

## CAP141 Working Group

Meeting Name	CAP141 Working Group
Meeting No.	1
Date of Meeting	15 <sup>th</sup> January 2007
Time	11:30am – 02:00pm
Venue	Room B1.1, National Grid Offices, Warwick

---

This note outlines the key action points from the first meeting of the CAP141 Working Group.

### **1. Introductions/Apologies for Absence**

1. Apologies for absence were received from GG (Scottish and Southern).

### **2. Working Group Terms of reference**

2. After discussion the Group agreed the standard format for the TORs and agreed that the following items should be included in paragraph 5 of the TORs:
  - the development of the form of any new Exhibit to the CUSC representing a Statement of Works as part of CAP141;
  - Consider the adequacy of the legal text for CAP141 and in particular a new definition for "Statement of Works"
3. In Paragraph 1 the reference to the Proposer should be to Dong Walney and not Eclipse Energy. The Secretary would incorporate these items into the Terms of Reference and arrange for them to be considered by the CUSC Panel.

**Action: RD**

### **Working Group Internal Procedures**

4. The Secretary circulated proposed Internal Working Procedures for the Group as required under paragraph 13 of the TORs and these Procedures were agreed.

### **3. Background to and Overview of CAP141 Proposals**

5. TC explained that CUSC section 6.5.5 requires DNOs to make a request for Statement of Works prior to energisation of the connection of certain Embedded Power Stations. Although it is clear that National Grid must respond within 28 days to such a request there is a lack of clarity in the form of such a response and the detail that it should include. In particular there are three categories of works that could be required;
  - On the GB transmission system (CUSC 6.5.5.3)
  - On the GB transmission system which also give rise to modifications to Connection Assets (CUSC 6.5.5.4)
  - Site Specific Requirements at the site of the connection of the Power Station (6.5.5.5)
6. There is also no definition of "Statement of Works" and no Exhibit that corresponded to such a document in the CUSC. Furthermore, TC believed developers of Embedded Power stations should be entitled to know the magnitude of the works that might be required on the transmission system. For example, the impact of an embedded generator could involve the installation of a system to generator intertrip or major infrastructure reinforcement. The former would be straightforward to install but the latter could take many years. The Developer could then take an informed decision on

the viability of the project.

7. Working Group Members generally supported the thrust of CAP141 and in particular the suggestion that the Embedded Generator should be able to discover the detail of the works that were required to connect him. Members asked whether the 28 day period was sufficient for National Grid to make a proper assessment. EC indicated that this was a significant issue for National Grid and the scope of the works required cannot be fully known within the 28 day period, especially in Scotland where National Grid would need to consult with one of the Scottish TOs. National Grid accepted, however, that the CUSC should have a definition of "Statement of Works". The Group noted that representatives of DNOs had been encouraged to attend CAP141 Working Group meetings but in the event this had not been taken up. National Grid had intended to put forward an Amendment Proposal to the CUSC in due course on this and a number of other issues arising from the introduction of LEEMPS but now that CAP141 had been raised National Grid agreed that the defect in the CUSC should be addressed. There would need to be an alternate to CAP141 anyway as the current reference to Exhibit S was incorrect and the reference should be to Exhibit U. The form of Exhibit U might however drive further changes to the legal text for CAP141 so it was agreed that the Group should work through a draft of Exhibit U which was tabled by National Grid.
8. During discussion of Exhibit U it was agreed the Group needed more understanding of the processes behind the analysis that National Grid undertake when they receive a request for a Statement of Works from the DNO.
9. EC indicated that she would try to identify examples that would trigger the three possible situations described in the draft Exhibit U (listed in paragraph 5 above).

**Action: EC**

10. EC also wished to consider further changes to the legal drafting put forward as part of CAP141 based on a revised Exhibit U.

**Action: EC**

#### **4. Next Steps**

11. It was agreed that National Grid would provide a further draft of Exhibit U for discussion at the next meeting. It was also agreed that the CUSC Panel should be requested to approve an additional month for the Working Group to submit its report (i.e. to the March Panel meeting),

**Actions: EC**

#### **5. Date of Next Meeting**

12. The next Working Group meeting was due to be held on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2007 at the National Grid offices in Warwick but was subsequently postponed until Thursday 1<sup>st</sup> March in Room D3.1 at National Grid House commencing at 10.00am.

# CAP141 Working Group

## Appendix 1 – Working Group Attendance

### Members Present:

Rob Smith	RS	Chairman
Richard Dunn	RD	Secretary
Emma Carr	EC	National Grid
Ben Sheehy	BS	E.On
Tony Cotton	TC	ETCS Ltd
John Norbury	JN	RWE Npower
David Scott	DS	EDF Energy

### Apologies:

Garth Graham	GG	Scottish and Southern
--------------	----	-----------------------