

MINUTES OF THE SONI GRID CODE REVIEW PANEL MEETING

Held at the Spencer Hotel, Dublin

On Wednesday 11th June 2014, 1.30pm -2.30pm

Present:

Members/Alternates	Representing	Position on the GCRP
Brendan Woods	SONI	Chairperson
Karen Creighton	SONI	As an advisor for SONI
Tom McCartan	SONI	As an advisor for SONI
Adrian Henning	SONI	As an advisor for SONI
Denis McBride	AES	Member
Cathal Martin	SSER	Member
Angela Blair	PPB	Observer
Tony McElroy	Energia	Member
Jim Cooke	Coolkeeragh ESB	Member
Ian Bailie	NIE	Member
Denis Kelly	NIE	Member
Mervyn Adams	NIRIG	Observer for Renewable Generation
Billy Walker	Utility Regulator	Member
David Macartney	PPB	Observer
Leigh Williamson	SONI	Secretary of the SONI GCRP

1. Chairman's Introduction to the Meeting

The Chairman welcomed the Panel Members, alternates and observers and gave an overview of the agenda.

2. Apologies for absence

The Chairman noted that apologies were received from: Stephen Hemphill, Alan Kennedy, William Steele, Conor O'Doherty, Ian Luney and Alex Baird.

3. Minutes of the Grid Code Review Panel Meeting held on 12 February 2014

The Chairman noted that no comments were received to the minutes of the previous meeting held on 12th February 2014 in Belfast. There being no other comments, the minutes of the previous meeting were approved by the Panel.

4. Panel Membership

- 4.1 The Chairman noted that Mervyn Adams has not confirmed an alternate. Mervyn confirmed he would look into this for the next meeting. William Steele has also to confirm an alternate.

Action: Mervyn Adams to confirm alternate at next NIRIG . Brendan Woods to follow up with William Steele on his alternate appointment.

5. DSU Modifications

- 5.1 Adrian Henning presented to the Panel on proposed DSU Modifications (presentation attached to e-mail). These proposals take account of the outcome of the JGCRP DSU Working Group. The intent is to align the Grid Code requirements as much as possible on an all-island basis.
- 5.2 Previous DSU modifications submitted to URegNI for approval on 10th July 2013 had not been approved and it has been indicated by URegNI that they intend to wait until the further changes were consulted upon and submitted for approval before they would proceed to approve. Billy Walker confirmed that this was his understanding.
- 5.3 It is intended to simplify the Application Data Requirements for DSUs. However, due to differing DSO processes that NIE and ESB currently carry out, then some Application Data Requirements may still be required from the DSU in Northern Ireland. It was stated that SONI are relaxed on who provides them with the data as long as it is received, There is also a concern that there may be no obligation of NIE to provide the data directly to SONI.
- 5.4 The RoI Grid Code is also introducing Operation modes of generation involved in the DSU at the request of ESB, in line with the RoI Distribution Code. They will not be included in the Northern Ireland Mods as the definitions do not exist in Northern Ireland.
- 5.5 A DSU Notice Time has been introduced to provide clarification to DSU Operators with respect to when they are expected to begin ramping to meet a dispatch instruction and distinguish this from the Response Time.
- 5.6 Some changes to wording are being proposed as part of the signal requirements for DSU to clarify the requirements for DSUs.
- 5.7 Frequency requirements of generation included in DSU was introduced as part of the previous modifications submitted for approval. The Working Group has made proposals that less onerous requirements should be placed on generation at individual demand sites operating in a short term paralleling mode, as compared to those individual demand sites operating generation in long term parallel mode. This would be specific to DSUs, however, it should further be noted that the Northern Ireland Distribution Code already places Frequency Requirements on Distribution connected generation. Adrian Henning confirmed that if it is purely only demand reduction that is being used at an individual demand site then these frequency requirements would not apply.
- 5.8 The major proposed change is in respect to the Performance Monitoring of the DSU. Currently this is based on DSU predicting aggregated demand of all Individual Demand Sites day ahead comprising the DSU for each half-hour trading period. This must be accurate to within 5%

when not dispatched and used as baseline when dispatched. The Working Group has deemed that this provided difficulties for both DSUs and the TSOs.

The new method of calculating the baseline is based on correlation with historical data and has been outlined in the updated modifications going through. The DSUs on the Working Group requested that these requirements were clarified and as such, a worked example was developed and is available on EirGrid Website:

http://www.eirgrid.com/media/DSU_PM_of_DI_Worked_Example_DRAFT-Multiple_Sheets_No_Formulas.xlsx

http://www.eirgrid.com/media/DSU_PM_of_DI_Worked_Example_DRAFT-Single_Sheet_Formulas.xlsx

- 5.9 Adrian Henning outlined that the final wording to reflect these changes in the SONI Grid Code would be issued in a consultation towards the end of June as per the normal procedures. The consultation will be published on the SONI website and an email will be sent to Panel members as well as Working Group members to make them aware that the consultation has been launched. This consultation will run for 4 weeks, and then a Report will be issued to URegNI during August seeking approval of the changes.
- 5.10 Denis Kelly queried what the barrier to DSUs in the market is. Adrian Henning said that his understanding was that primary legislation doesn't allow for DSU licensing so the Regulator has been looking at a form of agreements to put in place with DSUs instead, similar to the AGU Agreement. It is expected that this will be in place during Q4 2014 so the DSU Modifications would need to be in place in preparation for this. Billy Walker stated that he would check internally as to the status of the URegNI work looking at providing a Licence to DSUs is to check the status of the work stream and feedback anticipated dates when this would be in place.
- 5.11 Mervyn Adams pointed out there is no DSU representation. Brendan Woods noted and said that he would consult with UREGNI on changes to the constitution of the panel.

Actions: SONI to issue consultation by end of June 2014.

URegNI to provide update on DSU Licensing issue

6. European Network Codes

- 6.1 Brendan Woods gave an update on Network Codes. RFG is in comitology as is the Demand Connection Code and CACM. The Forward Capacity Code and HVDC codes are with ACER. Ultimately, the Network Codes approach is to be approved by the Regulator.
- 6.2 David Macartney said that the stakeholder meeting on the Network Codes is to take place on 1st July and suggested it would be good to have a meeting on this matter beforehand.
- 6.3 Brendan Woods asked if there are any further comments on the Network Codes. Denis McBride said he has looked at the Codes and it is hard to see what it would look like in practice but the lack of progress being made is frustrating.
- 6.4 David Macartney said elements of this when doing a risk assessment would be obvious.
- 6.5 Brendan Woods commented that it would be logical to adopt the same processes for NI and ROI.
- 6.6 Denis McBride asked about how is the implementation of the European codes is governed. Brendan Woods confirmed it is a member state responsibility i.e. DECC but in NI this falls to DETINI and UREGNI.

- 6.7 Denis McBride commented that at the last working group Option 3 was discussed but cannot be done because of legislative requirements. Option 4 works in relation to European legal requirements.
- 6.8 Brendan Woods noted that Option 1 was the GB preference but suggested that as long as the NI authorities were satisfied then DECC would not object.
- 6.9 Cathal Martin said that he thought Option 4 and 5 are similar but Option 5 would be more cumbersome.
- 6.10 Denis McBride said all Options have 3 levels. Cathal Martin pointed out that Option 4 does not have the requirement to go through European Codes as the National Codes will have the same detail.
- 6.11 Denis McBride said there is a need to make sure this all goes through the Panel and consultation. David Macartney commented that the main issue is maintaining separate governance for NI and ROI arrangements. Denis McBride pointed out that ESB are represented at meetings but NIE are not.
- 6.12 Brendan Woods suggested that the Panel members should decide which route they want to take and that it would be appropriate to then meet with UREGNI..

Action: Denis McBride to arrange a conference call with Brendan Woods to discuss.

7. Fast Frequency Response

- 7.1 The Chairman stated that the Regulator was to review the derogation process. Karen Creighton suggested that this should be time limited.
- 7.2 The Chairman said there was a response from OEMs on the agenda and queried if there has been a response from NIRIG. Mervyn Adams confirmed there was a letter sent to SONI after the previous GCRP in February.
- 7.3 Cathal Martin read a response letter from NIRIG. Mervyn Adams said Enercon had confirmed they would cannot meet and have provided a formal response.
- 7.4 Brendan Woods commented that fast frequency response is mentioned throughout the Grid Code and not technically defined. SONI was asked to define this during the consultation on the Wind Farm Settings Schedule and there was a consultation with no comments on the 200ms figure (other than from NIRIG who stated that 200ms seems onerous and that they did not know whether OEMs could achieve this. Brendan Woods said he discussed the issue with Jon O'Sullivan (it's not a requirement in the EirGrid grid code) and they agreed that the 200ms requirement should be removed from the grid code.

Action: Brendan Woods to discuss with Billy Walker how this requirement can be modified without going for consultation.

- 7.5 Cathal Martin said it would be best to relax the 0.2s threshold and deal with this matter through system services.
- 7.6 Karen Creighton said that wind farms in the connection process have had turbine manufacturers query this and SONI have advised all parties that a derogation will be required until the issue is resolved. Cathal Martin said that at the time of consultation OEMs had not yet looked into this enough.

7.7 Karen Creighton asked for clarification around the discussion of permanent derogations in the NIRIG letter to SONI. Cathal Martin said that older plants do not comply so a derogation is required. Brendan Woods said that the requirement should be removed completely from the Grid Code. Cathal Martin then suggested that it would be better to change it to the RfG requirement of 2 seconds as all OEMs can comply with this and it will need to be implemented down the line anyway.

7.8 Mervyn Adams queried if SONI could reply formally to the NIRIG letter to allow the wind industry some comfort that the issue is being dealt with.

Action: Brendan Woods to formally reply to the NIRIG letter.

8. ROCOF

8.1 Brendan Woods stated that as per earlier discussions an independent consultant would be brought in for ROI but not NI. The Regulator may advise that NI can appoint an independent consultant but it does not make sense to have a different independent consultant to that appointed by CER.

8.2 Tom McCartan said the fact that SONI has carried out a piece of work to prioritise the generators in NI that would be required to have their ROCOF studies completed in the initial phase of the implementation of the ROCOF decision as published by the Regulator on the 7th May 2014. He suggested that SONI would share this information initially with the Regulators and if they were happy with SONI's approach, SONI would then present this information to the generators. Denis McBride and Jim Cooke indicated that they would be happy to have a joint meeting for the presentation of the SONI work.

8.3 Denis McBride indicated that if the 'B Station' units had to undertake a ROCOF study this could affect the capacity bidding process.

Action: Brendan Woods to organise a meeting with the Regulators to allow SONI to present priority findings to generators.

8.4 Tom McCartan pointed out that there would be a requirement for a ROCOF study on at least one of these units unless AES made a formal submission to the effect that the unit was capable of staying connected to the system following a ROCOF of 1Hz/s measured over 500 ms.

Action: Tom McCartan to look at previous system events that may have indicated a 'B station' generator had stayed connected during events of at least 1Hz/s in the past.

9. Any Other Business

9.1 Jim Cooke said there is a discussion ongoing regarding primary operating reserve at the RoI Grid Code Panel. He was concerned that this could lead to a divergence between the two Grid Codes.

9.2 SONI undertook to clarify this issue in the Grid Code.

Action: Brendan Woods to consider this point.

10. Arrangements for next meeting

12th November 2014 (Belfast).

DRAFT