

## GRID CODE COMPLIANCE WORKING GROUP

Meeting Name	Grid Code Compliance Working Group
Meeting No.	4
Date of Meeting	2 <sup>nd</sup> September 2008
Time	10:00am – 300pm
Venue	D3.1 - National Grid House, Warwick

This note outlines the key points from the fourth meeting of the Grid Code Compliance Working Group

### Members Present:

Mark Perry	MP	Chairman
Natalie Field	NF	Secretary
Steve Hoar	SH	National Grid
Helge Urdal	HU	National Grid
Bridget Morgan	BM	Ofgem
John Norbury	JN	RWE Trading
Chris Berry	CB	Scottish Power Networks
Claire Maxim	CM	Eon UK
Mick Chowms	MC	RWE Trading
Mike Kay	MK	North West Electricity
John Morris	JM	British Energy

### Apologies:

Damien McCool	DM	Scottish Power Renewables
Richard Dunn	RD	National Grid

### Introductions/Apologies for Absence

1. Apologies for absence were received from Damien McCool and Richard Dunn.
2. MP summarised the work of the group to date and stated that it was NGET's intention to focus this meeting on new items rather than revisiting previous work.
3. There was a general feeling amongst group members that it would be useful if a single draft document could be produced including all of the work to date. An accompanying note from NGET discussing comments from members that had not been taken into account would be useful.
4. In response to queries from members MP confirmed that all of the proposals made to date, with the exception of the Technical Performance proposals that have already been subject to consultation, will be circulated to the group for comment prior to agreement to consult on them being sought from the GCRP.

### Draft Minutes of the Working Group Meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2008

5. BM had some comments on the minutes that she agreed to send to NGET as soon as possible.

**Action: BM**

6. There were no comments from other members.

### Compliance Testing Process and Relationship with OC5

## GRID CODE COMPLIANCE WORKING GROUP

7. HU presented a NGET paper making proposals on the principles for incorporating Grid Code compliance testing requirements within the Grid Code and their relationship with OC5.
8. The paper proposes that the testing requirements are included as new appendices within the Connection Conditions, to which they directly relate. These tests will apply to plant first seeking to demonstrate compliance and to plant seeking to demonstrate that it is compliant following a problem in service.
9. NGET's view is that changes to OC5 should be kept to a minimum, largely to avoid the need to make significant revisions to the CUSC. This will mean that OC5 will continue to describe testing procedures but will contain references to the tests specified in the Connection Conditions.
10. JN commented that whilst he agreed that the structure of the Grid Code should be maintained as far as possible, he believed that there would be benefit in modifying OC5 so that it contained all of the requirements and processes, including the Limited Operational Notification process, applicable to plant once it had obtained its Final Operational Notification. CM had sympathy with this view but on balance supported the proposals of the paper. She suggested that OC5 could be renamed to make its purpose clearer.
11. MK supported the proposals and requested that NGET consider the impact on the Distribution Code when drafting the Grid Code text to similarly minimise the structural changes.

### **Generic Compliance for Synchronous Plant**

12. HU described NGET's view, set out in a paper, that type registration/generic compliance is not suitable for synchronous generating units.
13. MC queried whether synchronous plant was more suitable for type testing than Power Park Units due to the impact that a windfarm network will have on the contribution of Power Park Units to the overall Power Park Module performance. HU replied that significant parts of the compliance assessment of synchronous units relate to site specific parameter settings that in general remove much of the commonality of units.
14. HU noted that Eon had originally raised this issue and requested that they, or any other group member, provide proposals in any area that they thought would benefit from type registration. CM agreed to consider this further.

**Action: AII/CM**

### **Generic Compliance for Power Parks**

15. HU presented a paper setting out NGET's proposals for type registration/generic compliance of Power Park Units. The proposals allow for type registration in six areas, allowing generators to submit a reference number in place of data where the Power Park Unit has been registered.
16. In response to queries NGET clarified that the registered data would give the performance of the unit and would not be an indication of compliance with the Grid Code in any area.
17. JN and MC expressed concerns about the effect of type registration on the procurement process for generators. In particular there may be a distortion of the market if only a limited number of suppliers offer type registered units as investors place a high value on minimising risk in the performance of the plant purchased. NGET noted that type registration was open to all manufacturers and

## GRID CODE COMPLIANCE WORKING GROUP

that if it proved to be the case that those who did not type register were commercially disadvantaged they would be likely to register.

18. MC was unsure that manufacturers would see a benefit to type registration. HU commented that NGET had already seen some interest.
19. JN queried the usefulness of the process if generators continually develop plant, making the registered data invalid. NGET's view is that only time will tell.
20. JM asked whether a manufacturer could type register data as it was obtained during commissioning of a unit. HU confirmed that this would be possible.
21. JN requested clarification of the proposed confidentiality agreement between NGET and manufacturers. HU explained that they are likely to be required by manufacturers to ensure the technical know how developed by one manufacturer was not disclosed to another. CB noted that the proposals benefited DNOs, who wouldn't need to be party to any such confidentiality agreements.
22. CM was concerned that as different manufacturers are likely to register data in different areas of plant performance, it will be unclear to generators where submitted data exists and where the generator will be required to submit data. HU acknowledged the concern and suggested that where there was a lack of clarity the generator should speak to NGET for confirmation of the requirements of the generator.
23. CM also queried whether there would be an impact on week 24 data submissions as a result of the use of type registered data. Further consideration of this is needed.
24. There was a discussion on whether the proposed Grid Code text contained too much that related to the requirements on manufacturers, who are not party to the Grid Code. NGET accepted that the proposals did not place any obligations on the manufacturers and explained that the intention was to provide information to generators on the process that manufacturers will undertake in registering data. NGET believe that this will provide clarity in the area. JN acknowledged the benefit in making the information visible but suggested it may be more appropriate to put it in a guidance note. All members agreed to further consider the principle of the drafting and provide views to NGET.

### **Action: All**

25. CM noted that the proposed text did not contain definitions of some new terms. HU replied these are currently being drafted.
26. In response to a query from JN, HU explained that compliance activities are funded through revenue income from connection charges rather than as part of the application fee for a specific scheme. NGET activity associated with type registration will be also funded through revenue income. It is anticipated that these costs will be offset by consequential reductions in costs of compliance work on specific developments.

### **Simulation and Studies**

27. HU talked through an NGET paper making proposals for the inclusion of the requirement for generators to provide simulation study results as part of compliance assessment in the connection conditions.
28. JN requested that the general terminology used, which refers to studies, simulation studies and reports, be made consistent.

## GRID CODE COMPLIANCE WORKING GROUP

29. CM questioned whether it would be appropriate to maintain the details of on-load commissioning in BC2.11.2(d) or combine them with the requirements being proposed.
30. MC was concerned by the proposals requiring a model and simulation studies to demonstrate frequency control capabilities. He stated that a large amount of resource would be required to develop models sufficient for the purpose: for example a full boiler model would be required for super critical coal units. He believes that testing of the actual plant would be more appropriate. NGET agreed to consider the matter further.

**Action: NGET**

### LEEMPS drafting

31. SH described the changes proposed by NGET in respect of LEEMPS stations.
32. MK questioned the need for the defined term DCUSA and references to it in the proposals as it doesn't refer to connection agreements, although he felt it may be useful to retain it for the future.
33. JN feels that in general there are too many defined terms and too many processes. He believes that the proposals would benefit from fewer of both.
34. The NGET proposals require that whoever (NGET or a DNO) begins the compliance assessment process with a generator should complete it. MK requested that the proposals are modified to allow responsibility to be changed during the assessment. All members agreed that it would be acceptable if the generator, DNO and NGET were in agreement.
35. There were comments that in a number of places the text could inadvertently include small power stations.
36. MK noted that in several cases the text was not clear whether data and notifications went via a DNO or directly between NGET and the generator. Any such issues will need clarifying in the text.
37. CM commented on the use of both the terms DCCS and DC Converter within the proposals and queried whether this is necessary.
38. MC and JN commented on the LON proposals. They would prefer that the text did not specify that NGET would be involved in any investigation into the cause of a non-compliance. They also believed that the proposals were more restrictive than the present arrangements that allow some negotiation on OC5 testing. They agreed to provide further comments on this issue.

**Action: JN/MC**

39. The paper did not include proposals on the roles of NGET and the DNOs in the LON process for LEEMPS stations. Three options were discussed:
  - The DNO takes full responsibility for compliance once a station is operational
  - The DNO acts as an interface, passing relevant issues to NGET
  - NGET maintains a direct link with generators
40. MK preferred the second option but would consider the issue further.

**Action: MK**

## GRID CODE COMPLIANCE WORKING GROUP

41. MK queried the need for the DNO to supply NGET with information to allow the preparation of site responsibility schedules as this is done by the owner of the 132kV bar – the generator will not be embedded where NGET owns the bar.

### Next steps

42. All group members agreed to provide further comments on the papers presented at the meeting for NGET to include in the proposals.

**Action: All**

43. The draft text that has been prepared to date has resulted in a number of different versions of the Connection Conditions. Group members agreed that it would be useful for NGET to produce a single consolidated version including all of the drafts to date and taking account of comments received in the meetings and by e-mail. NGET will produce this prior to the next group meeting.

**Action: NGET**

44. MP described the further work that NGET believes is required:

- Send a Report to the Authority on the Technical Performance proposals that have been consulted on
- Produce a single consolidated version of the text to date
- Introduce new drafting for plant modifications and for testing requirements/OC5
- Complete existing proposals eg. LON process for LEEMPS, studies for DC converters
- Merge the proposals with the off-shore Grid Code proposals
- Consider changes to other documents – CUSC, DCUSA, Distribution Code
- Produce a final version of the proposals
- Prepare the working group report for submission to the February '09 GCRP
- Consult on the proposals
- Send a Report to the Authority recommending Grid Code changes

### Next meeting

45. The next meeting will be held on Monday, 3<sup>rd</sup> November