

Grid Code Modifications– GCRP 10 [14th September 2004]

MPID	Section	Modification Text or Change	Comment	Submitted by	Comments from GCRP	Recommend for Approval?
126	PCA.4.10.1	See linked document for wording: Modelling Rqrts for WTG MPID126 11Oct.doc	New section to be added regarding provision of suitable and accurate dynamic models for wind farm power stations See linked discussion document: Planning Code Mod justification 11Oct.doc	ESBNG	Further views from industry to be sought and proposal to be revised before sending to CER. See linked documents.	YES
127	CC12.4	Signals to be provided by Users shall be presented in such form as is nominated by ESBNG <u>under the Connection Agreement.</u>	These Signals are specified in ESBNG's Functional Specification which is provided post Connection Agreement execution.	ESBNG		YES
128	PC4.4.3	Any User proposing to de-rate , close, retire, withdraw from service or otherwise cease to maintain and keep available for Dispatch in accordance with Good Industry Practice any Generation Unit or Generation Units with Registered Capacity greater than 10 MW in aggregate shall give ESBNG at least 24 calendar months notice of such action .	Amended to capture unit de-ratings also.	ESBNG	ESBPG representative not present. Comments received by email from ESBPG rep provided in Appendix A below	YES
129	GCRP Constitution 6.6	Each member shall retire automatically at the beginning of the Panel meeting held on the first working day in the month of March <u>each year every second year starting from the year 2005 e.g. 2005, 2007, 2009, etc.</u> (or if no meeting is held on such day, at the meeting which is held on the date falling closest after that day) but such member shall be eligible for re-appointment.	It would appear more appropriate to hold elections every two years as opposed to every year. Running elections every year for a Panel whose members rarely change could be considered an inefficient overhead.	ESBNG	No election held in 2004. Next election to be held in 2005.	YES

130	OC4.6.5.1.1 OC4.6.5.2.1	Add as items to each of the above sections; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For wind generators the effect of weather conditions will be considered by ESBNG as a single contingency with a magnitude equal to the total wind generation. The effect of a single transmission event on multiple wind generators will be considered a single contingency. The magnitude of the contingency will be determined by ESBNG taking account of the total wind generation in a locality which may be disconnected following a single transmission event. 	System security policy is based on individual generators being treated as independent random variables. However wind generators may all be dependant on the same event, either weather or tripping over a wide area following a transmission disturbance.	ESBPG	See Appendix B below	YES
131	SCD2A.3 SCD2A.3.1 SCD2A.3.2.1 SCD2A3.3	SDC2A.3 SDC2A.3.1 SDC2A.3.2.1 SDC2A3.3	Change of incorrect section numbering from SCD to SDC	ESBNG		YES
132	General	Change 'VAr' to 'var'. This includes changing 'MVar' to Mvar and 'kVAr' to 'kvar'.	The IEC (International Electrotechnical Commission) have defined the term for reactive power as 'var'. Source: http://dom2.iec.ch/terms/terms.nsf/0/AAB7206D830D30E5C1256D9B0043C446?OpenDocument	ESBNG		YES

Modifications discussed at previous meetings:

101	CC.12.2	New wording of new point (ba) to be proposed as follows: (ba) +/- MW and +/- MVar at transformer low Voltage terminals <u>where signals are not available on the HV terminals</u>	New wording proposed at the GCRP meeting 7 as follows: +/- MW and +/- MVar at transformer low Voltage terminals where signals are not available on the HV terminals, <u>as agreed between ESBNG and the User</u>	ESBNG	Revised wording recommended for approval by panel: <i>Where it is agreed between ESBNG and the User that signals are not available on the HV terminals, +/- MW and +/- Mvar shall be provided at the transformer low Voltage terminals.</i>	YES
-----	---------	--	---	-------	--	-----

121	GC 8.8 (a)	<p>ESBNG shall:</p> <p>a) keep a register of all derogations which have been granted, identifying the company and plant in respect of whom the derogation has been granted, the relevant provision of the Grid Code and the Grid Code version number, the period of the derogation and the extent of compliance to the provision; and</p>	<p>ESB PG representative stated at GCRP meeting 7 that the information regarding the technical compliance or non-compliance to the Grid Code is confidential. He does not recommend it to CER for approval.</p> <p>The remaining panel recommended it for approval</p>	ESBNG	<p>Comments subsequently received from ESBPG:</p> <p><i>PG prefers that info under GC is kept confidential. Replace "company and plant" by "company"</i></p>	<p>Approved by all but ESBPG rep at GCRP meeting 7</p>
-----	------------	---	--	-------	--	--

Appendix A

Stephen Walsh, ESBPG representative sent the following comments by email after the meeting:

My apologies for missing this morning's meeting. I had some comments I intended to make on the issue of de-ratings.

There are three issues. Firstly there is more work involved in organising the shut-down of an entire plant than in de-rating its output following an incident or inspection. Secondly it has been many years since PG agreed the ratings of its plants. The gradual deterioration and accumulations of incidents has previously been recorded as an ongoing non-availability and it now needs to be formalised as de-ratings to better describe the contribution to system reliability. Thirdly, while it normally takes a long time to plan a plant closure, it is possible due to unforeseen incidents for plants to permanently shutdown following a very serious incident or where an inspection reveals a serious and previously unknown problem.

A reasonable and prudent operator will then generally give 2 years notice of a shutdown and give much less notice for a de-rating. However it is occasionally possible that a shutdown will be decided upon with less notice and the Grid Code should allow for this. Therefore I oppose the mod as proposed.

*Stephen Walsh
Manager, Power Market Contracts
ESB Power Generation*

Appendix B

ESBNG proposed the following text in place of the ESBPG proposal:

- Wind power generation output forecasting uncertainties
- The effect of a single transmission event on multiple generators will be considered a single contingency. The magnitude of the contingency will be determined by ESBNG taking account of the total generation in a locality which may be disconnected following a single transmission event. The probability of such an event occurring will also be taken into account by ESBNG.

Following the meeting ESBPG proposed changing ESBNG's text for the first point is as follows

- Wind power generation output forecasting uncertainties will be considered a single contingency.