

Grid Code Generic Provisions Working Group

Notes of 3rd meeting held at Brandon Hall, Coventry
9th January 2003

Present

<u>Name</u>		<u>Company</u>
David Payne	(DP)	National Grid (Chairman)
Nasser Tleis	(NT)	National Grid
Steve Mortimer	(SM)	National Grid
Mark Horley	(MH)	National Grid
Mike Thorne	(MT)	National Grid
Peter Lang	(PL)	Seeboard
John Norbury	(JN)	Innogy
Ham Hamza	(HH)	Innogy
John France	(JF)	Powergen
Paul Newton	(PN)	PowerTech
John Morris	(JM)	British Energy
Charlie Zhang	(CZ)	London Power Company
James Glennie	(JG)	BWEA
Hamish Dallachy	(HD)	Scottish Power
Elaine Grieg	(EG)	AMEC
Bridget Morgan	(BM)	Ofgem (Observer)

Apologies for Absence

Gareth Swales	(GS)	Electricity Direct
Dave Ward	(DW)	Magnox
Francois Boulet	(FB)	RTE

1. DP welcomed Bridget Morgan (Ofgem observer) and Paul Newton (PowerGen adviser) to the meeting.
2. DP opened the meeting by thanking group members for their comments on the draft provisions for Medium and Large Power Stations which were circulated after the last meeting. However some of the comments had related to commercial arrangements and connection policy and DP reiterated that the purpose of the GPWG was to consider technical provisions to be included in the Grid Code to cover all types of plant and catering for any technology that may arise. Given the need to introduce provisions to the Grid Code by the end of 2003 and the limited time available to the group to consider the technical issues, it would be better for any commercial or policy issues to be considered as National Grid business and the subject of separate discussions.
3. JN requested clarification that NGC was effectively saying that it did not wish to discuss the technical requirements that it was currently seeking to impose on wind farms, either via a bilateral agreement or licence exemption requirement. Group members generally expressed concern at this approach and felt that all the issues were linked. They also felt that related discussions with Ofgem/DTI were within the remit of the group although it was recognised that the group could not seek to influence those discussions. With respect to

interim requirements becoming a condition of licence exemption for Medium Power Stations EG stated that National Grid's view outlined in para 7 of the last minutes did not coincide with the DTI's view. DP suggested that EG take this up separately with the DTI. NT stated that bilateral discussions with the dti do not fall within the remit of this WG. Also, National Grid understands that the dti will consult on the proposed draft minimum technical requirements for medium power stations and this will give the opportunity for all interested parties to comment and for issues to be discussed.

NT/SM pointed out that the documents had been prepared as a guide to the requirements for those windfarms seeking a connection until provisions could be included in the Grid Code. With respect to the GPWG the requirements were intended as a starting point for Grid Code provisions.

Actions from Last Meeting

5. **Action 2/1** - SM stated that there had been limited contact with manufacturers although the 'interim documents' had been circulated to BWEA members. However, limited assessment had been made as to whether obligations would be technically or commercially feasible. JG believed that the obligations were achievable but at a cost.
6. **Action 2/2** – NT stated that a revised draft of obligations for submission to the DTI was in preparation and would be circulated to the group.

Action 3/1 – NT/DP

7. The revised draft proposed a staged implementation of some proposals. NT also pointed out that National Grid was communicating with manufacturers to understand existing technology and also to ensure that manufacturers and developers are aware of Transmission System requirements through discussion on provisions. EG felt there was a need to ensure that Grid Code obligations were constructed around actual system requirements rather than on the capability of existing plant.
8. JN expressed the view that Grid Code CC.6.3.1 specifically excluded renewable generators irrespective of size from the requirements of CC6.3, although this was not National Grid's view. He also pointed out that it would not make any sense to require licence exempt generating units to install a frequency response capability whilst no provisions existed for the response to be instructed and paid for. National Grid was aware of this issue which was currently under consideration.
9. CZ stated once again that he felt there was no need to place a frequency response requirement on medium windfarms as it is possible that these will replace nuclear plant and not cause deterioration to the overall position. NT stated that this issue was not for the working group to discuss but the draft provisions indicated that frequency response would only be required from plant signing connection agreements after July 2003. JN pointed out that the point of financial commitment for embedded generators would be when the developer signs up with DNO, which was usually at the start of the process. Consequently, the DNO connection agreement may not be signed until just prior to synchronisation. In contrast, National Grid required a Connection agreement to be signed at the start of the process.

10. CZ also felt that it was not sensible to argue for the same provisions for all types of plant.
11. All other actions from the last meeting had been completed.

Statement on SGCRP proposals relating to windfarms.

12. For information BM made a brief statement stating that Ofgem welcomed any input or further clarification from interested parties, in particular those with sustained objections. Guy Nicolson had offered to collate all views from the windfarm community.

Proposed Workplan

13. Using the chart that had been circulated with the meeting agenda DP explained how it was proposed to meet the tight timescales for introducing provisions into the Grid Code. The aim would be to identify provisions for all relevant areas of the Grid Code including definitions and then prepare a final report with proposed Grid Code changes for the May GCRP meeting. A further two working group meetings prior to the May GCRP were already scheduled to discuss proposals with the possibility of a third. A formal industry consultation would then be initiated with the expectation of sending the Final Report to the Authority in early September 2003.
14. EG felt that the timetable as proposed was at risk as developers objected to the principles of allocating technical obligations to medium windfarms without determining transmission system needs. However it was accepted that there was a need for obligations on large windfarms. EG also felt that there was no need for technical obligations on windfarms if a future frequency response market was to be developed. CZ pointed out that Ofgem had not approved BSC Modification P36 although it supported development of a frequency response market.
15. JF stated that group members must be allowed to comment in more detail on the proposals and also BWEA must undertake to provide the views of its members.

Initial thoughts on Generic Provisions

16. DP stressed that the proposed Connection Conditions and Definitions (circulated with the meeting agenda) were at a very early stage of drafting and were presented to generate discussion within the group. It was appreciated that working group members would need time to consider the proposed provisions in addition to the discussion at this meeting
17. MH explained that the approach had been to consider the existing Grid Code Connection Conditions (which are clearly intended to cover synchronous units) and attempt to apply them to non synchronous units, changing specific references and terminology where appropriate. Definitions of Generating Unit, DC Converter, Non Synchronous Generating Unit and Renewable had also been considered to aid the process.
18. The proposals were considered on a point by point basis at the meeting and the following main points raised:

- Definitions – Is there a need for a separate Non Synchronous Generator definition? Consider extension of definition of Generating Unit to include Non Synchronous and DC Converter but avoiding technology specific terms if possible.
- Grandfathering – National Grid believes there is a need to ensure that existing generation is not adversely affected by inclusion of new provisions.
- CC.6.3.1 – Group view that this clause could be removed given that specific provisions for renewable generation are now being developed.
- CC.6.3.2 – Group view that +/- 0.9 pf at the point of connection would be slightly more onerous than 0.85 lagging to 0.95 leading at the generator terminals. Following substantial discussion National Grid agreed to further assess the pf range and share the results with the working group.

Action 3/2 – MH

DP undertook to circulate the final report of the Reactive Power working group for information.

Action 3/3 – DP

19. In view of the tight timescales DP asked group members to provide comments by 17 Jan 2003 so that progress could be made with other parts of the Grid Code.

Action 3/4 - All

Any Other Business

- 20 With respect to considering other parts of the Grid Code DP asked working group members to consider the existing Grid Code and suggest areas that need new provisions to cover Generic generation.

Action 3/5 - All

Date of Next Meeting

- 21 Next meeting will be on **21st February 2003** at Brandon Hall, Coventry starting at 10.30.

Summary of Actions

No.	Name	Action
3/1	NT/DP	Circulate draft requirements document
3/2	MH	Reassess power factor ranges
3/3	DP	Circulate Reactive Power Working Group Report
3/4	All	Provide comments on proposed definitions and Connection Conditions
3/5	All	Provide views on other areas of Grid Code requiring generic provisions