

# Summary of Meeting and Actions

---

Meeting Name	GSR007 Working Group
Meeting No.	5
Date of Meeting	Tuesday, 28 <sup>th</sup> October 2008
Time	10:00am – 1:00pm
Venue	National Grid House, Gallows Hill, Warwick, CV34 6DA

---

This note outlines the key action points from the fifth meeting of the GSR007 Working Group.

## 1) Review of Minutes

The Working Group reviewed and agreed, subject to minor amendments, the minutes from the last Working Group meeting (25<sup>th</sup> September 2008) which will be published on the GB SQSS website.

## 2) Normal Infeed Loss Risk

The Working Group noted that National Grid (in their role of GB System Operator) would investigate the issues, options (identifying pros and cons) associated to amending the normal infeed loss risk limit; providing updates to the Working Group.

Potential options are as follows:

- Normal Infeed Loss Risk changed to 1800MW such that it aligns with the proposed new level for Infrequent Infeed Loss Risk.
  - Covers the worse case of greater than 2 1800MW trips a year.
  - May require the GBSO to cover 1800MW in full at all times.
- Retained Current Level i.e. 1000MW.
  - Count of frequency events <49.5MW may grow too high i.e. outside statutory limits.
- Hybrid
  - Retains the optimality as the current 1320:1000 balance.

## 3) Implementation

The Working Group discussed the various implementation options associated with the amendment proposal. The Working Group identified and discussed three potential options:

Option A – Plan to 1800MW immediately.

- Option A (1) - Hold the response and socialise the cost as soon as any >1320MW risk is commissioned.
  - Likely to be fairly soon.
  - Some with existing restrictions will argue to be released immediately.
  - The cost benefit is not there for a transmission risk.
- Option A (2) – Only socialise the cost for a generation risk, a User will have to pay for the extra response required for transmission risk.

Option B – Go-Live Date Announced.

- The Authority determines that it expects the first >1000MW unit (whether nuclear or super-critical coal) to commission on a specific date. Before this date any >1320MW risk has to pay for the extra Response required. After this date, the extra Response is expected to be held, and the costs will be socialised.
- Option C – The costs benefit does not occur until more than 2 larger generating units are connected to the transmission system. The new provisions would not be applicable until the second large unit connects.

# Summary of Meeting and Actions

---

The initial preference of members was for Option A (2) but acknowledged that Option B also required careful consideration. The Working Group report would outline all possible options listing the pros and cons of each option.

**Action: PP**

The Working Group noted that associated text changes would be developed for Option A (2) and B and circulated to TOs (for approval) and Working Group (for discussion).

**Action: PP**

The Working Group noted the possible scenario of a relatively small connection to the GB Transmission System, at the end of a spur, which would result in the existing 1320 ruling being breached. The Working Group discussed the impact which the different implementation dates would have on the affected User in this scenario. It was agreed that this scenario would be taken into account when the Working Group finalised their preference for the implementation date and referred to accordingly within the Working Group report.

## 4) Technical Considerations

The Working Group was advised that studies were being undertaken to give a view of the effect on system performance if the largest infeed loss was increased from 1320MW to 1800MW. The studies focus on three demand levels: 22GW, 45 GW and 61GW representing the range of GB system conditions. In each case the study has been set up so that the demand and generation balance and a steady frequency of 50Hz are maintained.

Responsive machines in the network are part loaded so that a system response is held to provide additional power following a generation trip. The response held in each study is that required to contain the frequency following a generation loss so that it just remains within statutory limits. The rate at which the frequency changes immediately following the generation loss is also being looked (it was noted that the initial rate of change of the GB Transmission System, after a frequency deviation, was driven by the amount of inertia on the system rather than the amount of reserve). If the fall was too rapid it may cause the operation of ROCOF relays.

The Working Group noted that the technical/engineering challenge was securing the GB Transmission System to operational standards in a summer minimum scenario i.e. generation mix predominantly wind and nuclear; minimal flexibility in managing the GB Transmission System when compared to conventional plant.

The Working Group was informed that they will be kept updated regarding the progress (which was on-going) and results of the technical analysis and of any potential implications on the transmission system.

**Action: ML**

## 5) Cost Benefit Analysis

The Working Group noted that it was important that the cost benefit analysis do not include any double accounting especially in terms of on-going costs e.g. waste removal, uranium enrichment (for nuclear power stations) and construction costs e.g. cement etc (applicable to all new builds/extensions).

## 6) Working Group Report

Members discussed and provided comments/suggestion on the draft version of the Working Group report.

It was noted that the following issues still required inclusive and/or finalising within the Working Group report:

- Due and Undue Discrimination  
SE provided discussed the contents of this section which will be provided to the Working Group when it has been finalised. **(Action: SE)**
- Technical Analysis **(Action: National Grid)**

## Summary of Meeting and Actions

---

Inclusive of the review on Plant margins which is reviewed to identify any possible implications on security of supply (even if these are formally outside the scope of the GB SQSS).

- Text Changes  
Text changes will be developed for implementation options A (2) and B. **Action: PP**
- Transition and Implementation  
The finalised position to be included in the Working Group report; pros and cons to be included for all possible options and justification/rationale for Working Group's preferred option.
- Normal Infeed Loss Risk – Change of Limit
- Cost of Carbon Source e.g. Governments, Other Advisory Body  
The Working Group acknowledged the difference prices (and associated sources) for the cost of carbon. The Working Group report will specify the cost of carbon figure utilised and the reasons behind the selection.

**Action: PP**

The Working Group noted that any proposed change to the GB SQSS had to be accompanied by a licence change request by the three Transmission Owners. This stage in the process was to be reflected in the Working Group Report.

### 7) Next Steps

- The Working Group outlined and agreed the next steps and key milestone which would ensure that the associated consultation paper (subject to approval from the GB SQSS Review Group) was issued to the industry in February 2009 (in line with the current work plan). The timeline may be viewed in Appendix 2
- Transmission Owners will provide an impact assessment on the proposed amendment which will be included in the final version of the Working Group report.  
**Action: CB, RL & PP (December 2008)**
- Associated draft legal text will be developed initially by National Grid, reviewed by the Working Group and approved by SPT and SHETL legal representatives.

**Action: National Grid (December 2008)**

### 8) Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Working Group is scheduled for 28<sup>th</sup> November 2008 via teleconference commencing at 10:00am. The aim purpose of the meeting is to discuss the findings/results from the technical analysis.

#### *Future Meetings*

- Thursday, 28<sup>th</sup> November 2008, National Grid House, Warwick (discuss findings/results from technical analysis)
- Thursday, 18<sup>th</sup> December 2008, National Grid House, Warwick (page turn Working Group report inclusive of commercial and technical analysis and associated text changes).

# Summary of Meeting and Actions

---

## Appendix 1 – Working Group Attendance

### Members Present:

Mike Lee	ML	Working Group Chairperson
Lilian Macleod	LM	Working Group Secretary
Paul Plumptre	PP	National Grid
Richard Lowe	RL	Scottish Hydro Electric Transmission
Cornel Brozio	CB	Scottish Power Transmission
Sebastian Eyre	SE	EDF Energy
James Suckley	JS	EDF Energy
Bridget Morgan	BM	Ofgem

### Apologies:

Claire Maxim	CM	E.ON
John Morris	JM	British Energy

# Summary of Meeting and Actions

---

## Appendix 2 – Work Group to Consultation Paper Timeline

11 <sup>th</sup> November 2008	Draft GSR007 Working Group Report to be discussed at GB SQSS Review Group Meeting. ⇒ Reminder to be sent out to the GB SQSS Review Group one week before meeting date.
20 <sup>th</sup> November 2008	Draft text changes circulated for comment/approval. ⇒ SPT and SHETL legal advisors to review and approval legal text by end of December 2008.
28 <sup>th</sup> November 2008	Draft Working Group report (inclusive of technical analysis). ⇒ Teleconference to discuss technical analysis and findings.
Dec '08 to Mid Jan '09	Transmission Owners to obtain relevant internal sign off of Working Group recommendations/proposals.
18 <sup>th</sup> December 2008	Review/agree/finalise content of Working Group Report.
8 <sup>th</sup> January 2009	Working Group Report and Draft Consultation paper to be submitted to GB SQSS Review Group.
15 <sup>th</sup> January 2009	Review, provide comments and approve/reject Working Group Report. Provide comment on draft consultation paper.
2 <sup>nd</sup> February 2009	Industry consultation for GSR007.
28 <sup>th</sup> February 2009	Industry consultation closes for GSR007.