



MINUTES

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting 19

Thursday 29th November 2007
10.00am – 12.30pm
Alpha Suite, Morgan Hotel, Fleet St. Dublin 2

Panel Attendees

<u>Name</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Role</u>
Simon Grimes	Y	Chairman
Siobhán Dinneen	Y	CER Representative
Simon Tweed	Y	EirGrid Representative
Mark Norton	Y	EirGrid Representative
Ger Harnett	N	Independent Electricity Suppliers Representative
Neil Bingham	N	Independent Generators (CCGT) Representative
Peter Gillespie	N	Independent Generators (non-CCGT) Representative
Donal Phelan	Y	Transmission Asset Owner Representative
Dave O'Connor	Y	Alternate Renewable Generators Representative
Chevron Nolan	Y	Public Electricity Supplier Representative
Therese Lannon	Y	ESB Power Generation Representative
Alan Staunton	Y	Alternate Distribution System Operator Representative
No member put forward	-	Directly Connected Customers Representative

Other Attendees

<u>Name</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Role</u>
Robin McCormick	N	SONI observer
Geoff Clarke	Y	CER (advisor)
Marta Valescudero	Y	TSO (advisor)
Emma Fagan	Y	GCRP Secretary

1. Agenda

- i. Welcome to New Members
- ii. Review of Grid Code Version 3.0 and the modifications required for SEM;
- iii. Review new modification proposals
- iv. Arrangements for next meeting
- v. AOB

2. Welcome

2.1 S. Grimes welcomed the new members, alternates and advisors who had not previously attended a meeting. Paul Cooley is the new Renewables Representative, Ger Harnett is the new Independent Electricity Suppliers Representative and Simon Tweed is the new Operations Representative for the TSO.

2.2 S. Grimes noted the apologies received:

2.2.1 Paul Cooley, replaced by his alternate Dave O' Connor;

2.2.2 Neil Bingham;

2.2.3 Rónán Ó hÓgartaigh, replaced by his alternate Alan Staunton;

2.2.4 Robin McCormick.

2.3 Each member introduced themselves.

2.4 S. Grimes noted that some significant changes had occurred since the previous GCRP meeting including the fact that Grid Code version 3.0 had been published at the end of September 2007 in time for the new SEM. S. Grimes thanked all those that had been involved in the process.

3. Review of Grid Code Version 3.0 and the modifications required for SEM.

3.1 E. Fagan presented on Grid Code version 3.0 and a summary of the modifications required for the SEM.

3.2 The modifications required for SEM involved a complete re-write of the Scheduling and Dispatch Codes, which are now nearly identical to those in the SONI Grid Code.

3.3 Other modifications were required to the majority of the other sections of the Grid Code to incorporate new concepts such as demand side units and dispatchable wind farms etc. In addition, the all-island aspects to power system planning, outage planning, information exchange etc. had been included.

3.4 The Joint Grid Code Review Panel (JGCRP) is now required and will consist of all the members of the existing GCRPs both north and south. No meeting is scheduled as of yet. The JGCRP requires its own constitution which is currently being drafted and the existing GCRP constitution will require change. Both shall be circulated to GCRP members in due course.

4. Review of Modification Proposal – MPID167 – Short Circuit levels

M. Norton presented the proposed modifications to CC.7.2.2.2 and CC.8.6.

4.1 In summary this modification deals with referencing that some areas of the Transmission System are seeing increasing fault levels and that these need to be designed to a short circuit level of up to 31.5 kA and that user plant should be designed with this in mind.

4.2 It was agreed that in general the principal of the proposal was acceptable but that the exact wording needed some further work.

4.2 It was agreed that EirGrid would take this into account and re-circulate the revised wording prior to submission to the Commission for approval.

5. **Review of Modification Proposal - MPID139– Removal of Maximum Continuous Rating (MCR)**

- 5.1 E. Fagan presented the modification on removing references to MCR, which followed on from the recent new definition for Registered Capacity.
- 5.1 The renewables representative queried the use of “Net” in the provided diagram and it was explained that this still meant “Export Point”.
- 5.1 The ESBPG representative queried whether Registered Capacity (RC) was the same as the MEC value and it was explained that these are two very different figures. RC is the rating of the unit at particular atmospheric conditions and MEC is a contractual figure above which a unit can never export. A generator may choose an MEC higher than its RC as it may be able to export higher amounts on colder days etc. Currently only MEC is reflected in the Connection Agreement but in the future both figures will be reflected.

6. **Review of Modification Proposal – MPID156 – Planning Criteria**

M. Norton presented on the modification proposal. It was commented that the proposed modification was better than the existing text but that the new definition did not go far enough in that it didn't state where the Criteria could be located. It was agreed to add the following text to the end of the definition: “The **Transmission Planning Criteria** are available on the **TSO's** website.”

7. **Review of Modification Proposal – MPID166 – Fault Ride Through**

- 7.1 S. Tweed presented on the modification proposal.
- 7.2 It was queried what was meant by “normal”. It was responded that this meant the expected response from that unit. It was agreed that by putting “its normal” in the text instead that it would be clearer.
- 7.3 The ESBPG representative stated that this modification may cause further non-compliances for some plant as some auxiliaries may trip, which may not result in the tripping of the whole unit, but which could result in a reduced MW output etc. ESBPG would see that the last line is a material change. S. Grimes stated that ESBPG were welcome to submit to the GCRP secretary further written comments by the end of the following week (i.e. 07 December 2007).
- 7.4 G. Clarke noted that the use of the word “synchronised” may be inappropriate as some plant is asynchronous. E. Fagan responded that the Fault Ride Through requirements for asynchronous wind farms was already contained in WFPS1.4.1 and in that case the word “connected” was used in place of “synchronised”. E. Fagan also noted that none of the Grid Code had been modified yet for the addition on DC Interconnection, but when it was, the use of the words “synchronised” and “connected” would be considered at that stage.
- 7.5 This discussion then led to the Renewables representative stating that the format of the Grid Code would need to be reconsidered now that various different technologies were either connected to, or likely to connect to in the near future, the Transmission System. It did not seem right that a wind farm developer would have to search all the way through the Grid Code to finally get to the last chapter where it is stated that certain provisions do not apply to him. EirGrid agreed to take away these comments and consider alternative approaches to make the Grid Code more user friendly for all technology types.

8. Modification Proposal – MPID169 – Requirements for Secondary Fuels

E. Fagan advised that the Commission had gone to consultation on this and once a determination had been made that EirGrid would finalise any required Grid Code modifications for the panel's review and also for presentation at a subsequent meeting. S. Dinneen stated that the Commission hoped to make its determination in the next few weeks.

9. Review of Modification Proposal – MPID171 – Complex Connections

M. Norton presented on this modification proposal.

The modification proposal was recommended for approval.

10. Review of Modification Proposal – MPID172 – Glossary - Acronyms

E. Fagan presented on this modification proposal and noted that some changes had been made in the most recent version of the modification proposals document to reflect correct spelling etc.

It was queried whether the unit “var” is used in the Grid Code without the prefix Mvar or kvar. (Post meeting note – var is used on its own without this prefix.)

The modification proposal was recommended for approval.

11. Review of Modification Proposal – MPID173 – Removal of references to old safety rules.

S. Tweed presented on this modification proposal. A few queries were raised regarding which safety rules were applicable where, but as the existing text of the clause refers to power stations subject to the ESBPG safety rules, this was not relevant.

The modification proposal was recommended for approval.

12. Review of Modification Proposal – MPID174 – OC10 Flowchart

S. Tweed presented on this modification proposal. It was noted that there were four references to ESBNG in the existing Flowchart and that these should all change to “the TSO”.

It was also noted that the proposed modification to the text in the OC10.6.2 block had changed slightly from previous correspondence.

The modification proposal was recommended for approval.

13. Review of Modification Proposal – MPID175 – Submission of Updated Planning Data

13.1 M. Norton presented on this modification proposal.

13.2 A query was raised by the Transmission Asset Owner representative whether this clause also included provision of information on transmission assets built contestably by the customer. The response indicated that it does. The representative stated that this was favourable for the TAO as there are currently problems in obtaining this data from customers.

- 13.3** Concern was raised by a number of representatives on the addition of the words “*unless otherwise directed by the Commission*”. These had originally been included as the Commission may, on a case by case basis, require that certain data is provided under a different timeframe, as was the case for the wind farm dynamic modelling data for Gate 2 wind farms. It was stated, however, that there is no need to re-iterate this here as the Commission may make such a determination at any stage on any aspect of the Grid Code or otherwise. In addition, parties may be deemed to comply with the Grid Code, if they are in compliance with a determination that differs from the Grid Code.
- 13.3** With the removal of the words “*unless otherwise directed by the Commission*” this modification proposal was recommended for approval.

14. Review of Modification Proposal – MPID176 – Connection Conditions Typos

E. Fagan presented on this modification proposal.

There were no comments and the modification proposal was recommended for approval.

.

15. Review of Modification Proposal – MPID177 – Operating Codes Typos

E. Fagan presented on this modification proposal noting that there was a change to the proposal regarding SFRS control range.

There were no comments and the modification proposal was recommended for approval.

.

16. Review of Modification Proposal – MPID178 – Wind Farm Forecasts

S. Tweed presented on this modification proposal.

The CER’s advisor queried why the models could not work without standing data from the wind farm and that he expected that modelling based on past performance would be preferable to modelling based on wind farm characteristics.

It was noted that wind models now utilise very complex programs that take account of everything from wind farm topography, surface obstacles, wind farm layout etc. to past performance.

The Renewables Representative stated that the wind industry is generally very happy to provide whatever data is required for the TSO to engage in activities that may result in the system being able to carry additional wind, and that he had no objections to the modification proposal in principle. The wording of the last line did, however, need to be clarified, and it was agreed to add “*of the date of the request*” to the end of the last line.

17. Review of Modification Proposal – MPID179 – Generators’ Connection Conditions

17.1 E. Fagan presented on this modification proposal.

17.2 The ESBPG representative stated that ESBPG does not agree with this modification proposal. ESBPG believes that the text as currently written is appropriate given that it was always expected that legacy plant would have a requirement for derogations. It was stated

that ESBPG would like to formally respond in writing with its concerns surrounding this modification proposal.

- 17.3** The Renewables Representative stated that the Grid Code only has any value in so far as it is enforced. He stated that the Renewables Industry has some issues with how the Grid Code is enforced on green and on brown generators. It is also his intention to bring this issue up with various agencies. He stated that all generators must either (i) comply with the Grid Code, (ii) seek a derogation from the Grid Code, or (iii) shut down. In addition if a derogation application is received and EirGrid identifies that the non-compliance could have a negative impact on another generator or class of generators, then EirGrid should rigorously oppose the derogation.
- 17.4** S. Grimes stated that EirGrid takes Grid Code compliance seriously and that EirGrid is well aware of how derogations for one generator may impact negatively on others. He stated that in past year work on Grid Code compliance has been given an enhanced focus by EirGrid.
- 17.5** S. Grimes also stated that in terms of this modification proposal that the text that is being proposed to be deleted is somewhat superfluous as the process for derogations is clearly set out in the General Conditions of the Grid Code and is available to all plant. The particular wording in question is also not mentioned in other parts of the Grid Code.
- 17.6** S. Grimes requested to the ESBPG representative that any further comments be submitted to the GCRP secretary by 7th December 2007.
- 17.7** The Transmission Asset Owner Representative stated that the wording would be even further improved by changing the first line to read "...*apply to all Generation Units connected to the Transmission System.*"
- 17.8** It was agreed that EirGrid would forward the revised modification proposal along with ESBPG's comments and any other comments received to the Commission for their decision.

18. Arrangements for next meeting

- 18.1** The Chairman suggested Thursday April 24th 2008 for the next meeting. There were no objections.

19. AOB

No Any Other Business was raised.

20. Action Items / Summary

- 20.1** EirGrid to submit all agreed and recommended modification proposals including any revisions to the CER for approval.
- 20.2** EirGrid to include any comments received.
- 20.3** EirGrid to circulate proposed changes to the GCRP and the proposed text for the JGCRP constitution to the panel members when complete.
- 20.4** EirGrid to consider rewording of MPID 167 Short Circuit Levels and recirculate prior to the submission to the Commission.
- 20.5** ESBPG to submit to the GCRP secretary further comments on MPID 166 – Fault Ride Through.

- 20.6** EirGrid to consider the Commission's determination on Secondary Fuels and prepare any necessary Grid Code modifications for presentation at a subsequent GCRP meeting.
- 20.7** ESBPG to submit to the GCRP secretary further comments on MPID 179 – Generators' Connection Conditions.

MINUTED BY : E. Fagan, GCRP Secretary