: National Grid(SC)

Grid Code Signatories Consultation (pp11/19)

1543. This paper proposed a revision to the Grid Code was required to ensure that signatories to the Grid Code are consulted with and have their views considered in relation to any potential changes to the Grid Code that may take place as a result of any activity or discussion in any other forum other than the GCRP. The revision proposed that in order to satisfy National Grids obligation in relation to license condition C14.1 and C14.2 of their electricity transmission license; maintain the existing transparency in the GB Grid Code revision process and ensure that views of stakeholders are considered adequately and effectively.

1544. The panel asked in what capacity National Grid were attending the ENTSO-E drafting meetings. DS confirmed that National Grid was attending the ENTSO-E as Transmission System Operator (TSO) and this did not differ, for example, from Scottish Power Transmission (SPT) or Scottish Hydro Electricity Transmission Ltd (SHETL). DS went on to highlight that National Grid is the only part in GB that

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

fulfils the role as System Operator and therefore would have clear knowledge in this area when discussing related items at an ENTSO-E level. CMD stated that he has been to a number of industry consultation days on the Network Codes drafting and it is clear to him that National Grid's position is that GB stakeholders need to get involved of their own accord. DS informed the Panel that while National Grid had a role to play in helping stakeholders to interface with the ENTSO-E, for example keeping them informed on ongoing work and consultations, it could not represent all the users' views. DS gave an example whereby on a particular issue National Grid, TOs, generators and DNOs all have differing views, in this example it may take significant time to come to an agreed position, during which the ENTSO-E meetings would be running without National Grid input. DS did accept however that there was a role for National Grid to discuss European development issues with stakeholders since, as has been proven on many occasions in Grid Code development work, there will be specific stakeholder issues that National Grid will not be aware of which will influence our view within the bounds of licence objectives. DS highlighted that there may be restrictions to the extent such stakeholder engagement can take place due to the pace of European development work and the resources of both National Grid and the industry. DS also highlighted there was a process at an ENTSO-E level to consult with stakeholders and it may be more efficient for stakeholder engagement to occur at this level. CMD pointed out that transparency as a whole was an issue it is very difficult from the outside to see what is being discussed. A contrast was made between GB Code governance, where the proceedings of the GCRP for example were recorded and published for all affected parties to see, and the drafting process currently underway on European network codes where there are no visible minutes of the drafting teams meeting. DS highlighted that the EU commission had recently highlighted governance of European network code development as an immediate focus area for ACER and ENTSO.

1545. DS proposed that a Grid Code Working Group was established to explore the best way forward on this matter. It was suggested this could be a joint CUSC Grid Code Working Group meeting coupling up with CAP191. TI and CMD are to work up a TOR for this Working Group.

**Action: National Grid(TI) &
CMD (LP Gens)**

3. Working Group report for Consultation

1546. There were no Working Group reports at this meeting.

4. Working Groups in Progress - Update

Frequency Response & Technical sub group

1547. TI gave a summary of the current status of the Working Group and the technical sub group. TI presented 3 options that the Frequency Response Working Group are considering for the delivery of FR in the future these were: ability to trade codified obligations; day ahead auctions (with or without obligations) and bilateral tenders (obligations removed).
1548. TI informed the Panel that because of speed of implementation and interim nature option 1 (ability to trade codified obligations) was being developed at this time with no prejudice to the final decision. GN stated that by doing this the Working Group was excluding the other options from the reckoning. TI reported that he would feed this back to the Working Group although he could confirm that the development of Option 1 first was not precluding the final Working Group recommendations, by allowing the option of a quick implementation, if only as an interim step.

Action: National Grid (TI)

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

1549. TI updated the Panel on the technical sub group progress. TI informed the Panel that the technical sub group had had the scheduled 3 meetings it initially thought it might require to deliver the technical specifications but in light of progress and the number of issues felt another 2 were required. This had been reported to the BSSG FR Working Group who had accepted the new timescales with which this group expect to conclude. GN pointed out that the Republic of Ireland TSO had facilitated 50% wind without any Synthetic Inertia and that the GB system had only recently achieved 10% wind. In reply to a question from JN, TI confirmed that the Working Group would be considering such issues as the provision of inertia by low loaded synchronous generation units and also the provision of inertia centrally. TI stated that although this was currently the case the Irish are looking at our own Working Group outcomes as they believe similar obligations may be required, perhaps even retrospectively. A panel member pointed out that, under EU third package, Interconnectors were exempt from such requirements and therefore obligations on other players could be discriminatory.
1550. MK noted that the changes to the characteristics of the Total System would probably lead to higher rates of change of frequency following system disturbances, and that this could have an adverse effect on the efficacy of RoCoF protection on distributed generation. He said that the WG should keep this in mind and flag or forecast any concerns.

Harmonics

1551. GS updated Panel on progress in the G5/4 Working Group. The group has initiated research work on harmonics above the 50th and the necessary scope and extent of a Stage 3 assessment through the Energy Networks Association. Group discussions over how rights to generate harmonics are allocated are ongoing. GS intends for the Working Group to progress these issues and report to the May panel meeting.

Action: National Grid (GS)

Grid Code Requirement for Electronic Communication Facilities between NGET and BM participants (pp11/08)

1552. TD gave an update to the panel of the progress that this Working Group has made since its formation at the May 2010 Panel. The paper to the GCRP included work carried out as a result of the Working Group actions which looked at determining the impact of the new requirements on the new users and the associated costs. The paper detailed that it would affect 6 users retrospectively and a further 26 control points would require EDL up until 2019. TD outlined the cost associated with the installation of EDL to the industry: an initial outlay of £30-40k per site and £7k operational expenditure each year. TD stated a further Working Group meeting was occurring in March to discuss the findings of the analysis carried out by National Grid and agree legal drafting. The Working Group are aiming to submit the Working Group report to the May 2011 GCRP.

Action: National Grid (TD)

Reactive Despatch Restrictions

1553. SL updated the Panel on the progress the group had made in resolving the consequences from CAP169 surrounding the Reactive Despatch Network Restriction. NS repeated the particular concern that he raised at the November Panel meeting – should a DNO send a reactive instruction to an embedded generator it should take priority over National Grid's instruction – and asked if it had been considered at the BSSG. SL told NS that yes it had been considered and the BSSG felt it was a separate issue and that even before CAP169 this conflict existed. NS acknowledged this but felt that this was a good opportunity to at least establish an interim position to resolve this subject and therefore include this in the modification. NS and SC agreed to discuss the matter outside of the GCRP to see if the issue could be built into the consultation (with the BSSG's approval) or if it had to come back to May's Panel meeting as a separate Grid Code issue.

Action: National Grid (SC)

5. Consultation Report Update

Frequency and Voltage Operating Range (D/10)

1554. Frequency and Voltage Operating Range has two consultation options for the lower threshold frequency for the continuous operation option: one that is 49Hz and the other that is 48.5Hz. GS reported that National Grid are currently discussing this lower threshold limit for continuous operation at internal governance meetings. An outcome from this meeting is expected within the next month and National Grid shall update the final Authority Report and the Working Group accordingly.

Action: National Grid (GS)

6. Pending Authority Decisions

1555. None

7. Outstanding Grid Code Development Issues

Consultation Papers (pp11/09)

- **Grid Code changes relating to BSC proposal P243 F/09**

1556. TI gave an update to the panel on the status of F/09. Implementation has been agreed and is scheduled to coincide with that of BSC mod P243.

- **Compliance A/10**

1557. The Panel asked for an extension to the current consultation timescales due to the volume of consultation material. TI agreed for the consultation to be extended to the 8th April 2011. In light of the number of pages of the consultation document NG were asked to consider whether to hold an industry consultation day as they did for the previous A/10 Consultation document. TI stated there the previous text had been simplified and all condensed into one section without many material changes but conceded that a consultation day could be organised if it would be useful to other industry parties.

Action: National Grid (TI)

1558. MK stated that he was disappointed with the removal of the component related to LEEMPS. He emphasised that during the early 2000's the DNOs had agreed to the LEEMPS process to be helpful to the industry with the understanding that National Grid would support the compliance process, however since that time National Grid's interpretation of the relevant parts of the Grid Code has been considerably different to what was envisaged by the original D/05 WG members. TI and MK agreed to discuss this aspect further, to determine the appropriate way forward.

Action: MK and TI

8. Minutes from previous meetings

- **Minutes of November Panel meeting (pp11/10)**

1559. GN stated that he would like a footnote added to the minute 1487 as even though National Grid had believed the Panel to have approved an interim interpretation of the grid code, he did not. GN stated he had been opposed to the National Grid interim solution all along and the only reason that he had not opposed it in the

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

previous meeting was a lack of understanding of National Grid's presentation, which was presented to the Panel at the meeting and not circulated in advance as good governance requires. DS told GN that he would look for a way to address GN's comments in the November meeting – potentially a footnote. The Panel approved the November GCRP Panel Minutes subject to this modification. The Panel agreed that the relative urgency of the issue of Continuous Voltage Control justified the organisation of an Extraordinary GCRP meeting before May 2011 so an interpretation of the current code can be agreed.

Action: National Grid(SW)

- **Minutes of December extraordinary GCRP meeting (pp11/11)**

1560. SW stated that he had received 3 comments from the GCRP meetings which he would incorporate into the minutes. The Panel approved the minutes of the EGCRP as a fair recollection of the meeting.

Action: National Grid (GS)

9. Review of Actions

ALL COMPLETED ACTIONS

Intertripping Offshore (F/08) (pp11/13)

1561. As a result of F/08 system-to-generator intertripping modification Ofgem wrote to National Grid requesting the company to determine if the proposed text was applicable for offshore. National Grid has reviewed current BCA F5s for offshore generators against CC.6.3.17 of the Grid Code. In some instances the F5 proposed breaker to be tripped is in direct conflict with the current requirement in the Grid Code.

1562. For this reason National Grid proposes to amend the definition of **System to Generator Operational Intertripping** to allow intertrip schemes to trip the relevant transmission Owner's circuit breaker where all parties agree. The Panel agreed that National Grid should process to a one month industry consultation and noted that National Grid will respond accordingly to the Authority updating them of their findings.

Action: National Grid(TI)

Hadyard Hill (pp11/14)

1563. At the previous Panel meeting CMD had raised an issue with the late cancellation of outages that affected Hadyard Hill windfarm in SP Transmission area. SC presented a detailed list of planned outages affecting Hadyard Hill. The list contained a breakdown showing the cancelled outages and the associated timing of the cancellation. CMD and AK exchanged views on the cancellation of the outages. AK stated that there have been bilateral discussions between SPT and Hadyard Hill already and there will continue to be going forward. CMD stated that he did not consider the level of compliance with OC2 acceptable and that if repeated across the industry it would be at huge cost.

Special Actions (pp11/15)

1564. SC presented to the Panel National Grid's use of Special Actions following a request from a Panel member at the previous GCRP. SC gave an introduction to what a Special Action was used for, what it was and why National Grid used them. A Special Action that National Grid may use following a secured event on the transmission system may be: a change in output of one or more generating sets at a power station at a rate that may differ from the submitted BM parameters; transfer of load between GSPs by a DNO and a demand reduction by a DNO. CMD's opinion was that if a generator provides a Run-Down-Rate greater than their submitted dynamic parameters then they are offering a service. CMD further to this

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

stated that this could potentially be accommodated in the new EBS where two sets of Run Down Rates could be submitted with equivalent prices. CMD also commented that having this facility include in the future EBS replacement would harmonise communications to users.

1565. NGET are obligated by the Grid Code to discuss and agree with a relevant User the special action ahead of time. The communication levels that National Grid are obligated to in the Grid Code is to inform the user 7 weeks ahead, 1 week ahead and finally at 1700 the day prior to the Special Action potentially being required. Some Panel members felt that the amount of communication that National Grid was obligated to in the Grid Code was excessive. The communication shall normally be via fax or email. CMD enquired as to how a non-return of the fax instruction would be treated by National Grid. SC stated he was not entirely sure but would confirm at a later date. [Post meeting note: Currently National Grid would processes would assume that a non return is "Special Action not confirmed".

Action: National Grid (SC)

1566. The instruction, because of the importance to the integrity of the transmission system, will be issued as an emergency instruction and will have no corresponding BOA. National Grid will construct a BOA(s) post-event and cash flows will be sorted accordingly. Some Panel members felt that no matter whether the process had been followed from 7 weeks ahead to day ahead, their operators if sent an emergency instruction would conduct the emergency instruction regardless. JN suggested that the communication via the faxes should state in the comments box "the special action will be instructed via emergency instruction" on the day and also the actual instruction should reference the previously agreed special action. Some Panel members also felt this presentation would be extremely useful at an Ops Forum to make Users aware of the process and actions required surrounding Special Actions.

Action: National Grid (SC)

Simultaneous Tap changing (pp11/16)

1567. This paper was produced by National Grid detailing how and why a simultaneous tap changing instruction would occur. SC pointed out that due to the obsolescence of the Operational Broadcast System the instruction would be sent via a fax. JN suggested that this paper was much improved and the guidance should be forwarded on to generators. Some panel members also felt it may be a useful paper to send out via the Ops Forum. SC will issue the paper in its final form to generators at their Trading Points and to the Ops Forum for future use. JN also suggested that information relating to when Simultaneous tap instruction may be used would also be useful.

1568. SC suggested, in the first instance, given that it is a significant time since a Simultaneous Tap instruction was issued, it would be sensible to test the process. SC will discuss options for a test at ENCC and communicate details of a proposed test to generators in writing.

Action: National Grid (SC)

G59 Generator Protection Settings – Progress update (pp11/17)

1569. TI presented figures from the ENA that detailed the percentage of generators in each DNO who had modified their G59 protection settings to those required in G59/2. The change to the required settings arose following the 27th May 2008 and the subsequent E3C recommendation/report. There still remained a significant number of embedded generators who could not (for safety or stability reasons) or have not adopted the new protection settings. MK commented that he had raised this at previous ITCG meeting and would do again at the upcoming meeting, emphasising to DNOs how important this issue is. MK believes that this issue will take at least 3-4 months to progress. GN pointed out that even although the G59 settings may be modified for the DNO protection some plant (e.g. older wind turbine

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

generators) will trip out automatically on over speed. DS stated that National Grid should report the progress made on applying the G59/2 settings across DNO connected generation back to the E3C.

Action: National Grid (TI)

Two Shift Limits

1570. MD attended the Panel to give an update on the Two Shift Limit Grid Code issue which Michelle Dixon raised in November GCRP. MD restated the position established at the previous Panel meeting that the TSL is for guidance only and that if a generator does not wish to two shift twice in a 24hr day then they should set the MNZT and MZT dynamic parameters accordingly. It is also possible for the generator to state this position in other relevant data. MD told the Panel that the TSL was likely a parameter that links back to the previous Electricity Balancing Mechanism the pool.

1571. BV stated she was disappointed that the paper which was expected at this Panel meeting had not been forthcoming. She reminded the Panel that an industry member had taken time to attend a Panel meeting seeking a resolution to an operational issue. The paper was supposed to address the ambiguity in the Grid Code. DS stated that this issue could be added to the EGCRP – already agreed to by the Panel for Continuous Voltage Control – arranged for late March.

Action: National Grid (TI)

Outstanding Actions

1572. The outstanding actions from the November and December Panel meeting are summarised below.

- (Minute 1370&1452) – Codification of Generic Requirements currently included in the Bilateral Connection Agreements

DS updated the panel on why National Grid had included the compliance testing in the F5s ahead of the prospective A/10 Grid Code amendments. DS had spoken to the Customer Agreements, compliance team. The new addition to the F5 had been included to seek a bare minimum for a test and was not included to pre-empt the A/10 consultation outcome. JN stated that he could understand the need for compliance tests and the sentiments of including the testing in the F5s but felt there was more appropriate ways of this being done. JN suggested that generally he was not an advocate of a guidance notes but in this instance it may have been a better method.

- (Minute 1466) – Grid Code Requirements for Electronic Communication Facilities between NGET and BM Participants

The proposed Working Group solution has been commented on during the consultation phase. Taking on board this comment it was felt the best course of action was to reconvene the Working Group for one further meeting. The outcome of this meeting should be an acceptable proposal for all parties.

- (Minute 1470) – Grid PNs from Code Requirements for Electronic Communication Facilities between NGET and BM Participants

This document is currently being produced by BT and should be available for the May Panel meeting.

- (Minute 1487) – Continuous Voltage Control

This document is currently being produced by GS and should be available for the May Panel meeting.

- (Minute 1518) – Europe

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

DS sent out an email to Panel members asking for comments to incorporate into the letter – no comments were received. This action is now superseded by the action of 1539 and is therefore closed.

10. 2011 GCRP Membership (pp11/18)

1573. The membership list for the 2011 Panel meeting had been drawn up by National Grid and proposed to the Panel. Due to uncertainties at the Authority no Ofgem representative was confirmed in the membership list. SBr confirmed that he would be the Authority representative on the Panel and that Shijun Yi would be his Alternate. TD stated he would update the membership list accordingly. The new membership list for 2011 was approved at the meeting.

Action: National Grid (TD)

11. Standing Items

European Network Codes

1574. An update on the ENTSO-E network codes was given by DS. DS stated to the Panel that the European network codes may have a significant impact on the Grid Code. The Panel was shown the expected timeline for European Network codes introduction. DS told the Panel that the current pilot Network Code on Generator connection does not meet its TOR in the Framework Guidelines because the Framework Guidelines changed in December and the pilot Network Code is yet to be updated. DS noted a key change in the revised December Framework Guidelines was with regards to the retrospective application to existing generators, i.e. this had been significantly relaxed and hence stakeholders can expect a significant change to the Network Code as a result. DS noted that ENTSO-E have been receiving some feedback on the lack of transparency in the pilot consultation process and the need to respond to stakeholder comments in a timely fashion. DS highlighted that ACER will be formally consulting on the Framework Guidelines in March once the 3rd package goes live and once this is complete; ENTSO-E will be doing further code development, holding stakeholder workshops followed by a formal consultation. DS reminded the panel that the first drafting of the Framework Guidelines and Network Code was a Pilot exercise to explore the issues of drafting European codes. DS noted that developing both Framework Guidelines and Network Code in parallel had been shown to be an issue and this was recognised by the EU Commission at the outset however, time did not allow for an alternative pilot exercise.

12. Issues

1575. None

13. Impact of Other Code Modifications or Developments

- **CUSC**

1576. Not covered due to meeting time constraints

- **BSC**

1577. Not covered due to meeting time constraints

- **Cross Code Forum**

1578. Not covered due to meeting time constraints

14. A.O.B

1579. CMD asked if NGET could give an update on the planned interconnection to the NETS at the next meeting. TI to circulate an answer.

Action: National Grid (TI)

15. Date of Next Meeting

1580. It was proposed that the next Panel meeting will be an EGM probably via teleconference to cover the agenda items that were not completed at this meeting and resolve the TSL and ENTSO-E network codes matters covered at this meeting. It is thought at this stage it will probably be some time toward the end of March.