

# Summary of Meeting and Actions

---

Meeting Name	GSR007 Working Group
Meeting No.	4
Date of Meeting	Thursday, 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2008
Time	10:30am – 2:00pm
Venue	EDF Energy Offices', 80 Victoria Street, London

---

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

## 1) Review of Minutes

The Working Group reviewed and agreed the minutes from the last Working Group meeting (8<sup>th</sup> August 2008) which will be published on the GB SQSS website.

## 2) Normal Infeed Loss Risk

The Working Group discussed whether the normal infeed loss risk (currently set at 1000MW) should be altered and the implication of any proposed change. The Working Group identified and discussed three potential options:

- 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.

The Working Group noted that National Grid (in their role of GB System Operator) will further investigate the issues and provide an update to the Working Group.

**Action: PP**

The Working Group noted that the GB SQSS (Chapter 2) covers transmission connection risk; the associated generational connection risk was outside the scope of standard. The Working Group agreed that it was not necessary to raise the issue of generation connection risk at the Grid Code Review Panel.

## 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

# Summary of Meeting and Actions

---

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.

The Working Group agreed that this was an important issue which required detailed discussion. The initial preference of members was for Option A(2) but acknowledged that Option B also required careful consideration.

The Working Group agreed that it would be useful, if the Working Group report outlined all possible options listing the pros and cons of each option.

**Action: PP**

## 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 studies only consider the primary response requirements. Initial results show that the system frequency drop can be maintained by extra response holding that is an increase in the largest single loss will not impact on system security but will affect frequency response market costs.

The rate at which the frequency changes immediately following the generation loss is also being looked at. If the fall is too rapid it may cause the operation of ROCOF relays. Typically these relays are set in the range 0.5 – 1Hz/sec. First indications are that the rate of change resulting from an 1800MW loss is lower than 0.5 Hz/Sec. The initial studies have not considered future networks will potentially large amounts of wind generation and new technologies such as supercritical coal units. Such scenarios will need to be studied as they reflect the background into which larger sets will be introduced and in which transmission system performance may be different.

The Working Group noted that ROCOF relay settings were of special importance given the 27<sup>th</sup> May 2008 events.

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

**Action: ML**

Plant margins will also be reviewed such that any possible implications on security of supply may be identified (even if these are formally outside the scope of the GB SQSS).

**Action: CB & PP**

## 5) Working Group Report

Members discussed the draft version of the Working Group report. Any comments on the format and content are to be forwarded to PP by 8<sup>th</sup> October 2008.

**Action: All**

The Working Group noted that in accordance with the governance provisions the proposed amendment was to be assessed against the GB SQSS Review Group principles. It was noted that the three main discussion streams could be aligned against the review group principles:

## Summary of Meeting and Actions

---

- Development, maintenance and operation of an efficient, economical and coordinated system of electricity transmission; (*Economic and Environment Cost Benefit Analysis*)
- Ensure an appropriate level of security and quality of supply and safe operation of the GB Transmission System; and (*Technical Analysis*)
- Facilitating effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity. (*Due and Undue Discrimination*)

SE will provide wording for inclusion in the Working Group report regarding due and undue discrimination.

**Action: SE**

### 6) Next Steps

- 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**

- 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 & ML**

- 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)**

- The House of Lords ruling regarding judicial review for BSC Proposals 198 and 203 will be examined to see if the decision could provide any advice regarding the nature and scope of such a formal court review.

**Action: SE & JS**

### 7) Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Working Group is scheduled for 9<sup>th</sup> October 2008 via teleconference commencing at 10:00am. The aim purpose of the meeting is to discuss the latest draft of the Working Group report in preparation of its submission to the GB SQSS Review Group (update only).

#### *Future Meetings*

- Thursday, 28<sup>th</sup> October 2008, National Grid House, Warwick (discuss findings/results from technical analysis)
- Thursday, 27<sup>th</sup> November 2008, National Grid House, Warwick

# 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
Claire Maxim	CM	E.ON
John Morris	JM	British Energy
Sebastian Eyre	SE	EDF Energy
Paul Mott	PM	EDF Energy
James Suckley	JS	EDF Energy

### Apologies:

Bridget Morgan	BM	Ofgem
----------------	----	-------