

**Joint Grid Code / Distribution Code Working Group
Licence Exempt Embedded Medium Power Stations
Actions Record**

| Action No | Action on | Action / Outcome | Status |
|------------------|------------------|---|------------------|
| 26/8/04 1 | JN/CM | Provide details of generator's costs relating to testing (engineering and out of merit costs) | New |
| 26/8/04 2 | NGC | Testing related costs are (action 26/8/04 1) propose how they should be dealt with | New |
| 26/8/04 3 | MK | Take on board comments made in meeting on DPC7 and DOC5 drafting, as appropriate | New |
| 26/8/04 4 | ALL | Email comments on DPC7 and DOC5 drafting to MK | New |
| 26/8/04 5 | MK | Check the new OC5.8 drafting works with DOC 5 drafting | New |
| 26/8/04 6 | PH | Establish what evidence NGC would be satisfied with that the LEEMPS complies with the Grid Code | New |
| 26/8/04 7 | MK | Clarify wording of DOC5.6.3.1 and list the triggers (minute 26 refers) | New |
| 26/8/04 8 | MK | Add detail to DPC7 drafting so that it refers to compliance report/statement of compliance | New |
| 26/8/04 9 | MK | Include wording in DOC5 drafting on how to instruct and agree test programme | New |
| 26/8/04 10 | ALL | Email any thoughts on CUSC changes to PH (for paper to GB GCRP) | New |
| 18/6/04 1 | ALL | Review CUSC 1.3.1(b) and whether it answers the question as to what class of generator requires a BEGA (cross ref to Action 12/5/04 4) | Completed |
| 18/6/04 2 | PH | Clarify what data is needed in the square brackets of PC.4.3.1 which is not being obtained through the Grid Code <i>PH clarified on 26/8/04 that it is any data which is submitted that is required to produce the SYS</i> | Completed |
| 18/6/04 3 | PH | NGC to consider a paper to GCRP on limited frequency sensitive mode <i>PH advised on 26/8/04 that NGC is looking at a number of options, including limited frequency mode and basic capability. NGC is still considering separately the need for a GCRP paper. WG agreed to report to Panel that the WG is aware of the issue and will progress through the Panel.</i> | Completed |
| 18/6/04 4 | PH | Re-draft OC5 to include obligations for testing mentioned in BC2.10.2(c) and BC.2.10.3, covered under 26/8/04 2 | Complete |
| 18/6/04 5 | SN | Revise swim lane diagram to accurately reflect what would happen if the embedded generator triggered infrastructure works | On-going |
| 18/6/04 6 | PH | Include on swim lane diagram what OC5 is to achieve | On-going |
| 18/6/04 7 | SN | Clarify what data NGC requires at Tasks 3 and 10 of the Gantt chart | On-going |
| 18/6/04 8 | DNOs | Identify changes required to DNOs pro forma connection offer <i>DNOs advised on 26/8/04 that the offers are not common across the companies. To be</i> | Completed |

| | | | |
|------------|------|---|-------------------------------------|
| | | <i>assessed once drafting completed</i> | |
| 18/6/04 9 | NGC | Determine what is the position on who pays for testing/operating the agreement | See new action 26/8/04 1 |
| 18/6/04 10 | PH | Insert the words “BM Unit” before “Generating Unit or CCGT Module...” in the heading to the table in OC5.5.3 | Completed |
| 18/6/04 11 | ALL | Email any comments on PC to PH | Completed |
| 18/6/04 13 | PH | Capitalise the “p” in “prior” in CC5.2.1 and CC5.2.2 <i>PH confirmed on 26/8/04 that “p” is correct</i> | Completed |
| 18/6/04 14 | DNOs | Review and redraft DOC5 and DPC7 <i>Drafting was considered by WG on 26/8/04</i> | Completed |
| 18/6/04 15 | NGC | Consider and report back on whether the GC changes lead to a consequential CUSC modification or the other way round <i>PH confirmed on 26/8/04 that it is a Grid Code change and there are changes to the CUSC which can be consequential or in parallel</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 1 | CB | Produce Gantt chart of current connection process and data flows etc for Embedded MPS <i>Gantt Chart circulated and discussed at 18/6/04 Meeting</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 2 | PH | Annotate Gantt chart produced by CB to establish time line and process proposed by the re-drafting <i>Annotation started and discussed at 18/6/04 Meeting. PH advised on 26/8/04 that OC5 is to be updated</i> | On-going |
| 12/5/04 3 | PH | Clarify the meaning of “Bilateral Agreement” and “CUSC Contract” as used in the redrafting and whether one of these terms should be used throughout rather than both terms <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this is covered in the note of the issues addressed in the redraft of the Grid Code</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 4 | PH | Establish what class of generator requires a BEGA <i>PH referred the WG to CUSC 1.3.1(b) – see New Action 18/6/04 1</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 5 | PH | Establish if clarification is required on the different treatments of Embedded Medium Power Stations (ie those licensed (with agreement) and those licence exempt (without agreement)). <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that aside from directly connected issues there should be no difference in obligation between those with an agreement and those without, the only difference being in how the obligations are carried out</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 6 | PH | Redraft clause PC.3.2(b) to include list of obligations, as suggested by MK in his email of 28/4/04, on LEEMPS <i>PH circulated the list of obligations prior to the meeting on 26/8/04. MK’s updated version is to follow by email. These will be included in the GB drafting</i> | On-going |
| 12/5/04 7 | ALL | Inform PH if wording in square brackets should be removed from PC.4.3.1 <i>See New Action 18/6/04 2</i> | Completed |

| | | | |
|------------|--------------------|--|------------------|
| 12/5/04 8 | PH | Review applicability of “section 6.5” of the CUSC wherever it is mentioned (PC.4.4.4, PC.5.4, PC.A.1.4(b) were highlighted in particular) and delete reference where not appropriate <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this has been addressed in the redrafting and in the note summarising the issues addressed in the redraft of the Grid Code</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 9 | PH | Clarify timescale by possibly inserting “on application of the connection to the DNO” in clause PC.5.2 <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this has been addressed in the redrafting</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 10 | PH | Clarify what clause PC.A.1.2 should be referring to as there is no “PC.4.6” <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this has been addressed in the redrafting (reference should be PC.4.4.3)</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 11 | ALL | Circulate any comments from PC.A.3.1.2 onwards to the WG <i>None received</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 12 | PH | Consider re-drafting of CC.3.3 to list obligations on LEEMPS as suggested by MK in his email of 28/4/04 (and then CC.6.4.4 can be deleted) <i>PH circulated the list of obligations prior to the meeting on 26/8/04. MK’s updated version is to follow by email. To be included CC.3.3 drafting but BGC thinks CC.6.4.4 cannot be deleted</i> | On-going |
| 12/5/04 13 | PH | Clarify wording in brackets in clause CC.5.1 as point made whether there would be a need for NGC to give approval if Licence Exempt Embedded MPS? <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that he thought this was a CUSC issue rather than a Grid Code issue</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 14 | PH | Review CC.5.2 and CC.5.3 and their order and whether CC.5.2 can be modified to include CC.5.3 (MK’s email of 28/4/04) <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this has been addressed in the redrafting</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 15 | PH | Remove highlighting in clause CC.6.3.3 because it is a duplication | Completed |
| 12/5/04 16 | PH | Consider whether clause CC.6.3.7(f) applies to anybody and if it does, does it actually change anything <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that NGC believes it does apply to anybody who is captured by that section of the Grid Code</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 17 | PH | Assess request for word “reasonable” to be inserted after “NGC’s” and before “view” in clause CC.6.3.8(a) <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that NGC believes there needs to be a link back to the CUSC but not use the word “reasonable”</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 18 | PH | Identify backstop for NGC to notify the relevant Network Operator of the requirements (clause CC.6.3.8(a) <i>The WG’s agreed solution was for the clause to refer to paragraph “x” of the CUSC instead of “6.5”. CUSC rather than Grid Code</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 19 | PH/MK/C B/NT/CZ | Consider what the mechanism for applying obligations between the parties should be (by Schedules or serving Notices?) | Completed |

| | | | |
|------------|-----|--|------------------|
| | | <i>PH advised on 26/8/04 that NGC would provide the DNO with any additional site specific requirements on a Schedule. Within 28 days NGC would tell the DNO whether the application has a material effect and whether it requires a Modification Application. PH thinks this is a CUSC issue</i> | |
| 12/5/04 20 | PH | Consider what timescales need to be specified for the provision in clause CC.6.3.12 <i>PH advised on 26/8/04 that the CUSC would contain the process and timescale rather than the Grid Code</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 21 | PH | Reconsider CC.8.1 to see if it can be clarified further regarding the issue previously discussed in Generic Provisions (ie a directly connected MPS requires a MSA for reactive power but not frequency response whilst an Embedded MPS does not need a frequency or reactive MSA) <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this is covered in his paper on BC3/CC.8.1</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 22 | MK | Obtain legal advice on the use of the word “procure” in CC.A.3.1 <i>(PH advised on 18/6/04 that NGC’s lawyers think it is acceptable to use “procure”). MK agreed use of “procure” on 26/8/04</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 23 | | Consider MK’s suggested drafting change for CC.A.3.4 (email 28/4/04) <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that MK’s comments have generally been taken on board and the structure for OC5 has been amended</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 24 | ALL | Clarify whether need to be a BMU to despatch frequency response (NGC believes not) <i>See New Action 18/6/04 3</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 25 | PH | NGC to consider taking forward discussion during meeting on minimum performance at the GCRP <i>Discussed on 18/6/04 but no conclusion reached. See New Action 18/6/04 3</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 26 | PH | Re-draft OC5 whilst considering implications under CUSC (who does testing and liabilities etc) and clarifying who OC5 applies to <i>(see New Action 18/6/04 4)</i> | Completed |
| 12/5/04 27 | ALL | Forward any comments on OC5 to PH | Completed |
| 1/12/03 34 | PH | Identify at what stage data is required <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this is part of Action 12/5/04 1 & 2</i> | Completed |
| 1/12/03 37 | PH | Draft text so that individual CC clauses are listed <i>PH noted on 18/6/04 that this is outstanding – see Action 12/5/04 12</i> | Completed |
| 1/12/03 41 | AB | Clarify minimum technical design criteria with respect to CC8 and licence exempt MPS <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this has been done in the drafting and in the BC3 Paper to be discussed</i> | Completed |
| 1/12/03 46 | PH | Identify requirements for testing and compliance so as to enable DNOs to consider the impact on the D Code <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this is covered in the redrafting of OC5</i> | Completed |
| 1/12/03 56 | GN | Review initial assumptions on the Scottish issues and BETTA and changes to the GB Grid | Not now |

| | | Code | required |
|-------------|----|--|------------------|
| 14/10/03 20 | PH | Identify mechanism for making link to DNOs and potential changes to CUSC to cover indemnity <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this should be clearer from the redrafting of OC5</i> | Completed |
| 14/10/03 21 | PH | Establish route for testing and compliance once identified what needs to be tested <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this should be clearer from the redrafting of OC5</i> | Completed |