

## Minutes

<b>Meeting name</b>	Frequency Response Workgroup
<b>Meeting number</b>	20
<b>Date of meeting</b>	05 <sup>th</sup> April 2012
<b>Time</b>	1:00pm – 5:00pm
<b>Location</b>	National Grid House, Warwick, CV34 6DA

## Attendees

<b>Name</b>	<b>Initials</b>	<b>Company</b>
Ian Pashley	IP	Chair
Robyn Jenkins	RJ	Technical Secretary
Eleanor Brogden	EB	National Grid
Thomas Derry	TD	National Grid
Graham Stein	GS	National Grid
Andy Walden	AW	National Grid
Simon Lord	SL	FHC
John Costa	JC	EDF
Bob Nicholls	BN	EON
Chris Hastings	CH	SSE

## Apologies

<b>Name</b>	<b>Initials</b>	<b>Company</b>
Mike Murphy	MM	SP Power Systems
Guy Phillips	GP	EON
Joe Warren	JW	RLtec
Ian Nicholas	IN	National Grid
Mick Chowns	MC	RWE
Katie Bloor	KB	RLtec
Guy Phillips	GP	EON
Raoul Thulin	RT	RWE

## 1 Introductions and Apologies for Absence

1. Apologies were received from Mick Chowns (RWE), Raoul Thulin (RWE), Mike Murphy (SP Power Systems), Guy Phillips (EON), Katie Bloor (RLtec) and Joe Warren (RLtec).

## 2 Minutes from previous meeting

2. The draft minutes of the Grid Code/BSSG Frequency Response Working Group meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2012 were approved and will be made available on the National Grid Website.

## 3 Review of Actions

3. The Workgroup noted that all the actions from meeting 19 held on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2012 have been completed.

## 4 Discuss Draft Frequency Response Consultation Document

4. The Workgroup reviewed the comments SL provided on the consultation, following the action taken from meeting 19. A key point from these comments was that the difference between Frequency Response capability and delivery was not explicit enough and this needs to be reflected in the Workgroup Consultation.
5. SL questioned if, under any of the market options, different types of plant should have different capability requirements and suggested that the Workgroup Consultation should include a question on this. It was also suggested that a cost benefit analysis for each type of plant would be useful and the Workgroup Consultation could seek some views from different technology types on the cost impacts that different levels of Frequency Response capability would have on the User
6. SL suggested that all plant should have an aspiration to comply with the current Grid Code obligation (10% primary, 10% secondary, 10% high), but where it cannot be achieved then there should be a methodology to deal with it. IP noted that this is similar to the derogation process and assumes that this would be a separate process contained within the Grid Code.
7. The Workgroup discussed how the capability of different technology types should be determined and whether a process could be put in place utilising an independent engineer to assess the Frequency Response capability for each plant type.
8. The Workgroup questioned whether the current Grid Code requirements are fit for purpose, or whether it would be more appropriate to have plant capability based on their technical capability and then have some other mechanism to make up any shortfall.
9. It was noted that this discussion regarding specific technology types providing based on their technical ability had been undertaken by the Workgroup previously but it could be expanded within the Workgroup Consultation following the discussion today.
10. Prior to the meeting the updated Draft Frequency Response document had been circulated to all Workgroup members. GS commented that the output from the technical subgroup should be included in an appendix of the report and the discussions around the market issues should be captured. SL: requested that the consultation ask whether it is possible for wind to deliver the 10% obligation but in 5 seconds, and the costs associated.

**Action: National Grid (TD)**

11. The Workgroup discussed the inclusion of demand side Frequency Response. CH said that the issue with the Grid Code is that because it is aimed at generators, demand side is not included. BN questioned whether smart grids would help alleviate the problems in the future, something that is only mentioned once in the report.
12. The Workgroup concluded by discussing the possibility of an obligation on capability but with capability payments for those who cannot reach the levels set out in the code.
13. The Workgroup also requested clarification on Firm Frequency Response and how this differs to the area the Workgroup is looking at.

**Action: National Grid (EB/AW)**

## **6 Next Steps**

14. **ACTION: TD** Update the Workgroup Consultation based on the discussions held today and circulate to the Workgroup for review and comment ahead of the next meeting.
15. The Workgroup agreed to schedule a further meeting in a month's time.
16. **ACTION: RJ** Arrange next Workgroup meeting and circulate invite