

CAP149 Working Group

Meeting Name	CAP149 Working Group
Meeting No.	Four
Date of Meeting	4 th September 2007
Time	10.00 – 15.00
Venue	Lakeside House, Northampton

1. Introductions/Apologies for Absence

The following working group members were unable to attend the meeting: Garth Graham, John Morris, Alec Morrison, Merel Kolschoten, Stephen Ayre and Emma Carr.

2. Re-cap from 23rd August Meeting

TD recapped the meeting on the 23rd August.

3. Actions

Confirm how TRAs work with BELLAs

- Users with BELLAs don't have TRAs so the proposed amendment can not be extended to BELLAs.

Find out how the SO sets the MEL for multiple users in outage conditions?

- National Grid is obliged to minimise the restriction on users. They try to give the user flexibility, if one user is on outage the other user would not need to MEL down. If both power stations are owned by the same company they get a shared MEL.
- Many cases are single circuit connections so both users would either have all their capacity or none of it.
- There are currently few cases where two power stations have different owners behind a constraint.
- If both power stations are operational the level of MEL is pro rated to a level stated in the connection agreement. The group considered if this was efficient. Cascade hydro power stations can use their operational flexibility under a shared contract. This is more efficient. Other users do not have this flexibility. The group could not think of a solution to apply this flexibility to a constraint with more than one user behind it.
- BR suggested the user should be notified of the outage and given instruction of what to do even if the do not have to MEL down.
- It was considered that previously the group had been loose with their terminology. In some situations the term TRAs has been used but they were referring to restricted BCAs.

Clarify whether “design variations” are non-standard designs or non-compliant designs

- Design variations are non compliant designs.
- Some users have above the design standard but these design variations do not have restricted BCAs. This amendment applies only to design variations below the GBSQSS requirements. This should be made clear in the report.

Check OC2 notification requirements

Action TI: Email OC2 requirements to Working Group Members

Action SH: Email Tony Tom's TRA presentation

4. Review of Amended Legal Text

AML presented the amended legal text, the following points were raised:

- To help make the Working Group Report clearer only the alternative legal text should be included in the report
- Is 2.13.7 relevant? This point directly refers to charging which will be covered through the charging methodology and not the CUSC. AML argued that giving the user an idea of the charge and the restriction would help them balance their risk. NG could not guarantee the information they provided was correct so it wouldn't have any value. Providing specific information would come at a financial cost.

It was considered that advising users of the location of charging information through the connection agreement would be more appropriate. Users should be able to request a best guess of availability but it must be clear that this must be paid for and is not legally binding.

Action TI: Look at what the licence says about informing users of charges

Action AML: Amend 2.13.7 appropriately

- BR would like to see a minimum time of notification before a planned outage specified in the legal text.

Action AML: Amend section 10 appropriately considering the Grid Code requirements

5. Applicability for Offshore/Island Generators

As there will be a lower security standard for offshore specified in the GBSQSS offshore connections with less redundancy than the onshore standards will be compliant with the offshore GBSQSS. CAP 149 could be applied to offshore by changing the definition of design variation to specifically include offshore. This would make it easy to include offshore at an appropriate time.

The current drafting covers connections to islands and these connections could be eligible for CAP149 arrangements.

6. Candidates for any Working Group Alternatives

The new legal drafting will form the basis of a working group amendment.

BR would like to see 10.10.2 removed. This was not considered as an alternative amendment but should be mentioned in the report

DS suggested another alternative could include a different method (other than pro rata) for sharing remaining capacity under outage conditions. This too was not considered as an alternative amendment but should be mentioned in the report.

The group also considered if there should be provision of information about TRAs.

CAP149 Working Group

7. Implementation Issues

It was considered that users with existing agreements could choose to have a standard agreement.

TI suggested that it would not be difficult to change all existing agreements to the new standardised form and this could be completed in less than six months. This would mean all agreements were standardised and would avoid any legacy issues.

Action TI: Find out if National Grid would prefer to standardise existing agreements

8. Future Meeting Dates

The meeting on the 12th September has been cancelled. The final meeting will be held on 17th September. This meeting will be at the National Grid offices in Northampton.

Action TD: Email draft report to Working Group before Friday 14th September.

Appendix 1 – Working Group Attendance

Members Present:

Tony Diccio	TD	Chairman
Paul Jones	PJ	E.ON
Aileen McLeod	AML	Scottish and Southern
James Anderson	JA	Scottish Power
David Scott	DS	EDF
Tom Ireland	TI	National Grid
Bill Reed	BR	RWE
Karron Baker	KB	Ofgem
Robert Longden	RL	Airtricity (Phone)
Sarah Hall	SH	Technical Secretary

Apologies:

Emma Carr	EC	National Grid
Garth Graham	GG	Scottish and Southern
John Morris	JM	British Energy
Alec Morrison	AM	Scottish and Southern
Steven Ayre	SA	British Energy
Merel Van der Neut Kolfshoten	MK	Centrica