

Day After Report for GC0107/113 (RfG parameters); GC0117 Regional Differences

Present:

Emma Hart	NGESO	Rachel Woodbridge-Stocks	NGESO
Rashpal Gata-Aura	NGESO	Alan Creighton	Northern Powergrid
Garth Graham	SSE	Paul Youngman	Drax
MK			

GC0107/0113 Agenda

This is the mod that will publish a large spreadsheet of each and every RfG required parameter, both generic, and more worryingly, those which are site specific.

No real progress from last month. To take it forward I have agreed (and I think NG reluctantly did too – although I'm probably no longer on Rachel's Xmas card list) to go through Garth's spreadsheet to put in the G99 data, and to identify for us what might be site specific and hence what the risk is. As I think I reported last time – my worry is that site specific voltage control parameters get caught – or at least get caught in Garth's view of the world, so we need to argue that they are not in scope as the RfG expects these to be done bilaterally and does not suggest they should be published.

Garth also has in mind that anything that is applied bilaterally to any generator should be recorded in the spreadsheet to be maintained by NG; ie more than just parameters etc. It is still not clear, absent working through it all, what the implications of this are.

NG also promised to provide the draft legal text for next time (having failed this time). By which time we'll have a view of how much of this is bilateral versus how much is fixed.

My view is that if the fixed parameters dominate totally any bilateral parameters we should be able to argue that the baseline code is more efficient than this mod, or failing that I still think a WAGCM to limit the bilateral parameters to transmission connected generation might be appropriate. Next meeting in mid May.

Present:

Paul Mullen	NGESO	Alan Creighton	Northern Powergrid
Garth Graham	SSE	Andy Vaudin	EDFE
Jeremy Kaplan	Exxon	Matthew Bent	NGESO
Rachel Hinsley	NGESO	Paul Youngman	Drax
MK		Richard Wilson	UKPN

GC0107/0113 Agenda

Another WG meeting with not much progress from the last meeting. However we did get close to consensus on a few points:

The changes would not apply retrospectively to the key technical requirements of existing plant.

However the changes would retrospectively to obligations in the Operating Codes – this might imply some new costs in relation to, for example, real time data.

There is an unresolved issue about applying requirements at generating module level (a la RfG) or at power station level (Grid Code approach). Retaining Large and Small would certainly make G Code drafting easier, and protect all that NG hold dear, but at the expense of simplicity for generators (and us) who still have to apply the main technical requirements at module level, but pick up some issues at power station or facility level. I think it might be possible to square this circle when we get into the drafting.

Another positive step that was taken today (after prompting for a couple of meetings) is that the WG now believes it should try to formally engage with the Open Networks project so that all the issues about real time data etc can be tackled in an inclusive and forward thinking approach, rather than one that just tries to rationalize the historical arrangements. I expect an email suggesting at least one meeting between the WG and appropriate ON experts to be sent to the ENA by NG Code Admin. Next formal WG meeting probably in June.

These are informal notes only

Mike Kay

10 April 2019