

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

Actions (brought forward and new)

Action No	Action on	Action / Outcome	Status
14/10/03 20	PH	Identify mechanism for making link to DNOs and potential changes to CUSC to cover indemnity <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this should be clearer from the redrafting of OC5</i>	Completed
14/10/03 21	PH	Establish route for testing and compliance once identified what needs to be tested <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this should be clearer from the redrafting of OC5</i>	Completed
1/12/04 34	PH	Identify at what stage data is required <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this is part of Action 12/5/04 1 & 2</i>	Completed
1/12/04 37	PH	Draft text so that individual CC clauses are listed <i>PH noted on 18/6/04 that this is outstanding – see Action 12/5/04 12</i>	Completed
1/12/04 41	AB	Clarify minimum technical design criteria with respect to CC8 and licence exempt MPS <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this has been done in the drafting and in the BC3 Paper to be discussed</i>	Completed
1/12/04 46	PH	Identify requirements for testing and compliance so as to enable DNOs to consider the impact on the D Code <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this is covered in the redrafting of OC5</i>	Completed
1/12/04 56	GN	Review initial assumptions on the Scottish issues and BETTA and changes to the GB Grid Code	On-going
12/5/04 1	CB	Produce Gantt chart of current connection process and data flows etc for Embedded MPS <i>Gantt Chart circulated and discussed at 18/6/04 Meeting</i>	Completed
12/5/04 2	PH	Annotate Gantt chart produced by CB to establish time line and process proposed by the re-drafting <i>Annotation started and discussed at 18/6/04 Meeting</i>	On-going
12/5/04 3	PH	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 <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this is covered in the note of the issues addressed in the redraft of the Grid Code</i>	Completed
12/5/04 4	PH	Establish what class of generator requires a BEGA <i>PH referred the WG to CUSC 1.3.1(b) – see New Action 18/6/04 1</i>	Completed
12/5/04 5	PH	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)). <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that aside from directly connected issues there should be no difference</i>	Completed

		<i>in obligation between those with an agreement and those without, the only difference being in how the obligations are carried out</i>	
12/5/04 6	PH	Redraft clause PC.3.2(b) to include list of obligations, as suggested by MK in his email of 28/4/04, on LEEMPS <i>PH noted on 18/6/04 that this is outstanding</i>	On-going
12/5/04 7	ALL	Inform PH if wording in square brackets should be removed from PC.4.3.1 <i>See New Action 18/6/04 2</i>	See New Action 18/6/04 2
12/5/04 8	PH	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 <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this has been addressed in the redrafting and in the note summarising the issues addressed in the redraft of the Grid Code</i>	Completed
12/5/04 9	PH	Clarify timescale by possibly inserting “on application of the connection to the DNO” in clause PC.5.2 <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this has been addressed in the redrafting</i>	Completed
12/5/04 10	PH	Clarify what clause PC.A.1.2 should be referring to as there is no “PC.4.6” <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this has been addressed in the redrafting (reference should be PC.4.4.3)</i>	Completed
12/5/04 11	ALL	Circulate any comments from PC.A.3.1.2 onwards to the WG <i>None received</i>	Completed
12/5/04 12	PH	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) <i>PH noted on 18/6/04 that this is outstanding</i>	On-going
12/5/04 13	PH	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? <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that he thought this was a CUSC issue rather than a Grid Code issue</i>	Completed
12/5/04 14	PH	Review CC.5.2 and CC.5.3 and their order and whether CC.5.2 can be modified to include CC.5.3 (MK’s email of 28/4/04) <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this has been addressed in the redrafting</i>	Completed
12/5/04 15	PH	Remove highlighting in clause CC.6.3.3 because it is a duplication	Completed
12/5/04 16	PH	Consider whether clause CC.6.3.7(f) applies to anybody and if it does, does it actually change anything <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that NGC believes it does apply to anybody who is captured by that section of the Grid Code</i>	Completed
12/5/04 17	PH	Assess request for word “reasonable” to be inserted after “NGC’s” and before “view” in clause CC.6.3.8(a) <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that NGC believes there needs to be a link back to the CUSC but not use the word “reasonable”</i>	Completed

12/5/04 18	PH	Identify backstop for NGC to notify the relevant Network Operator of the requirements (clause CC.6.3.8(a) <i>The WG's agreed solution was for the clause to refer to paragraph "x" of the CUSC instead of "6.5"</i>	On-going
12/5/04 19	PH/MK/C B/NT/CZ	Consider what the mechanism for applying obligations between the parties should be (by Schedules or serving Notices?)	On-going
12/5/04 20	PH	Consider what timescales need to be specified for the provision in clause CC.6.3.12	On-going
12/5/04 21	PH	Reconsider CC.8.1 to see if it can be clarified further regarding the issue previously discussed in Generic Provisions (ie 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) <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that this is covered in his paper on BC3/CC.8.1</i>	Completed
12/5/04 22	MK	Obtain legal advice on the use of the word "procure" in CC.A.3.1 <i>(PH advised on 18/6/04 that NGC's lawyers think it is acceptable to use "procure")</i>	On-going
12/5/04 23		Consider MK's suggested drafting change for CC.A.3.4 (email 28/4/04) <i>PH advised on 18/6/04 that MK's comments have generally been taken on board and the structure for OC5 has been amended</i>	Completed
12/5/04 24	ALL	Clarify whether need to be a BMU to despatch frequency response (NGC believes not) <i>See New Action 18/6/04 3</i>	Completed
12/5/04 25	PH	NGC to consider taking forward discussion during meeting on minimum performance at the GCRP <i>Discussed on 18/6/04 but no conclusion reached. See New Action 18/6/04 3</i>	Completed
12/5/04 26	PH	Re-draft OC5 whilst considering implications under CUSC (who does testing and liabilities etc) and clarifying who OC5 applies to <i>(see New Action 18/6/04 4)</i>	Completed
12/5/04 27	ALL	Forward any comments on OC5 to PH	On-going
18/6/04 1	ALL	Review CUSC 1.3.1(b) and whether it answers the question as to what class of generator requires a BEGA (cross ref to Action 12/5/04 4)	New
18/6/04 2	PH	Clarify what data is needed in the square brackets of PC.4.3.1 which is not being obtained through the Grid Code	New
18/6/04 3	PH	NGC to consider a paper to GCRP on limited frequency sensitive mode	New
18/6/04 4	PH	Re-draft OC5 to include obligations for testing mentioned in BC2.10.2(c) and BC.2.10.3	New
18/6/04 5	SN	Revise swim lane diagram to accurately reflect what would happen if the embedded generator triggered infrastructure works	New
18/6/04 6	PH	Include on swim lane diagram what OC5 is to achieve	New
18/6/04 7	SN	Clarify what data NGC requires at Tasks 3 and 10 of the Gantt chart	New
18/6/04 8	DNOs	Identify changes required to DNOs pro forma connection offer	New
18/6/04 9	NGC	Determine what is the position on who pays for testing/operating the agreement	New

18/6/04 10	PH	Insert the words “BM Unit” before “Generating Unit or CCGT Module...” in the heading to the table in OC5.5.3	New
18/6/04 11	ALL	Email any comments on PC to PH	New
18/6/04 13	PH	Capitalise the “p” in “prior” in CC5.2.1 and CC5.2.2	New
18/6/04 14	DNOs	Review and redraft DOC5 and DPC7	New
18/6/04 15	NGC	Consider and report back on whether the GC changes lead to a consequential CUSC modification or the other way round	New