

**Joint Grid Code and Distribution Code Review Panels Working Group
Implementation of Technical Requirements for Licence Exempt Embedded
Medium Power Stations**

Minutes of 9th Meeting held on 29 June 2005 at NGT House, Warwick

Present

Ben Graff	National Grid (Chair)
Patrick Hynes	National Grid
Sue Newbould	National Grid (Technical Secretary)
Mike Kay	United Utilities
Chris Berry	SP PowerSystems
John Norbury	RWE Trading
Claire Maxim	E.ON UK

Apologies

Bridget Morgan	Ofgem (observer)
Guy Nicholson	Econnect
Nigel Turvey	Western Power
Charlie Zhang	EDF

Review of minutes of 8th Meeting held on 28 January 2005

1. The minutes were agreed as being accurate.

Review of actions

2. The WG agreed that as the actions had been incorporated into the drafting to be considered at this meeting they would be reviewed then.

Grid Code Drafting

3. PH advised that he tried to incorporate Generic Provisions in the Grid Code drafting and more generic issues in CC.3.3 and CC.3.4. The WG then page turned the drafting.
4. JN advised he was uncomfortable with the definition for "Embedded Person". The WG agreed that in the definition of Embedded Person, the "owner of" should be replaced by "party responsible for".
5. CM queried the use of "Embedded Person" in PC.4.3.1. The WG agreed that reference to "Embedded Person" should be removed and replaced by "Embedded Medium Power Station or Embedded DC Converter Station" as used in PC.4.4.3.
6. JN asked whether PC.A.5.1.4(i) could be simplified by deleting "with a Registered Capacity of less than 100MW". The WG agreed that this wording could be deleted because the differentiation was those subject to a Bilateral Agreement (PC.A.5.1.4(i)) and those not (PC.A.5.1.4(ii)).
7. PH to change wording of PC.A.5.5(ii) to cover units but not wind turbines.
8. MK queried whether the list in CC3.4 was a comprehensive list. He was nervous that requirements might be scattered throughout the Grid Code that are not listed here. After a discussion, the WG agreed to delete "that would otherwise have been specified in a Bilateral Agreement" from CC.3.3(ii) and to insert a list of requirements. CC.3.3(ii) would then be moved to become CC3.4(ii).

9. The WG agreed that “Embedded Person” in CC.6.4.4 should be changed to “Embedded Medium Power Station or Embedded DC Converter Station”.
10. PH advised the WG that NGC was relaxing the frequency requirement on LEEMPS in CC.8.1(c) such that LEEMPS are not obliged to provide frequency control.
11. CM and JN queried the dynamic response tests requirements in CC.A.3.4. PH replied that the LEEMPS does not need an ASA but is still required to be stable and so the dynamic response tests are to ensure compliance with the relevant CCs. PH answered OC5 to JN’s query of where the entitlement for NGC to test comes from. JN did not think that OC5 covers commissioning tests and the WG agreed. JN therefore thought the test obligation in CC.A.3.4 is not covered in OC5 and he would like more detail on the tests and the reason for them. The WG agreed to make the drafting a separate paragraph and make the purposes of the tests clear (compliance with CCs). The WG agreed revised wording as a first draft.
12. The WG agreed to change “Embedded Person” in the Reactive Capability table on page 30 as previously discussed.
13. JN queried why if there is no obligation in the Grid Code on generators subject to a Bilateral Agreement to submit a Compliance Statement there is one on LEEMPS (OC5.8.1). The reason is because there is no direct contractual relationship. It was queried whether OC5.8.1 should live in an Appendix to the CCs as being more related to commissioning. MK thought that strictly speaking the Compliance Statement requirements should be in the CCs. The triggers for testing are in OC5.8.2 and JN asked whether there would be any other triggers for testing. PH replied not that he was aware. MK thought that OC5.8.2 would be the fall back position for any testing rights. The WG agreed to leave the drafting as it is and wait for the consultation.
14. At the end of the review of the Grid Code drafting, JN advised that his main concern is the interim provisions for existing connected LEEMPS and what the transitional arrangements would be. PH told the WG that he had spoken with Bridget Morgan and BM had advised him that any report to the Authority would have to include what we would do about derogations. PH thought MPS in Scotland probably would not comply and would need enduring GC derogations (he thought this was covered in GC15 for 1 year). Derogations would be required after the year. In England and Wales, PH advised that stations built prior should have complied or had derogations. Some plants built since the licence exemption may need a derogation. PH informed the WG that the possibility of having an implementation date for LEEMPS has been discussed so anything pre-LEEMPS would not need to comply. There should not be new obligations for existing plants (early LEGAs may not have covered all the requirements). NGC would need a derogation from the Grid Code. The WG thought the DNO would need a derogation from their licence.

D Code Drafting

15. MK advised that he thought there may be further amendments required for BETTA. MK drew the WG’s attention to the main changes since the last walk through (DPC7, DOC5, DOC12).
16. The WG agreed with CM’s suggestion to make it clear in DPC7.3.3(a) that it is incumbent on EMPSSs to provide the data to the DNO.

17. JN queried the use of the term “exceptional” in DPC7.5.4.4 because he thought it was normal. The WG agreed to remove “exceptional” and add “if NGC reasonably” before “believes”.
18. The WG discussed the reference to “not more than twice in any calendar year” because in PH’s opinion NGC was unlikely to make the request but in the end decided to leave the drafting as it is.
19. With reference to DOC5.6.3.6, JN asked whether it could be added in the Grid Code that it is a discussion. MK said the wording in DOC5.6.3.6 was more explanatory because the DNO is in the middle and did not think it needed duplicating in the Grid Code.
20. JN also thought the Grid Code would benefit from the triggers (a) to (d) in DOC5.6.4.1. JN qualified this by saying it was a comment he was making rather than for action.
21. MK advised the WG that he had added a new clause DOC12.1.4.
22. MK also advised that the definition of “Medium Power Station” had been amended.
23. CB asked whether some words could be put in a Guidance Note to the Grid Code. MK did not think so but took an action to add a paragraph to capture the work of this WG.

Working Group Report

24. The WG discussed the report drafted by PH for the July GCRP and DCRP. PH made the agreed changes at the meeting.
25. MK questioned whether Appendix 9 contains the latest version of the GC and DC clauses and suggested that the report states that the table was accurate at that time. The WG queried what the appendix was adding and whether it should be removed. Similarly, CB thought Appendices 5 and 6 were useful at the time. PH said the report was to show both Panels what the WG had done but was not proposing to include these appendices in the consultation. Therefore the WG agreed to leave these appendices in and PH updated the wording to explain that the appendices were relevant at the time but have been superseded.
26. An action was placed on NGC to re-write the 4th sentence of the 4th paragraph of the Summary.
27. An action was put on all to submit their comments on the report to Mark Duffield, copied to Pat Hynes, by the end of the week (close of play 1st July). The report would then be issued the following week for final comments. The report is to be discussed at the extraordinary GCRP to be held on 20th July.
28. *Post meeting note:* BG clarified that the Consultation Paper would be prepared after the GCRP and not for the GCRP on the 20th July.
29. The WG thanked PH and MK for their work on the drafting.

Next Meeting

30. It is not expected that the WG will meet again as the final drafting of the DC, GC and report will be done by circulation.