

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

**Actions from 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 12 May 2004**

<b>Action No</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Action on</b>	<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Status</b>
12/5/04 1	Produce Gantt chart of current connection process and data flows etc for Embedded MPS	Chris Berry	ASAP (by 21/5/04)	
12/5/04 2	Annotate Gantt chart produced by CB to establish time line and process proposed by the re-drafting	Patrick Hynes	By 11/6/04	
12/5/04 3	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	Patrick Hynes		
12/5/04 4	Establish what class of generator requires a BEGA	Patrick Hynes		
12/5/04 5	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). Not had a directly connected MPS.	Patrick Hynes		
12/5/04 6	Redraft clause PC.3.2(b) to include list of obligations, as suggested by MK in his email of 28/4/04, on LEEMPS	Patrick Hynes		
12/5/04 7	Inform PH if wording in square brackets should be removed from PC.4.3.1	ALL		
12/5/04 8	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	Patrick Hynes		
12/5/04 9	Clarify timescale by possibly inserting "on application of the connection to the DNO" in clause PC.5.2	Patrick Hynes		
12/5/04 10	Clarify what clause PC.A.1.2 should be referring to as there is no "PC.4.6"	Patrick Hynes		
12/5/04 11	Circulate any comments from PC.A.3.1.2 onwards to the WG	ALL		
12/5/04 12	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)	Patrick Hynes		
12/5/04 13	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?	Patrick Hynes		
12/5/04 14	Review CC.5.2 and CC5.3 and their order and whether CC.5.2 can be modified to include CC.5.3 (MK's email of 28/4/04)	Patrick Hynes		
12/5/04 15	Remove highlighting in clause CC.6.3.3 because it is a duplication	Patrick Hynes		
12/5/04 16	Consider whether clause CC.6.3.7(f) applies to anybody and if it does, does it actually change anything	Patrick Hynes		

12/5/04 17	Assess request for word “reasonable” to be inserted after “NGC’s” and before “view” in clause CC.6.3.8(a)	Patrick Hynes		
12/5/04 18	Identify backstop for NGC to notify the relevant Network Operator of the requirements (clause CC.6.3.8(a)	Patrick Hynes		
12/5/04 19	Consider what the mechanism for applying obligations between the parties should be (by Schedules or serving Notices?)	Patrick Hynes / DNOs		
12/5/04 20	Consider what timescales the provision in clause CC.6.3.12 needs to be specified	Patrick Hynes		
12/5/04 21	Reconsider CC.8.1 to see if it can be clarified further regarding the issue previously discussed in Generic Provisions (e 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)	Patrick Hynes		
12/5/04 22	Obtain legal advice on the use of the word “procure” in CC.A.3.1	Mike Kay		
12/5/04 23	Consider MK’s suggested drafting change for CC.A.3.2 (email 28/4/04)			
12/5/04 24	Clarify whether need to be a BMU to despatch frequency response	ALL		
12/5/04 25	Inform GC/DC Review Panel of discussion during meeting about frequency response and minimum performance and whether it needs to be taken forward in a different forum	PH		
12/5/04 26	Re-draft OC5 whilst considering implications under CUSC (who does testing and liabilities etc) and clarifying who OC5 applies to	PH	By 11/6/04	
12/5/04 27	Forward any comments on OC5 to PH	ALL	28/5/04	