

## MINUTES OF THE JOINT GRID CODE REVIEW PANEL MEETING

Held at the Clarion Hotel, IFSC, Dublin

On 27 January 2010 at 1 pm

Present:

<b>Members/Alternates</b>	<b>Representing</b>	
Jon O'Sullivan	Chairman	
Dick Lewis	SONI	
Tom McCartan	SONI	
Alan Kennedy	SONI	
Adrian Henning	SONI	As an observer for SONI
Dave Thornton	SONI	As an advisor to SONI
Marie Hayden	EirGrid	
Arlene McGrath	EirGrid	As secretary of the EirGrid GCRP
Mark Norton	EirGrid	
Simon Grimes	EirGrid	
Chevron Nolan	ESB Customer Supply	
Jim Cooke	Coolkeeragh ESB Power Station	
Cathal Martin	SSE Renewables	
Brian Mongan	AES Kilroot Power Limited	As an alternate for Roger Casement
Bronagh Luney	NIE	
Ger Harnett	Independent Suppliers	
Patrick Liddy	Activation Energy	
Eamonn O'Donogue	Tynagh Energy Ltd	Observer
Kieran Adams	Huntstown Power Station	Observer
Gráinne O'Shea	ESB PG	
Rónán Ó hÓgartaigh	ESB Networks	
Barry Sherry	Endesa Ireland	As alternate for Miguel Gonzalez

Jane McArdle	SSE Renewables	
Brian McAuley	SEMO	As alternate for Liam Ryan
John Lynch	CER	
Munir Hassan	Secretary of the SONI GCRP	
Nick Molho	CMcK as reflected in the General Conditions of the SONI Grid Code	

**Introduction to JGCRP meeting & Approval of Minutes**

1. The Chairman welcomed Panel Members to the meeting and provided an overview of the agenda.
2. The Chairman reported that Garrett Blaney had resigned from the Joint Grid Code Review Panel. The Chairman noted that Garrett Blaney’s insightfulness and wittiness will be sorely missed and on behalf of the panel he wished him well in his new capacity with the CER.
3. The JGCRP approved the minutes of the previous meeting held in Belfast on 24<sup>th</sup> September.
4. The Chairman noted that there was still an outstanding action on the Regulatory Authorities (RAs) to give further thought to a formal arrangement for changes to the TSC that could potentially require a Grid Code change (item 6 of the minutes).

**MPID 194 Fail to Synchronise/Fail to Meet Minimum Stable Generation:**

**Discussion on Key Principles**

Tom McCartan and Marie Hayden provided an overview of the proposed Grid Code changes set out in MPID 194 (attached to these minutes) and stressed that the TSOs were giving more thought to what should happen to units that synchronise early, so the current proposed changes should mainly be read from the perspective of late synchronisation.

**Summary of Concerns**

Member	Comment	Response	Action
Brian Mongan	<p>The wording at the end of the proposed SDC2.A.4.1.5 implied that generating units may be asked to synchronise again when they were in fact already synchronised (albeit late) and that this was not technically feasible.</p> <p>There is no objection to the principle of the proposal but does not want a requirement for generating units that synchronise late to have to resynchronise again.</p> <p>A concern is that the unit is asked to come off before it had stayed</p>	<p>Maria Hayden and Tom McCartan will reconsider this.</p> <p>Jon O’ Sullivan recommended a definition for MoT.</p>	TSO to include a definition for MoT.

	on for its Minimum on Time (MoT).		
Jim Cooke	<p>It is unclear what set of technical parameters a generating unit is judged against under the proposed changes, as there are different sets of technical parameters in Northern Ireland (some set out in the Harmonised Ancillary Services contracts and others set out in Appendix A to SDC1).</p> <p>Marie Hayden explained that the technical characteristics in Ireland are those submitted in the TOD.</p>	Dick Lewis explained that a further explanation is required to clarify which sets of technical parameters are relevant in the SONI Grid Code version of the proposal.	SONI to further clarify technical parameters. But based on discussion point is accepted subject to appropriate clarification.
Grainne O'Shea	<p>The principle itself is reasonable however issues exist.</p> <p>The time windows for late synchronisation (-15/+5). A suggestion was made for the time window to be increased to 15 minutes, in particular given the higher penalties incurred but the Generators for late synchronisation.</p> <p>There are no tolerance bands associated with Failure to Reach MSG and the impact is quite harsh given a unit can loose start up costs, idle costs and all generation is then considered UI.</p> <p>There are a number of reasons why a unit may fail to reach MSG and these reasons should be distinguished.</p> <p>More time is needed to consider the fail to reach MSG.</p>	<p>Tom McCartan explained that extending the window to +15 minutes would put the TSOs in a worse position than they are in at the moment, -15 +5 already exists in the SONI Grid Code. It would increase the constraint costs borne by the TSO (and ultimately consumers) by having to dispatch another generating unit to compensate for the late synchronisation whilst still making a synchronisation payment to a generating unit that synchronised within 15 minutes following the original synchronisation time.</p> <p>Tom McCartan expressed that there was in fact a 20 min window for the units to synchronise 15 min early and 5 min late and that was being overlooked by the generators.</p> <p>The Chairman concluded that whilst there was no disagreement with the points of principle in the proposed changes, there seem to be a disagreement as to whether the time window for late synchronisation</p>	<p>TSOs to set out reasons for a failure to reach MSG.</p> <p>It was agreed by all Panel Members that a joint SONI / EirGrid consultation would be carried out with respect to the Failure to Synchronise and Failure to Reach MSG changes.</p> <p>TSOs to look at the concept of warm state.</p>

		<p>should be 5 or 15 minutes. The Chairman explained that the TSOs would make a recommendation that Generators should bear the costs of failing to synchronise within 5 minutes following the originally agreed time and that the RAs would have to take a view on this.</p> <p>Panel members agreed the band for Fail to Synchronise should be no more than -15 and +15 and they will be making such a recommendation to the RAs.</p> <p>John Lynch (CER) queried why a tolerance band was needed if the proposed wording already referred to achieving MSG in accordance with heat rates, which are themselves subject to time limits already.</p> <p>Marie Hayden agreed that referring to a tolerance band might be useful but it would require further thought and would have to be set as a tight period only.</p>	
Dick Lewis	The proposed definitions refer to Synchronisation to the System and the term System is defined in bold. This term is not defined within the NI Grid Code.		All agreed to remove this reference in the definitions which would remove the issue.
Barry Sherry	Following a failure to synchronise under the proposed Grid Code changes, a Generator would also be declared unavailable under SDC1.	Marie Hayden confirmed this is the case however there is an element of discretion around this. It would not be possible for the TSOs to develop a detailed process in practice as the TSOs need a certain element of flexibility to manage the Transmission System efficiently.	

## Summary of Actions

Changes to the TSC:  Further thought to a formal arrangement for changes to the TSC that could potentially require a Grid Code change.	RAs
Failure to Synchronise:  Include a definition for Minimum on Time	TSOs
Failure to Synchronise/Reach MSG:  Clarify technical parameters in NI Grid Code proposal.	SONI
Failure to Reach MSG:  Set out reasons for a failure to reach MSG.	TSOs
Failure to Reach MSG:  Look at the concept of warmth state and a possible tolerance.	TSOs
Failure to Synchronise/Reach MSG:  Remove reference to the word System in the proposed definitions.	TSOs
Consultation:  It was agreed by all Panel Members that a joint SONI / EirGrid consultation would be carried out with respect to the Failure to Synchronise and Failure to Reach MSG changes	TSOs/RAs