

## The National Grid Company plc

**Minutes of the  
Grid Code Review Panel  
National Grid House, Coventry  
6<sup>th</sup> February 2003**

**Members/Alternates**

Andy Balkwill (AB) ) (Chair)  
 David Payne (DP) ) (Secretary)  
 Patrick Hynes (PH) )  
 Nasser Tleis (NT) ) National Grid  
 John Greasley (JG) )

Mike Kay (MK) )  
 Jeff Hunt (JH) ) Network Operators

Bridget Morgan (BM) OFGEM

John Norbury (JN) ) Generators with Large  
 John Morris (JM) ) Power Stations with  
 John France (JF) ) total Reg. Cap.> 5GW

Emra Cevick (EC) BSC Panel (Alternate)

**Advisors/Observers**

Robert Lane (RL) CMK  
 Ben Graff (BG) NGC

Charlie Zhang (CZ) LPC

**1 APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS**

1381 DP explained that under the Grid Code Constitution and Rules Panel members were required to retire at the start of the February meeting and then be re-appointed as appropriate. A letter had been sent to existing GCRP members in December 2002 asking for nominations by the end of January 2003. Most existing members had confirmed their continuing membership with the following exceptions:

- John Morris replaced Graham Trott (Generators with Large Power Stations with total Registered Capacity >5GW)
- Jeff Hunt replaced David Gilliland (DNO's)

**2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1382 Apologies were received from:

- Edgar Goddard (National Grid, represented by AB)
- Mike Calviou (National Grid, represented by JG)
- Chris Rowell (BSC Panel - represented by EC)
- Dave Ward (Generators with Large Power Stations totalling <5GW)
- Malcolm Taylor (Generators without Large Power Stations)
- Ian Gray (DNOs)
- Francois Boulet and David Nicol (EISO representative and alternate)
- Brian Sequeira (Suppliers).
- No representative for Non Embedded Customers had been identified.

**3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (011121drpm.doc)**

1383 Minute 1348 – AB pointed out a minor typographical error.

1384 The minutes were otherwise agreed as a true record of the previous meeting.

#### 4 MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING (not covered below)

##### 4.1 Summary of actions (GCRP 03/01)

1385 Action 1310 – Grid Code Governance Issues. No comments had been received and the action was considered as completed although AB pointed out the GCRP members could raise issues as appropriate.

1386 Action 1371 – Grid Code website update. This action was ongoing.

1387 Action 1322 – Intertripping. PH stated that it was understood that paper GCRP 02/27 did not cover the whole range of intertrips. However following internal discussion it was not clear what should be included in the Grid Code other than what was already covered. Although PH agreed that common technical requirements for intertrips should be included there seemed to be no convincing argument that the Grid Code was the appropriate document to identify the need for specific intertrips.

1388 JN explained that generators view the provision of an intertrip as an optional service provided to National Grid and would wish to see the circumstances set out in the Grid Code that would require an intertrip to be installed and provided as a mandatory service included under a Bilateral Connection Agreement.

1389 JF commented that much of the older 500MW plant had been fitted with intertrip facilities but were never armed prior to NETA. Since the implementation of NETA there was a significant risk of arming such intertrips and JF felt that for older plant this should be viewed as a service. For new plant intertrips were installed to enable the plant to come on line early. NT pointed out that intertrips were never used as a means of permanently avoiding infrastructure reinforcement. If used to facilitate early connection they would be subject to time limited derogations. There was also the option for the generator to discuss the removal of an intertrip with National Grid with recourse to the Authority if necessary.

1390 MK stated that the issue of intertripping was being considered by DNOs and requested that an update paper be prepared as soon as possible.

1391 AB concluded that National Grid would take the action forward to update paper GCRP 02/27. Although it was felt that technical issues should be dealt with in the Grid Code, the Grid Code was not appropriate for the detailing the reasons for specifying intertrips at specific sites.

1392 **Action:** *National Grid to update paper GCRP 02/27 as soon as possible.*

1393 All other actions were either complete, ongoing or the subject of later agenda items.

1394 There were no other Matters Arising identified.

## 5. GRID CODE DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (GCRP 03/02)

### 5.1 Report On Progress Of Consultation Papers (GCRP 03/02 Table 1)

- 1395 D/01 – Provisions relating to Embedded Large Power Stations. The Authority continued to consider the report.
- 1396 A/02 – Implications to Grid Code of CUSC Amendment to clarify CUSC 6.5.1. The Authority was currently considering the report.
- 1397 D/02 – Proposed changes to GRID Code OC5. Implemented as Revision 9 on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2002.
- 1398 E/02 – Proposed changes to Grid Code OC8. A number of responses had been received disagreeing with the proposed changes. National Grid had replied to these responses and most issues resolved. One respondent needed further clarification.
- 1399 F/02 – Proposed changes to Grid Code BC2 associated with BSC Mod Proposal P87. Report now with Authority.
- 1400 G/02 – Clarification of Phase Unbalance term and change of company name. Report now with Authority.

### 5.2 Other Issues

- 1401 DP explained that Table 2 of the paper was being developed as a means of ensuring that outstanding issues are recorded and progressed as appropriate. Panel members felt that the format was useful. AB suggested that a further development could be to cover this information in a general progress report. Views on this were informally invited from panel members.

## 6 PROGRESS ON CURRENT GRID CODE MODIFICATION PROPOSALS

### 6.1 Generic Provisions Working Group GPWG (GCRP 03/03)

- 1402 DP gave a brief report on the progress of the GPWG. Proposed Connection Conditions and Definitions had been considered at the last meeting and further development in these areas was being considered. Other areas of the Grid Code were now also being considered. A final report to the GCRP was expected to be prepared for the May GCRP meeting followed by formal industry consultation on any proposed Grid Code changes.
- 1403 JN felt it was important for GCRP members to note that current DTI licence exemptions discussions were not the subject of discussion at the GPWG but were the subject of separate discussions. NT explained that the GPWG had been copied the draft exemption conditions for information. The conditions were designed to fill a current need for short term requirements. The GPWG was considering Grid Code provisions to be introduced in the medium to long term and this work needed to be progressed and concluded as soon as possible.

- 1404 BM stated that the DTI was considering licence exemption orders which would be the subject of public consultation and it should not be assumed that the proposed conditions would automatically be included in licence exemption orders.
- 1405 MK expressed concern that the draft interim requirements being discussed with the DTI included a statement that DNOs would be expected to confirm compliance with the requirements. NT stated that the most recent draft did not contain this requirement but the issue was not one for the GCRP to discuss.

#### **6.2 CC.6.3.3 Working Group (GCRP 03/04)**

- 1406 NT explained that there had been some limited progress since the last GCRP meeting. Discussions with the working group were ongoing and the draft final report had been updated although further updating would be required. It was still expected to present the final report to the May GCRP meeting

#### **6.3 Embedded Power Station Working Group Update (GCRP 03/05)**

- 1407 The paper provided a short status report from the working group. The paper noted that a joint meeting had been held on 2 December 2002 between the working group and the Distributed Generation Technical Steering Group Workstream2 – Rationalisation and Standardisation of Data Exchange group. A further joint meeting had originally been planned for 7<sup>th</sup> February but this had now been postponed to an unspecified date.
- 1408 JN asked whether the joint approach would continue and how the work of this group tied in with the Governance of Electrical Standards and the Distribution Code. MK explained that there was ongoing work to consider data exchange processes between DNOs and generators. This work was substantially complete and a consultation was expected to be initiated following the February DCRP meeting.
- 1409 MK also explained that there was no joint working group and the work of each group would continue separately until the need for joint work was identified. The joint meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> December had agreed that the issues being considered by each group were not in conflict.

#### **6.4 Grid Code Modifications consequent on BSC Mod Proposal P80 (GCRP 03/06)**

- 1410 PH explained that the paper included a proposed consultation paper related to Grid Code changes required as a consequence of BSC Mod Proposal P80. PH stated that the Grid Code changes were required in order to ensure that the P80 modifications were effective and any issues related to the P80 modification should be addressed through the BSC. GCRP members were asked for any comments or any reasons why the Grid Code consultation should not now go ahead.
- 1411 JN pointed out that P80 does not state at what point a System Fault affected Period would be declared whereas the Grid Code change appeared to require that it would be declared at the time of an incident. JN felt that the proposed Grid Code changes would be unworkable and possibly undermine the rationale behind Mod Proposal P80.

1412 AB invited PH and JN to address the text issues separately with the aim of preparing a revised Consultation paper for circulation to the GCRP for comment.

1413 **Action:** *PH and JN to discuss content of a revised Consultation paper.*

1414 BM pointed out that the Authority could not make any decisions on P80 until the outcome of the Grid Code consultation had been received. The further consideration identified at this GCRP meeting could have an impact on the timing of P80 implementation.

## **7 OTHER GRID CODE RELATED ISSUES**

### **7.1 Governance of Electrical Standards (03/07)**

1415 BG provided an update on progress with this issue. A joint working group meeting between the E&W GCRP, Scottish GCRP and GB Dcode had taken place on 20 December 2002. BG, JN and MK attended the joint group meeting. Further joint meetings were being arranged to take this work forward. A tendering meeting was to be held on Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> February to consider the appointment of a consultant to carry out the associated detailed work. Any decision on the appointment of a consultant would need to be ratified by the joint group. The next joint meeting was scheduled for 18<sup>th</sup> February 2002 and it was expected that the appointed consultant would attend that meeting.

1416 BG explained that following appointment, the consultant would have the task of preparing a final report for presentation to the three Review Panels. The Panels would then decide how to implement any recommendations. It was expected that for the E&W Grid Code a working group would be established. A nomination for this working group had already been received from JF. Further nominations would be requested at an appropriate point.

1417 MK stated that the most contentious issue would be related to the issue of which documents should be included in the scope of the arrangements and the appointed consultant would be required to focus on this issue. MK also felt that the Ofgem timescales for implementation of the arrangements were optimistic, but that good progress was nevertheless being made. BM stated that Ofgem would need to be informed of any expected delay to implementation as early as possible in order for Ofgem to be assured that any delays were occurring for genuine reasons.

1418 BG stated that GCRP members would be kept informed on the appointment of the consultant and a further report on progress would be provided at the May GCRP meeting.

1419 **Action:** *BG to inform GCRP members on the appointment of a consultant. BG to provide further report to the May GCRP meeting.*

## **8 BSC/CUSC MODIFICATION PROPOSALS (GCRP 03/08)**

1420 Update on modification proposals which may have an impact on the Grid Code:

1421 BSC Modification Proposals  
P80 – This had been discussed under an earlier Agenda item.

1422 CUSC Amendment Proposals

CAP043 – A decision by the Authority was expected shortly. If the decision was positive a Grid Code Consultation paper would be prepared and circulated to GCRP members for comment. This would propose a minor change to the Grid Code as a consequence of the introduction of new terms TEC and CEC.

## 9 REPORT FROM SCOTTISH GCRP

1423 JH stated that a Scottish Grid Code consultation on windfarm connection issues was now complete and available from the ScottishPower website.

1424 JH also indicated that Scottish and Southern and ScottishPower were undertaking a review of the Scottish Grid Code Data Registration Codes in order to harmonise requirements.

## 10 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

### Transmission Planning and Operational Standards Under BETTA

1425 BM explained that this paper (circulated with the GCRP papers) had been provided for information and set out Ofgems view on matters. BM stated that Ofgem would soon be consulting on the associated issues.

### Generic Provisions Working Group

1426 CZ asked whether the GCRP should direct the GPWG on three issues:

- 1) Should all plant be treated in the same way;
- 2) Should all plant including windfarms be expected to provide frequency response;
- 3) Is it necessary for new conditions to include all types of technology at this stage, even those not expected to materialise on a large scale in the near future (e.g. tidal power).

1427 With respect to issue (1) NT stated that this was an issue that would be discussed by the GPWG but there was an obligation on National Grid to ensure there was no undue discrimination. However it was recognised that conditions could not be applied to all types of technology in the same way. RL pointed out that the current Grid Code did indeed recognise the differences between different types of plant.

1428 With respect to issue (2) NT stated that the GPWG would be considering the issue of frequency response and the outcome of discussions would be included in the final report to the GCRP. CZ felt that the GPWG was concentrating on how to incorporate frequency response rather than whether it should be applied to particular plant. NT/AB also pointed out the frequency response market issues were the subject of discussions in the CUSC Balancing Services Standing Group.

1429 AB stated that with respect to issue (3) National Grid had an obligation to keep the Grid Code under review at all times. The GPWG had been implemented because it had been recognised that a review of the provisions for new types of technology was required.

1430 Taking into account the above statements it was generally agreed that it was not appropriate for the GCRP to direct the GPWG on these issues.

**11 DATE, TIME & VENUE OF NEXT MEETING**

1431 Thursday **22<sup>nd</sup> May 2003**, starting at **10:30 am**, at National Grid House