The National Grid Company plc

Minutes of the
Grid Code Review Panel
National Grid House, Coventry
15th November 2001

Members/Alternates		Advisors
Mike Metcalfe	National Grid (Chair)	Robert Lane, CMS Cameron McKenna
David Payne	National Grid (Secretary)	
Geoff Charter	National Grid	
Alan Robb	National Grid	
David Gray	National Grid	
Ian Gray)		
Mike Kay)	DNO	
John Palmer)		
Bridget Morgan	OFGEM	
John Norbury)		
Graham Trott)	Generators with Large Power Stations with total Reg. Cap. > 5GW	
John France)		
David Ward	Generators with Large Power Stations with total Reg. Cap.< 5GW	
(No rep present)	Generators without Large Power Stations	
(No rep present)	EISO	
Justin Andrews	BSC Panel	

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND INTRODUCTION

1038 Apologies for absence were received from Malcolm Taylor (Generators without Large Power Stations), David Nichol (EISO) and Chris Rowell (BSC Panel) who was represented by Justin Andrews.

2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

1039 The minutes of the last meeting were agreed as a true record.

1040 Geoff Charter pointed out that agreed minutes were placed on the National Grid website immediately following the meeting at which they were agreed. As this could be up to three months after the relevant meeting, Geoff suggested that it might be useful if a 'Headline Report' was put on the website shortly after the pertinent meeting in advance of the agreed minutes. This approach is used for BSC Panel and CUSC Panel meetings.

1041 After some discussion the Panel decided that on balance the current arrangements should continue.

3 MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING (not covered below)

3.1 Summary of actions (GCRP 01/28)

1042 David Payne stated that as the actions listed on the paper were either complete, covered by later Agenda items or were to be covered at future meetings, it was not

proposed to cover each action at this point unless the Panel wished to raise any associated issues. No issues were raised.

3.2 Report on Review of NETA Software Systems

1043 As requested at the September GCRP meeting, Alan Robb provided an update of progress with the National Grid review of NETA software systems.

1044 At the last meeting Alan had explained that National Grid did not wish to pursue any system modifications associated with Data Buffering, instead it was undertaking a more fundamental design review of systems which it was hoped would provide the same functionality of data buffering. The review was underway and National Grid would be able to report back on the outcome of the review by the Spring of 2002.

1045 Alan explained that a set of proposals were being developed internally and these were not expected to be available until January 2002, followed by final proposals by the end of March 2002. As it was possible that the proposals may be wide ranging, requiring internal sanctioning, it was not expected that the outcome of the review could be confirmed by the February GCRP meeting.

1046 Alan then used slides to provide some statistics related to computer system downtime and loading. The first slide indicated that from NETA implementation the anticipated planned system downtime had been 17 hours per annum (99.8%availability) with anticipated unplanned downtime as 8½ hours. This gave an overall anticipated system availability of 99.7%. The slide indicated that actual availability to date was within expected parameters. Alan explained that planned outages were required for software updates, inclusion of maintenance patches and generator name changes (which could not be achieved with the current systems on line). To date there had been a total of 23 system outages (16 planned and 7 unplanned) with an average duration of 64 minutes each. This situation was monitored on a weekly and daily basis and National Grid was striving to keep outages to an absolute minimum.

1047 Further slides were used to demonstrate the volume of PN Data being submitted and the subsequent effect on system usage. The slides indicated that large volumes of PN data were being received, with some participants supplying substantially more data than others even when the data was normalised to account for the differing numbers of BMUs managed by participants. The slides also demonstrated that some participants were repeatedly submitting complete sets of PN data even if only a few changes were required. For example in some instances, only about 2% of the data supplied was new data. Alan stated that this inefficient submission of large volumes of data had the effect of loading the system to near full capacity, resulting in extending data processing times.

1048 Alan stated that National Grid is currently taking steps to try to improve the situation and reduce load on the system. This has involved discussion with some of the larger inefficient data suppliers in an attempt to reduce the amount of data submitted. National Grid is also considering issuing some general ‘good practice’ guidelines on data submission as a supplement to the EDT Interface Specification. It is recognised that in some instances the software used may need to be amended and this may incur additional costs for the participant. However National Grid is seeking to work with participants to help minimise these costs.

1049 John Norbury stated that, prior to NETA implementation, EDT data submitted to National Grid had included all data items for each genset. Post-NETA, IT systems had similarly been designed to submit complete data sets to NGC. National Grid now appeared to be suggesting that data submitted should only contain new data, a requirement which could result in significant IT modification costs for Users.

1050 Alan responded saying that ideally National Grid would only want 'changes only' data sent to its systems but recognised that some participants software systems were designed such that only complete data sets could be resubmitted. Alan also indicated that this issue would also be raised at the next Operational Forum.

3.3 Report on the position with Time Tagging, QPN's and NTO/NTB

1051 Alan explained that as a result of the concerns relating to the heavy system loading described above, National Grid was reluctant to place even greater strain on the system by including additional parameters on the system. So it was not proposed to take these issues forward for the time being. It was envisaged that the resolution of the performance and resilience issues, the expected reduction of the Gate Closure period and possible OC2 changes would all take precedence, although it was confirmed that Time Tagging, QPN's and NTO/NTB would remain in National Grid's work programme. In the meantime, if participants were experiencing difficulty then National Grid could discuss this on an individual basis.

1052 With respect to NTO/NTB the generator reps expressed concern that National Grid appeared to be incentivised to retain the existing NTO/NTB requirement since it allows a 'Just in Time' process, enabling National Grid to minimise its costs. However, the requirement denies generators the opportunity to reduce their costs by optimising plant operation. John Norbury suggested that National Grid could at least demonstrate that there had been a trial period of operating with longer lead times.

1053 Alan explained that drivers for not pursuing the issues at this stage were all connected with software system capacity and the introduction of longer lead times at this stage would introduce another level of complexity.

1054 John Norbury stated that since the discriminatory requirement only applies to Large Power Stations, the level of complexity must already exist within the BM. In addition, given that that the 2-minute NTO requirement was introduced as a non-NETA change and the variables existed prior to the implementation of NETA he found it difficult to accept the complexity message.

1055 It was agreed that these issues are not easy to resolve at the moment but National Grid should give a high priority to seeking a solution.

3.4 Notification of Maximum Export Capacity (MEC)

1056 Geoff Charter provided an update on this issue which related to a paper (GCRP 01/27) presented by the generator reps at the September GCRP meeting concerned with the inclusion of MEC in the Grid Code. The paper proposed a Grid Code change on the basis that the CUSC states that MEC is submitted as Grid Code Registered Data.

1057 Geoff explained that the CUSC inappropriately describes MEC as Grid Code data and as MEC is not used in a technical context then it is not logical for it to be submitted as such. As MEC is a contractual requirement it is appropriate for the

term to be applied within the CUSC but it is recognised that the definition of MEC in the CUSC is less than ideal so a CUSC amendment may be appropriate. Therefore National Grid proposes to work with Users affected to draw up a CUSC amendment for submission to the CUSC panel for consideration. Panel members were invited to provide nominations of those wishing to be involved in drawing up the CUSC amendment proposal.

1058 John Norbury expressed concern that MEC was not considered as being a Grid Code data requirement, given that it is data describing the capacity of physical connection assets. Geoff replied that MEC had never been envisaged as being a data requirement and only applied to pre-vesting plant anyway. If the need for the data had been required it could have been proposed as a Grid Code requirement at any time since the introduction of the Grid Code.

1059 John France, Nick George and Graham Trott expressed a desire to be included in any informal discussions concerned with a CUSC amendment. Panel Members were invited to contact Geoff or David Payne with any other nominations.

4. REPORT ON PROGRESS OF CONSULTATION PAPERS (GCRP 01/29)

A/00 – Safety Co-ordination.

1060 Geoff reported that in order to progress with this consultation the issue had recently been simplified and a report to the Authority sent on 13 November. The concerns with proximity issues would be resolved internally and it was hoped to provide a further report on this at the February 2002 GCRP meeting.

A/01 – OC5 – Testing and Monitoring

1061 This had been approved by the Authority for implementation 1st December.

B/01 – Definition of NGC Demand and National Demand

1062 This had been approved by the Authority for implementation 1st December.

C/01 – Membership of the Grid Code Review Panel

1063 This had been approved by the Authority for implementation 1st December. In addition the associated amendments to the GCRP Constitution and Rules had been approved by the Authority also for implementation on 1st December. David Payne reported that the revised Constitution and Rules would be posted on the National Grid website on 1st December, and AEO's would be invited via the website and by e-mail to nominate representatives for the two new seats for Suppliers and Non Embedded Customers at the same time. Nominations would be required by 31st January 2002 in time for re-election of Panel members in February.

1064 Graham Trott requested that any e-mail message includes a list of the recipients of the message for information.

D/01 – Provisions Related to Embedded Large Power Stations

1065 A report had been sent to the Authority for consideration.

E/01, F/01, G/01, H/01

1066 Responses had been received and were in the process of being dealt with.

I/01 – OC2 Changes associated with proposed BSC modifications.

1067 Geoff reported that in order to parallel the proposed BSC changes, this consultation was being carried out using an accelerated process and so had not been brought to the Panel at a previous meeting. The deadline for responses was 16th November.

5 PROGRESS ON CURRENT GRID CODE MODIFICATION PROPOSALS

5.1 OC5 Review – The next stage (GCRP 01/30)

1068 David Gray reported that a meeting of the working group had taken place on 30th October at which the proposed changes to OC5 to incorporate lifetime testing for Connection Conditions had been explained. Working group members had been invited to provide comments on the proposals by 16th November but no comments had been received to date.

1069 It was now expected that revised text would be worked up by week commencing 16th December for discussion at the next working group meeting in January. It was then expected to present the final proposals to the Panel at the May 2002 meeting.

5.2 CC.6.3.3 Review Working Group Update

1070 Geoff reported that the latest working group meeting had been held on 8th November. The Generator concerned had still not applied for a generation licence and so Ofgem were still not in a position to formally request a review of CC.6.3.3. Therefore the working group continued to work with draft Terms of Reference.

1071 At the meeting the working group agreed that someone representing the Generator should be involved in the discussions. The Generator had been contacted and their representative was expected to attend the next meeting.

1072 In the meantime National Grid were carrying out more detailed studies on the effect of connecting such generators to the system. Work was also continuing to discover whether other countries' utilities applied similar connection conditions to those being considered.

1073 The next working group meeting was planned for February 2002.

6. NEW GRID CODE MODIFICATION PROPOSALS.

6.1 BC2 Drafting Issues (GCRP 01/31)

1074 The paper introduces three issues connected with BC2. The first two arose from suggestions for minor changes following comments received in respect of small BM Units joining or leaving the Balancing Mechanism. It was proposed that the text of BC2.5.5 should clarify that the provisions of BC2.5.2. would not apply to small BM Units leaving the Balancing Mechanism.

1075 In addition, it was proposed the text of BC2.5.2.3 should be amended to enable the switching in of Demand in response to high frequency. This effectively constituted a 'Synchronisation' which was not currently allowed under the Grid Code.

1076 John Norbury suggested that with respect to 'small' BM Units leaving the Balancing Mechanism, the text of BC2.5.2 should be amended to mirror the proposed change to BC2.5.5.

1077 John also asked whether, in the event that a 'small' BM Unit withdraws from the Balancing Mechanism but still continues to produce PN Data until such time that its IT systems can be modified, this would constitute continuing participation in the Balancing Mechanism.

1078 National Grid agreed to check the position in this case.

1079 **Action**: *National Grid to report back to the February GCRP meeting on whether small BM Units having withdrawn from the Balancing Mechanism but still submitting PN Data would be considered as still participating.*

1080 The panel agreed that National Grid should produce a Consultation Paper on these issues.

1081 **Action**: *National Grid to produce a Consultation Paper on two issues related to changes to BC2.*

1082 The paper also raised the issue of Bid/Offer Acceptances sometimes implying an instantaneous return to PN at the end of the Balancing Mechanism window (the 'wall'). Geoff stated that this problem becomes more pronounced when the Gate Closure period is reduced to one hour and this needs to be taken into account in any solution to the problem. National Grid was currently considering the way forward and it was intended to present the preferred solution at the 12 December Operational Forum. Ofgem requested that National Grid consults on any proposed solutions. In order to expedite any changes to the Grid Code a Panel paper could be circulated with the proposals in advance of the February GCRP meeting.

1083 John Norbury stated that he welcomed discussion on this issue at the GCRP but felt that any solutions to the issue should be progressed through the BSC and not the Operational Forum. Geoff explained that any solution may result in consequential Grid Code changes to clarify the process.

6.2 Licence Condition Number Amendments – impact on the Grid Code (GCRP 01/32)

1084 This paper explained that as a result of the recent Transmission Licence changes the Grid Code references to Transmission Licence clauses were now incorrect.

1085 The paper described the Grid Code changes required, and proposed that as these changes would have no material affect on Users it was not necessary to consult with AEO's. It therefore suggested that a report to the Authority could be produced seeking approval to implement the proposed changes.

1086 The Panel agreed with the proposed process.

1087 **Action:** *National Grid to prepare a report to the Authority proposing changes to the Grid Code to correct Transmission Licence references.*

7 OTHER GRID CODE RELATED ISSUES

7.1 BSC/CUSC Modification Proposals (GCRP 01/33)

1088 Geoff presented an update on those BSC/CUSC amendment proposals which may have an impact on the Grid Code.

- BSC Mod P20 (BM Unit registrations) has now been rejected.
- BSC Mod P14 (Manifest Error) – the BSC Panel has recommended that this be rejected but a decision by the Authority is awaited.
- BSC Mods P22/P33 related to OC2 Data resulted in Grid Code consultation I/01

1089 Justin Andrews also tabled a more detailed BSC Modifications status report which indicated that BSC Mod P34 (Transfer of Imbalances caused by Balancing Services to NGC) may also have an impact on the Grid Code.

1090 Justin offered to prepare a similar report for the next GCRP meeting. The Panel agreed that while the summary of modifications is generally sufficient there would be no harm in circulating the more detailed report as well.

1091 Geoff reported that CUSC amendment CAP002 related to CUSC 6.5.1 clarification had been discussed at the CUSC Panel meeting held on 9 November. As a result a CUSC working group had been set up to consider the issues. Papers related to this amendment could be found on the National Grid website.

8 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

1092 David Gray provided an update on the G75 review. G75 is concerned with generators connected to DNO's systems at above 20kV or with output in excess of 5MW. David stated that a consultation paper would be issued shortly with responses required by the end of January 2002 and expected implementation by Spring 2002. Panel members were requested to inform their constituents.

9 DATE, TIME & VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

1093 Thursday **21st February 2002**, starting at **10:30 am**, at National Grid House.