

## Minutes

<b>Meeting name</b>	GC0048: Joint GCRP/DCRP Workgroup on National Application of RfG
<b>Meeting number</b>	14
<b>Date of meeting</b>	28 October 2015
<b>Time</b>	10.00 – 15:00
<b>Location</b>	<b>National Grid House, Warwick Technology Park, Gallows Hill, Warwick, CV34 6DA</b>

## Attendees

<b>AC</b>	Alan Creighton	Northern Powergrid
<b>AD</b>	Amir Dahresobh,	Nordex
<b>AF</b>	Alastair Frew	Scottish Power
<b>AJ</b>	Antony Johnson	NGET
<b>AV</b>	Andy Vaudin	EDF
<b>CR</b>	Celine Reddin	NGET
<b>CW</b>	Chris Whitworth	AMPS
<b>GG</b>	Garth Graham	SSE
<b>HH</b>	Honor Hynes	NGET Tech Secretary
<b>JD</b>	Joe Duddy	RES
<b>JN</b>	John Norbury	RWE
<b>JR</b>	Julian Rudd	DECC
<b>MB</b>	Mick Barlow	S&C
<b>MK</b>	Mike Kay	ENA
<b>PG</b>	Paul Graham	UK Power Reserve
<b>PJ</b>	Philip Jenner	Horizon
<b>SM</b>	Steve Mockford	UKPN
<b>SP</b>	Stephen Perry	Ofgem
<b>RJW</b>	Richard Woodward	NGET
<b>RW</b>	Rob Wilson	NGET – Chair

## 1 Introductions

IP

RW welcomed attendees to the workgroup and outlined the main objective for the meeting to move banding thresholds forward by identifying which banding options to take forward as part of the workgroup report.

## 2 Stakeholder Representation

IP

RW raised the standing agenda item on effective representation, particularly from manufacturers and smaller parties.

RJW had attended a Solar Event at the NEC where he had met SMA, ABB and BPVA among others. RW requested that anyone not represented be encouraged to get involved.

SP suggested consumer representation such as Citizen's Advice Bureau would be useful. RW commented that CAB were already on the JESG mailing list and NGET were actively building a relationship.

Regarding Scottish TO involvement, NGET had been in touch regarding the Banding survey and had received a response from SHE Transmission.

MK commented on the following from the last meeting (Meeting 13) minutes.

“RW suggested that a possible way forward could be to draft a central framework for connection code, then each work stream/group could fill in the relevant section.

**Action** All - to think about how to go about this (not least the resources to achieve it).”

It was agreed that this Action be placed on NGET.

MK also noted that the minutes contained an action on Rob Wilson to collate ToRs for relevant WGs interacting with GC0048 and check for alignment and publish to GC0048 membership.

**Action** HH to update and publish the minutes accordingly.

### Actions

13. RfG timescales within connection offer documentation; highlighting to customers where projects could be ‘caught’ by RfG. RJW reported that a general update plus a round table had taken place at the recent Customer seminar but that this wasn’t sufficient to discharge this action. AJ had prepared a draft customer letter which could be used to inform existing holders of connection agreements and be included as part of the informal letter with new connection agreements. This is to be finalised and then sent out. GG commented that generators need to know whether RfG applies.

SP agreed to make this a joint action for Ofgem to provide guidance defining what is considered as a new or existing Generator. AJ understood the date of contract signature (ie the date of plant order) would be binding. **Amend to joint action** for completion by next meeting.

25. Future Compliance Regime Update. JR confirmed that an informal brainstorming session had taken place on 30 September consisting of a free ranging discussion around all the issues ensuring type A in particular would comply. Items included,

- Certification of equipment
- Legal framework
- Right to disconnect or sanctions where appropriate
- Decommissioning
- Other member states

The meeting fully explored the issues but did not conclude these and a follow up discussion would take place to formalise the issues and bring to GC0048 RfG for wider discussion.

69i-v. Banding actions to be reviewed following workgroup report.

81. Information on the number of LEEMPS stations, what their obligations are for providing frequency response, or where there are derogations from this. To be reviewed following workgroup report.

83. DECC/Ofgem to provide guidance on Relevant System Operator compliance testing to give assurance to generators that costs would be managed. Ongoing

84. Responsibility between TSO and DNOs to conduct compliance testing. DNOs to agree costing model.

86. RJW’s action to extract code mapping exercise into mod-specific reports covered under project plan. **Ongoing.**

88. NG to ensure that all relevant WG ToRs were summarised for GC0048 to confirm that all necessary development work is underway. Needs to be picked up under each workgroup. Ongoing.

91. Refer to Slide 48 of the ECCAF November 13 presentation identifying how many EU codes will impact the GC via the link below. Close

<http://www2.nationalgrid.com/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=29049>

94. G98 AJ has comments to pass on to SC. Ongoing

95. CR has added lines into the project plan to cover SC's G98, G99 work. Closed

97. RJW to update risk register. Closed

98,99 Banding and cross code coordination to be flagged at next steering group. Closed.

#### 4 Progress Update

DECC/Ofgem

SP gave the following update on Ofgem's focus on the connection codes:

- High level actions falling on Ofgem associated with RfG, DCC and HVDC were presented at last JESG.
- Multiple TSO Clause – NGET are producing a first draft for review and which will then be used by Ofgem as part of developing a consultation on this (as per the process used for CACM).
- Emerging Technologies clause – Ofgem will provide guidance for those wishing to be considered as an emerging Technology.

**Action SP** to provide further update at next meeting.

**Action** – NG to encourage other small players (already on WG mailing list) to attend next meeting.

Derogations – Ofgem will kick-off next and provide guidance on how this will work.

JR also acknowledged that DCC had been adopted by member states at the Cross Border Committee meaning that all 3 of the connection codes are now back with the Commission awaiting final European Council/Parliament approval.

#### 5 Project Plan Update

CR

The project plan slides had been updated since publishing on the website.

**Action HH** Publish updated slides.

CR presented the project plan slides commenting that the plan relies on the outcome of Banding Thresholds. All other deadlines hinge on this.

The first stage of Compliance work is due to start in January 2016. This is being progressed near the start of the plan given that it's a quick win.

Fault Ride Through, Voltage and Reactive Power are due to start in March 2016. Frequency is being undertaken by Grid Code workgroup GC0087.

RW commented that the plan has been revised to deliver on the work streams in one year or as soon as possible, rather than filling whole two years. This is in response to stakeholder concern over uncertainty at the point of determination of new vs existing (2 years after EIF).

GG commented on the legal EIF backstop date to carry out national implementation within 2 years. Would modifications be implemented once approved by authority or all at once? AJ referred to 'go active' and 'go live' dates used for BETTA and whether or not a similar approach could be applied.

**Action SP** to seek legal advice.

**Action RJW** to aim to draft outline ToR for sub-workgroups for the next meeting.

MK thanked CR for revisiting and compressing the plan.

RJW presented a work stream overview for RfG implementation post-banding resulting from a code mapping exercise. Once code mapping for DCC and HVDC is also completed, it will be possible to consider where there are common requirements that could then be combined into a single 'work stream' rather than consideration in isolation for each code.

Two day monthly bookings have been made to progress connection code issues in 2016. NGET will allocate items within the 2 days to combine as many consistent requirements across the GCCs as

possible. This will make attendance more efficient for all concerned, but also reduce the number of modifications needed to the Grid Code.

RJW requested feedback on how the workgroup felt about this approach which would aim to cover all connection code activity within the two day slot. GG, whilst supportive of fixing dates in advance, queried whether there was more work here which might not fit the two days and deliver against the project plan. RJW believed it was ambitious, but achievable, particularly as simultaneous workgroups were possible given the multiple room bookings NGET had acquired. The challenge then was to workgroup members not participating in everything due to passing interest, more where they can active help progress the issue forward. He suggested a project management supervisory workgroup which would allow interested parties to check in on progress without having to attend the technical subgroups.

RW commented that more than 2 days per month was probably too high a call on people's diaries but acknowledged GG's point. RW indicated that the first couple of meetings will kick-off with GC0048 on day 1 with the rest of agenda still needing to be fleshed out. .

GG expressed a preference that stakeholders be involved with Grid Code legal text drafting at these workgroups, though the other workgroup members were happy for NG to draft and stakeholders to review and comment. AJ reminded the group that it had previously been agreed that NGET would draft an outline. GG was concerned that the legal text needs to have sufficient time to be written. RJW was confident that review of workgroup reports and associated legal text would be possible via the proposed 2 day approach.

**Action** NG to send out 2016 dates and flesh out more detail on how it will work.

SP commented that the proposed approach was good. Scheduling should be mapped to work plans to see if two days will be enough.

GG commented that unlike current Grid Code mods, there would be no debate as to whether mods should happen – they are an obligation under EU. RW commented that with Grid Code mods generally there is one technical solution.

JN commented that drafting issue is the main thing making EU code/GC best fit. Technical specifications are open less to negotiation.

JN queried what the architecture of Grid Code would look like. eg new CCs feeding into CPs.

## 6 RfG Banding Workgroup Report

RJW

RJW presented the outcome of the banding survey, then focused attention on the next steps to draft a workgroup report for consideration at the next meeting.

RJW confirmed that none of the options received universal support, though option one was clearly the most popular. Even the lowest option, more the principle than the MW levels, had some support. This should be respected in proceeding to the next stage as well as allowing presentation of all arguments.

RW clarified that the objective was to home in on which options should be included in the WG report bearing in mind that this will lead to the industry consultation, and followed by the report to the authority.

**Action** HH to circulate all survey responses to workgroup members.

RJW highlighted delivery dates (see slide 17) indicating that a March 2016 industry consultation should be kept fixed. To meet this, the plan is to present the Workgroup report to the January 2016 GCRP. GG asked if consultation can be prepared between the GC0048 meeting and GCRP. RJW anticipated that some further work would be required to convert the workgroup report into a consultation, but supported consulting as soon as possible.

**Action** SP to check whether the report to authority could be submitted but decision delayed until EIF. RW added that perhaps submitting a draft that could be finalised on EIF to avoid setting off a KPI would be a way of minimising delays.

GG raised the potential for consultation to run into Easter Holiday which is better avoided. RJW confirmed there would be further engagement with GCRP and other interested industry parties ahead of consultation.

Survey: Feedback on Options Report:

RJW reported that there had been 21 responses from a good range of industry groups – including a couple of late responses not tracked in the slide statistics. However, RJW queried whether the volume and demographic of responses was sufficient since the survey was sent to the entire workgroup circulation. To give comfort that the survey captured strong opinions, RJW along with CW confirmed that some association bodies (e.g. AMPS) had submitted responses on behalf of their members. The actual spread of the survey was therefore far greater than the 21 responses received back. The workgroup agreed that the survey had been sufficiently circulated to move forward.

RJW presented results with selected pro and con comments for each option.

Regarding Option 2 (the lowest level), JD reminded the group that ‘supporting’ options only meant considering options to provide information and did not necessarily mean proposing an option to be adopted.

On the theme of consistency with other synchronous areas mentioned in some of the options, RW informed the group that he would be discussing next week with ENTSO-E what other member states are doing with banding and what consideration they have given this. Indications so far are that some TSOs in the Continental Europe synchronous area are looking at reducing their thresholds below the CE maximums.

CW at the DG forum in September queried ‘nameplate’ rating when considering which band a generator falls into. RW quoted recital 9 in RfG as having nothing to do with aggregation (in the sense of the role of an aggregator) and setting out the intent of RfG to apply by machine size for synchronous generators but to power park modules for non-synchronous.

**Action AJ** to send Chris slides from a previous workgroup clarifying this.

Option 4 of the survey had been open to respondents to suggest further options for consideration. MK had proposed Type C 30-75MW and went on to explain his thinking behind this option. RJW told the workgroup that a number of responses had advocated considering NGET’s banding proposal from January 2014. Given the support for this, it could be a viable ‘mid’ option.

RJW then asked the workgroup how many options should be taken forward and if so which ones. Given option 1 had a strong positive response, it made sense to take this forward. RW and JR confirmed though that even Option 1 (the ceiling levels quoted in RfG) needed robust justification and ratification by the NRA and that this principle had been discussed with the Commission. It was not a ‘default’ level.

AV commented that at present the options being taken forward are based on opinion. Would CBA still be considered?

RW explained that the report to authority needed to have enough information and justification for a decision to be made. A CBA was not mandated in the code to set the thresholds due mainly to the difficulties in arriving at exact figures but could form part of the case. RJW commented that once agreement on which options to cover was reached the cost implications for each option can be explored and analysed.

JN commented on the importance of the 5 year time horizons.

GG highlighted things to take into account:

- Today’s generation
- Future including demand side

RJW reminded the group that this is valid further on but for now which options should be taken forward?

SP commented that it would be difficult to exclude either end of the spectrum without having any evidence.

GG stated that the MW levels proposed for Option 2 were too extreme and never likely to be adopted in GB. The workgroup discussed what a low option could be – with RW mooted the Irish level given the theme of consistency with neighbouring synchronous areas (as with Option 1 to CE). MK had

reservations on the Type A – B level and JD remarked that this workgroup has not discussed reducing the A/B threshold, so it was agreed to make that consistent with the other banding options. The workgroup then discussed whether Option 3 could be determined as a reasonable low option, though there was some reservation that this was too close to a mid-level option.

MK commented that with the numbers available considering 3 options may infer the best solution by allowing a trend to be observed. RJW expressed reluctance to study more than three options. There was general agreement that three options across a viable spectrum of MW values was a good way forward. This was then taken to a vote.

A show of hands (DECC and Ofgem abstained) in the room concluded the following.

	Option 1 (High) (Existing RfG)	Option 2 (Low) Similar to Irish levels	Option 3 (Mid)
A	800W – 1MW	800W – 1MW	800W -1MW
B	1-50MW	1 – 5 MW	1-30MW
C	50-75MW	5 – 10MW	30-50MW
D	75MW	10MW+	50MW+

JN added that the costs (to all parties) of having systems in place to operate these options should be included. It was agreed that operability and route to market should be considered although being outside the core RfG setting of technical requirements.

With the three options agreed, RJW sought to assign drafting roles for the workgroup report. He suggested a SO, TO, DNO, generator and manufacturer representative from GC0048 prepare their respective section each critiquing the three levels, to compile into a comprehensive report. Despite a few workgroup members offering their support, some workgroup members thought NGET were better placed to draft the report, based on the extensive workgroup discussions on banding to date. It was agreed that RJW would draft the report and circulate for workgroup members to review and feed into in November. RJW was keen to stress again the delivery date of end of December for the report to be taken to the January GCRP, given particularly the contingent timescales involved in overall RfG implementation hinging on banding.

**Action** RJW to draft Workgroup report for review.

## 7 Risk Register

RJW

19 – AJ confirmed that unintended consequences of changes is still a risk.

22 – Covered under ToR clarification. RJW to update.

26- Cross code implementation. Mitigation in progress.

## 8 DECC/Ofgem Steering Group Reporting

JR/SP

Next Group meeting is in December. Proposal as previously to flag the banding discussions to the Steering Group.

## 9 Agree Actions

HH

See action log.

## 10 AOB / Next Meeting

All

### Next Meeting:

The next RfG Workgroup meetings will take place on **Thursday 19 November and Thursday 17 December, both at National Grid House, Warwick and starting at 10am.**