

## MINUTES OF THE JOINT GRID CODE REVIEW PANEL MEETING

Held at the Radisson Blu Hotel, Belfast

On Wednesday 11 September 2013, 10:30 – 13:37

### Present:

Members/Alternates	Representing	Position on the JGCRP
Brendan Woods	SONI	Chairman
Jon O’Sullivan <sup>1</sup>	EirGrid	TSO
Alan Kennedy	SONI	TSO
Cormac McCarthy	EirGrid	TSO
Karol O’Kane	ESB PowerGeneration	Generator
Paul Doyle	ESB PowerGeneration	Generator
Joe Duddy (alternate for Cathal Martin)	RES	Generator
Peter Gillespie	Edenderry Power	Generator
Colin D’Arcy	Tynagh	Generator
Denis McBride	AES Ballylumford	Generator
Barry Sherry	Independent Grid Connected Non CCGT & Non Renewable	Generator
Brían McAuley	SEMO	Market Operator
Gerry Hodgkinson	NIE	DSO
Steven Walsh (alternate for Paul Hickey)	ESB Networks	DSO
Patrick Liddy	Activation Energy	Demand Site Units
Ciaran Donnelly	Wind Prospect	Renewable Generators
Jane McArdle	SSER	Renewable Generators
Robert O’Rourke	CER	Regulator
Anne Trotter	EirGrid	Observer for EirGrid
Robbie Aherne	EirGrid	Observer for EirGrid
Karen Creighton	SONI	Observer for SONI

---

<sup>1</sup> Arrived towards the end of discussions under Update on RoCoF from RAs

John Ging	EirGrid	Observer for EirGrid
David Cashman	EirGrid	Observer for EirGrid
David Carroll	EirGrid	Observer for EirGrid
Séamus Power	EirGrid	Observer for EirGrid
Angela Blair	PPB	Observer for SONI
Brian McMullan	PPB	Observer for SONI
Kevin Hannafin	Energia	Independent electricity supplier (Observer)
Pat Blount	D.P.S.L	Independent electricity supplier (Observer)
Arlene Chawke	EirGrid	Secretary of the EirGrid GCRP
Dalia Majumder-Russell	CMS	Secretary of the SONI GCRP

**Apologies:** Cathal Martin (SSER); David Macartney (Power NI PPB); Rónán Ó'Hogartaigh (ESB Networks); Martin Ahern (Shannon LNG); Mark Glancy (EirGrid); Conor O'Doherty (SONI); Brian Mongan (AES Kilroot); Alex Baird (SONI); Joe O'Connor (Demand Customers). **Absent:** Brian Mulhern (Utility Regulator); Mick McGuckin (Moyle); Stephen Hemphill (Moyle); John Egan (EirGrid Interconnectors).

### **Introduction to JGCRP meeting**

- Brendan Woods as Chairman of the JGCRP meeting welcomed Panel Members to the meeting.
- The Chairman welcomed the alternates and noted the apologies.
- The Chairman provided an overview of the agenda.

### **Minutes and Actions from JGCRP held on 1 May 2013**

- The Chairman noted that no comments were received to the minutes of the previous meeting held on 1 May 2013 in Dublin. There being no other comments, the minutes of the previous meeting were approved by the Panel.
- The Chairman reviewed actions arising from the last meeting:
  - (a) The Chairman confirmed that a DS3 group meeting to consider RoCoF traces had been convened. Karol O'Kane noted that the request for RoCoF frequency traces is outstanding and generators would like to give this information to OEMs for use in the RoCoF studies. Later in the meeting Robbie Aherne talked through the following Frequency Transient Analysis document, which was published by the TSOs on 10<sup>th</sup> September [here](#).

The 100 ms frequency data for the events highlighted in the report will be available shortly [here](#) under June 2013 and Enhanced Performance Monitoring Workshop.

- (b) The Chairman confirmed that a link to Constitution and Rules of the Distribution Code Review Panel had been circulated with the minutes of the last meeting.
- (c) The Chairman noted that actions around dynamic modelling requirements and industry engagement have been actioned and that dynamic modelling is an agenda item.

#### **Fail Sync Discussion - RAs letters to TSOs**

- The Chairman updated the Panel that both CER and the Utility Regulator have sent letters to the respective TSOs asking the TSOs to give further consideration to the potential impact of higher ROCOF on system demand customers.
- The Chairman confirmed that the TSOs are carrying out further studies to consider this issue and once completed will convene a meeting to discuss the findings with industry. The Chairman explained, noting that this is not an urgent matter, which no date has yet been set as the timetable depends on when modelling studies are completed. The Chairman invited comments from the Panel.
- Robert O'Rourke asked whether the studies will be considered on an All Island basis and whether the TSOs intend to consult on any subsequent proposals. The Chairman confirmed that this was the intention.
- No other comments were raised by the Panel.

#### **SONI 'Demand Side Unit' Update**

- Alan Kennedy gave a presentation to update the Panel that the 'Demand Side Unit' consultation paper was published on 10 May 2013 on SONI's website. The consultation closed on 7 June 2013. A copy of the consultation is available [here](#).
- Alan Kennedy confirmed that responses to the consultation paper were received from two parties (Activation Energy and Endeco Technologies). The proposals were slightly modified following the consultation but there were no substantive changes made. SONI submitted the proposed modifications to the Utility Regulator on 22 July 2013 and has not yet had a response.
- The Chairman noted that no representatives from the Utility Regulator were in attendance. Robert O'Rourke (CER) was also not aware of the latest position.

#### **Proposal to set up a DSU Working Group**

- Seamus Power gave update about the TSOs' proposals to set up a Demand Side Unit Operator (DSU) working group and explained that the TSOs were in discussions with a number of DSU operators. A DSU Workshop was held in EirGrid's offices in Dublin on the 23 July 2013 attended by about 30 participants from the industry. The workshop identified a number of issues around performance monitoring and testing (especially in regards to commissioning testing).
- It was suggested that following the workshop a working group be set up to consider the issues and proposed modifications to the Grid Code requirements. The Terms of Reference for this DSU working group were circulated to the Panel with the agenda. No comments to the Terms of Reference were raised by the Panel.
- Seamus Power explained that the DSU Working Group is anticipated to meet every two months to consider the issues raised (such as around the commissioning testing process and performance monitoring).

***ACTION – Comments to the DSU Working Group Terms of Reference and expressions of interest to join the DSU Working Group should be sent to [GridCode@eirgrid.com](mailto:GridCode@eirgrid.com) by 25 September 2013.***

- Patrick Liddy queried the status of the Guidance Document relating to DSU proposals. Seamus Power confirmed that this would be covered at the GCRP.
- Gerry Hodgkinson asked for confirmation that the role of the DSO would be considered. Seamus Power confirmed that as per the DSU Working Group Terms of Reference the Membership of the working group shall comprise representative of the DSO and the DNO.

### **DS3 Update**

- Robbie Aherne advised that he moved into the DS3 Programme Manager Role on 26 May 2013. He updated the Panel that the DS3 programme is currently under review and the TSOs will give a more detailed update at the DS3 Advisory Council meeting scheduled for 25 September 2013. Agenda and status report for this meeting will be circulated shortly. Robbie Aherne gave a series of short updates as follows:
  - RoCoF: The CER published its proposed decision on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2013; consultation on CER's position on RoCoF proposals for the Republic of Ireland closed on 9 August 2013. The Utility Regulator published its proposed decision for consultation on 27 August 2013 and the consultation is due to close on 27 September 2013. The proposed positions of both CER and the Utility Regulator are broadly aligned.
  - System Services: The SEM Committee published for consultation its position on the DS3 System Services on 3 September 2013. The consultation is open until 11 October 2013. The SEM Committee recognised the work undertaken by the TSOs in preparing the recommendation. The SEM Committee is minded to agree with technical aspects of the TSOs' proposals but has reservations on economic rationale and commercial arrangements put forward in the TSOs' recommendations. Further steps in relation to a cost benefit analysis on System Services are considered necessary and the SEM Committee intends to carry out such analysis with a view to publishing its decision by the end of 2013.
  - Voltage Control: The TSOs and DSOs are currently working together and are broadly in agreement on control arrangements and their implementation. A more detailed update will be given at the DS3 Advisory Council meeting. Pilot PV study in Donegal into concerns about voltage control has recently concluded. A report summarising conclusions of the study is expected this month (September 2013).
  - Control Centre tools update: Real time short circuit analysis is currently being undertaken and Alstom have submitted a programme. The DS3 group is now considering whether there is scope for carrying out further user detailed analysis/testing.
  - Curtailment Report 2012: The report which has been compiled by the TSOs. A copy of the report is available [here](#).
  - All Island minimum number of units study: The results of the pilot study on the minimum number of sets have currently shown that the minimum number of units required to securely operate the system in a range of system scenarios is 8 sets. The TSOs are carrying out further and more in-depth analyses of the findings.
- Gerry Hodgkinson noted that DSOs and TSOs are in discussions on the various issues including the need for the distribution system voltage control to be closely coordinated with the

transmission system requirements. He noted that the TSOs and DSOs are close to having an agreed engagement programme on voltage control.

- Gerry Hodgkinson further commented that the 1Hz/s RoCoF modification proposal is due to be discussed at the next Distribution Code Review Panel meeting. Patrick Liddy queried if this is an open meeting. Gerry Hodgkinson to confirm.
- The Chairman noted that the 1Hz/s measured over 500ms is also being proposed in GB where National Grid is currently consulting on its RoCoF proposals. It was clarified that the GB proposals are limited to RoCoF protection settings.

### Enhanced Performance Monitoring

- David Carroll gave an update on Enhanced Performance Monitoring (copy of the presentation is available [here](#)). Workshops were held in Belfast and Dublin in June on existing and proposed enhanced process including presentations from Industry. The workshops were well attended with over 80 participants and there was a good level of engagement. The findings and actions from the workshops have been published [here](#). David Carroll updated the Panel on the items which were due for follow up at the JGCRP:
  - The wind industry noted that the 10 day notification process for rectifying controllability issues is too onerous and asked for the period to be extended if the wind farm can demonstrate a plan for rectifying the issue. David Carroll explained that the TSOs have considered the request and in view of the need to retain sufficient control for operation of the system intend to retain the 10 day limit.
  - High level frequency transient graphs for all major frequency transients from February 2010 to June 2013 have been published [here](#). The TSOs are analysing this data and will prepare a report on the findings. *Post Meeting Note: The TSOs will shortly publish [here](#) the high speed frequency data published in the report.*
  - The TSOs are currently engaging with interested parties on the warmth state issue for CCGT loading and are aiming to discuss the next steps at the next JGCRP meeting (4 December 2013).
  - The TSOs are developing an Enhanced Performance Monitoring design specification due to be completed by Q4 2013. Further workshops will be held early 2014 on the business process associated with the enhanced performance monitoring system.
- Karol O' Kane requested that tolerances be applied as a number of new compliance metrics are being introduced. Dave Carroll clarified that this was raised at the workshops in June and is part of the proposals presented by the TSOs and further clarification will be available in the workshops in Q1 2014;

### Commissioning and testing (David Carroll)

- David Carroll updated the Panel that the conventional and windfarm deliverables published as part of the testing recommendations will not be completed as per the published times. This is due to resources being prioritised for current conventional and windfarm testing. The TSOs are currently working on a sample test procedure to get feedback from industry and to determine the next steps to progress this work.
- Jane McArdle asked whether the windfarm test procedures would be completed by end September 2013. David Carroll clarified that as discussed earlier these timelines will not be met due to reprioritisation of resources;

- Barry Sherry asked whether new tests would be introduced as part of the testing recommendations. David Carroll commented that the recommendations are to standardise and harmonise the testing processes in Ireland and Northern Ireland and this may involve changes to tests.
- Jane McArdle asked when an update can be expected. David Carroll anticipates this being December 2013 or Q1 2014.
- Barry Sherry asked whether the TSOs considered other testing options and whether there are likely to be changes to the current tests (if so, when is this expected?). David Carroll noted that TSOs are seeking to harmonise testing across the island of Ireland and are considering changes to tests as part of recommendations from the workshops but further reports on this are unlikely to be produced before the end of this year.

### **Update on RoCoF from RAs**

- It was noted that no representatives from the Utility Regulator were present at the meeting.
- Robert O'Rourke updated the Panel that CER is considering comments received from the industry to its RoCoF position paper. The position in respect to SONI will be reviewed by the Utility Regulator once the consultation in Northern Ireland closes.
- Generally responses from conventional generators raise significant issues with the RoCoF proposals where as wind generators are generally more in favour. It is likely that CER will need to raise queries with EirGrid to confirm or explain some technical issues.
- Some respondents queried why the recommendations in the PPA Energy and TNEI technical study are not being adopted. Robert O'Rourke explained that CER considered these recommendations and in particular sought to focus on finding solutions where the study identified areas of uncertainties or concerns. Therefore an 18 month delay has been suggested so as to give sufficient time for the TSOs to confirm safe operation of the system.
- There was significant criticism of the proposals to include a Generator Performance Incentive (GPI) and feedback that the proposed figure (EUR 10,000) is too onerous. Similarly, there was feedback that an 18 month delay period is too short when considering the complexity, requirements for engagement with OEMs and role of the TSOs in needing to project manage and ultimately to validate whether compliance has been satisfactorily demonstrated. This is mainly a view expressed by conventional generators who have also responded in favour of including cost recovery mechanisms.
- CER is aiming to issue its decision in November 2013. The 18 month period would start from the decision date.
- Denis McBride queried how CER expects generator compliance to be verified. Robert O'Rourke explained that generators would conduct the studies with the TSOs being involved throughout the process so as to agree the outputs required to evaluate security of the system upfront.
- The Chairman added that a dynamic process of engagement would be needed to understand the capabilities of the generator. Denis McBride noted that the generator would be required to prove that it either can or cannot comply by performing a test and queried the consequence of showing that it cannot comply. The Chairman thought this could be a possible outcome.
- There were a number of questions about the RoCoF proposals and general discussion of these.

- Karen O’Kane thought that the 18 month period was not reasonable given that some OEMs have stated that because their studies would be carried out per unit sequentially a longer period would be needed. Robert O’Rourke highlighted that there is a need to strike a balance between needs of some OEMs and, given the implications of RoCoF on the system, the need to reach a resolution. In particular, progress on SMP and curtailment is dependent on resolution of the RoCoF issue so CER needs to set a deadline and include consequences (GPI) for generators failing to meet it.
- Denis McBride commented that the proposals seem to be imbalanced towards more ‘stick’ than ‘carrot’ such as by not including provisions on cost recovery. Robert O’Rourke responded that cost recovery was considered and excluded because the 2020 European targets, high penetration of wind and operation of a single electricity system increase the urgency to ensure that the Grid Codes provide for minimum system requirements. Further, at a principles level the issues of Grid Code compliance and costs are generally a matter for the generators though in this case the complexity and cost value are higher, it is not sufficient to depart from this established principle.
- Denis McBride asked about the consequences of a plant being shown to be uneconomic following the studies. Robert O’Rourke thought this could be addressed if and when the situation arises.
- Barry Sherry commented that the desktop studies will be based on certain assumptions so would have limited use because they would not be testing the generator’s actual ability on fault ride through. This then raises concerns about what would be the liability of generators should there be a system failure. Robert O’Rourke noted that compliance with RoCoF will be on the basis of studies which TSOs would consider to include an accepted level of risk. Therefore there should, in principle, be no liability for generators. The Chairman agreed that the TSOs would not be acting prudently if representations of generators/OEMs were not duly considered. However he noted that higher RoCoFs were required in other jurisdictions.
- A number of Panel members did not think that the proposed system exists in other jurisdictions nor had the compliance standard been tested. Karol O’Kane felt the Spanish electricity system is not comparable. Ciaran Donnelly questioned the prudence of any generator signing up to standard (including the current 0.5Hz one in the Republic of Ireland) which it cannot comply with. In this case the reliance is also placed on a study. Denis McBride stated the scale and cost impact of current proposals differentiate this change.
- Jon O’Sullivan confirmed that the TSOs will evaluate prudence of operating the system based on outcomes of the tests done by generators. As part of this, any issues raised would need to be shown to have been resolved. This is where simulation studies and frequency injections may prove useful for carrying out tests and determining what would be prudent. He noted that a result which removes a significant amount of generation from the system may not be a prudent outcome.

### **Curtailment Report Update**

- Jon O’Sullivan gave an update on the new template for renewable reporting as a result of the SEM Committee tie-break decision which is being developed. The TSOs have held two separate meetings with affected stakeholders (including Wind, CHP, Hydro, Peat) and have produced a high level report on an island of Ireland basis with the aim of agreeing it by end of September 2013.
- The reporting will be initially on a quarterly basis in arrears until an automated system is implemented (approximately in the next 2 years). The reporting systems will differ between

Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland partly also because the TSOs use different systems (EDOL in SONI and Wind Dispatch tool in EirGrid). This would be harmonised in the future.

### **Update on Wind Farm Settings Schedule**

- Alan Kennedy updated the Panel that the Wind Farm Settings Schedule has been sent to the Utility Regulator for approval. The Chairman explained that modelling requirements have been removed from the proposals and that it is unlikely that the Utility Regulator will review this proposal prior to making a decision on RoCoF.
- Gerry Hodgkinson noted that the Wind Farm Settings Schedule is due to be discussed at the next Distribution Code Review Panel meeting with a view to incorporating its requirements into the Distribution Code. This proposal would need the Utility Regulator's approval.

### **Dynamic Modelling**

- David Cashman began his presentation (a copy of which is available [here](#)) by explaining that the proposals on modelling were raised as part of the Wind Farm Settings Schedule. Since consulting on the Wind Farm Settings Schedule and associated Grid Code modifications, the TSOs have presented on this issue at the JGCRP on 1 May 2013 and have discussed the issues in working group meetings in April and July 2013. Since this the TSOs have also engaged in bilateral discussions with a number of wind OEMs.
- The TSOs received feedback from these engagements, namely that:
  - (a) requirement to produce models in three software systems was onerous and the industry is reluctant to provide the TSOs with its source code. In particular concerns were raised about protecting intellectual property rights which is overcome by providing black box models.
  - (b) The TSOs have produced a standard form Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) for OEM and industry comment but note that legal review may involve negotiation of the NDA and lead to delays.
  - (c) There have been requests for specific criteria for validation. The TSOs are considering this request.
  - (d) Concerns have been raised around retrospective effect of any requirements and the associated cost implications.
- David Cashman explained that that lack of accurate models and the known discrepancies between model outputs and actual plant performance necessitate an improvement in the information TSOs receive from the generating plants. Currently much of the information is provided on black box basis so there is limited ability for the TSOs to interrogate the data and to understand the impacts. Further for WFPS, the models are on turbine not wind farm level so the cumulative effect is not captured. This limits the ability of the TSOs to capture accurate frequency responses.
- David Cashman explained that the TSOs were seeking to avoid negotiated NDAs and are seeking ability to use the information consistently across the system for the stated purposes. This includes the need for the TSOs to share the modelling data with its affiliates. So far one OEM has signed the NDA.
- The TSOs have revised this request for models. The revised proposal is to request one fully validated RMS model and one EMT model together with all supporting information (developed to TSO specifications). The TSOs would develop the model in other formats at their own costs.



***ACTION: TSOs to prepare specifications for the EMT model to present at the next JGCRP.***

- Once the RMS model is validated no further changes would be expected to it. The generator would be responsible for updates for any black box models but the TSOs would be responsible for updates to the EMT model and for ongoing validation of the system provided sufficient access to the model is available. The TSOs would welcome inclusion of source code but in any case need all information to be provided in a format which is useable and understandable in the context of future model developments (in line with TSO prepared criteria and guidance). In case of software updates, the users would be asked to provide revised models.

***ACTION: TSOs to prepare criteria for model validation to present at the next JGCRP.***

- David Cashman explained that to address the knowledge gap, the modelling requirements may have retrospective effect. However should an acceptable alternative model exist, then no retrospective changes would be expected. It is also the TSOs intention that the changes would apply at distribution connection level.
- Proposals for dynamic modelling will be presented to the EirGrid GCRP and the proposals will be subject to consultation in Northern Ireland.
- Jon O'Sullivan stated that the TSOs are likely to know the extent of their knowledge gap by December and so able to propose solutions. David Cashman agreed that users will need adequate lead time to understand the requirements.
- Jane McArdle queried if the required format will be PSS/E, DigSILENT or another specified environment. David Cashman explained that the TSOs are reviewing software packages and will confirm their position at the next meeting. The environment will be defined and PSS/E, TSAT or DigSILENT are expected to be the chosen formats. The TSOs will also look to develop a supporting document setting out usability guidelines.
- A number of Panel members raised concerns about ability for the TSOs to require the generators to comply with changes it may make to its modelling requirements because the generators would have limited ability to challenge such requirements. David Cashman explained that should the TSO change its requirements (for example as part of software changes) the changes would be notified to the generators in advance and would be subject to the Grid Code governance processes. The TSOs would in any case seek to minimise possibility of changes.
- Ciaran Donnelly noted that it is important that the collaborative process to date is maintained and asked if there would be scope for stakeholder engagement on any documents setting out scope of possible changes. David Cashman confirmed that the document would be open to industry comment and welcomed bilateral discussions.

**European Codes**

- Jon O'Sullivan gave a presentation (a copy of which is available [here](#)) on the current status of European Network Code (ENC) development noting that ACER's recommendations to the draft Capacity Allocation and Congestion Management Network Code (CACM) have been published. ENTSO-E is in the process of revising the Network Code on Operational Security following ACER's adopted opinion which raised concerns about security of supply and interaction with other network codes. ENTSO-E aims to submit a revised code to ACER by end of September 2013. Work on the Network Code on Operational Planning and Scheduling (OPS) is due to commence shortly.
- Jon O'Sullivan commented that the ENCs appear to be being developed by disparate teams and with several draft ENCs now in comitology, this process is falling behind its intended timetable.

- Jon O’Sullivan informed the Panel that the TSOs carried out a workshop to discuss the framework guidelines and the draft Balancing Network Code and identified interactions with the Ancillary Services changes.
- Jon O’Sullivan updated the Panel that there is a desire to pilot the obligations of the Requirements for Generators (RfG) network code at national code level by end of 2013. Accordingly the TSOs are looking to progress this work stream by setting up a working group.
- Jon O’Sullivan expects the ENC to involve a substantial amount of administrative work over the next two years and significant updates to the business processes. As there are 9 network codes to consider with each one having a potential to impact the existing regulation frameworks, this is likely to be an involved process.

#### **ENTSO-E RfG Network Code readiness**

- The Chairman explained that high level impacts in both SONI and EirGrid Grid Codes have been assessed and the TSOs have circulated draft Terms of Reference (a copy of which is available [here](#)).
- Jon O’Sullivan explained that there are three possible levels of impact of the RfG: (a) minor textual change and little business impact; (b) significant textual change but minor business impact; and (c) minor textual change but significant business impact.
- On an initial view the Grid Code Connection Conditions in both Grid Codes appear largely consistent with RfG even if the RfG uses different terminology. The process will involve revising the compliance and monitoring business processes. Further, ability to make changes to the Grid Code once the RfG is in place will be limited because of the justification that would be required to make any changes that would have retrospective effect as well as the protracted comitology process with ACER. Robert O’Rourke noted that the Commission is currently considering how ongoing changes to the network codes could be made.
- Jon O’Sullivan explained that the approach to adopting RfG requirements needs to be agreed at a principle level and once agreed will need to involve a number of stakeholders including the government bodies responsible for each jurisdiction’s compliance with the network codes. As part of this, the TSOs are seeking a working group to work through the detailed requirements of the RfG. The TSOs will also need to carry out their own impact assessments.
- Gerry Hodgkinson stated that it is important to understand the position of the relevant government department and queried if their position is known. The Chairman explained that TSOs have presented on this issue to the respective departments but may not yet fully know their positions. Robert O’Rourke explained that technically the network codes do not require to be transposed into national legislation so there is no requirement for a decision from a Member State (i.e. GB or ROI). Jon O’Sullivan stated that the Member States are ultimately responsible for implementation of the ENC so the TSOs should keep them informed.
- The Chairman noted that the changes from the ENC are likely to eventually impact the whole of each Grid Code and need a dedicated group to interrogate the detailed requirements.
- Jon O’Sullivan raised that the ENC also represent a unique opportunity to harmonise the EirGrid and SONI Grid Codes if this is what is desired. The Panel considered the issues around and desirability of having a more harmonised approach and generally how to approach the ENC. There was a general recognition that there is likely to be limited appetite for undertaking this work at a later date and recognition that changes once ENCs are implemented are likely to involve needing to revert to ACER and go through comitology. While there would be benefits of having a single code questions were raised whether the amount of effort this would require

would outweigh the benefits. Anne Trotter pointed out that the TSOs have experience of harmonisation of the two codes – the SDCs and that there is still a facility for greyed out sections if the codes are harmonised. Jon O’Sullivan pointed out that the harmonisation of the SDCs was driven largely by political desire for an All Island system (setting up the SEM). The Chairman noted that jurisdictional separation would need to be maintained as the TSOs operate under different licences.

- Joe Duddy asked about the level of detail necessary to include in the Grid Codes so as to comply with the legal requirements. Jon O’Sullivan stated that it would be preferable, subject to legal review, of taking a light touch approach and expressed a desire for a small and effective working group which would highlight issues where the network codes impacts one of more documents in the regulatory framework.
- The TSOs considered that the working group could start on joint basis. There were no objections from the Panel.
- The Chairman invited comments to the Terms of Reference and expressions of interest. There were no immediate comments from the Panel to the terms. Denis McBride asked how interested Panel member could submit expressions of interest.

***ACTION – Comments to the ENTSO-E Network Code Adoption Working Group Terms of Reference and expressions of interest to join the ENTSO-E Network Code Adoption Working Group should be sent to [GridCode@eirgrid.com](mailto:GridCode@eirgrid.com) by 25 September 2013.***

- Jon O’Sullivan stated that the ENTSO-E Network Code Adoption Working Group Terms of Reference will be deemed approved if no comments are received by the above date. The TSOs will convene the first meeting of this working group prior to next JGCRP.

***ACTION – TSOs to convene the first meeting of the ENTSO-E Network Code Adoption Working Group prior to next JGCRP***

#### **Regulator update**

- Robert O’Rourke updated the Panel that the System Services proposals are currently being considered by CER and the consultation on its minded to position has been published. There is further work needed on the economic aspects of the proposals and CER intends to hold an industry workshop in October 2013 to consider these.

#### **Any Other Business**

- Frequency transient analysis and RoCoF
- Robbie Aherne noted that the Frequency Transient Analysis document shows RoCoF traces against frequency and may help inform the RoCoF studies including on current frequency responses.
- Karol O’Kane asked if this information sets out requirements which OEMs could rely on for their studies including in respect of extreme events. Jon O’Sullivan stated that the graphs included in the document are indicative and the standard being proposed is 1Hz/s over 500ms. This standard can be achieved in a number of permutations.
- Karol O’Kane thought that providing data on RoCoF traces was an action from the DS3 working group and considered the lack of information an inhibitory factor preventing the OEMs from beginning their studies for RoCoF. Jon O’Sullivan explained that he believed the action had been completed and noted that if the regulators expect the TSOs to project manage the

RoCoF studies process then, at such time the TSOs will work out the requirements with the specific generators. David Carroll noted that there are 55 historical events included in the table but it is not a complete record of all events in that period.

- Denis McBride raised the issue of TSOs involvement in the project management and evaluation of generator's RoCoF studies. In particular, the TSOs involvement is likely to have a cost impact on the generators and may impact the quotes it obtains from OEMs for the studies. Jon O'Sullivan noted that EirGrid had sent a letter to CER to state that if CER intends for EirGrid to manage and confirm compliance of generators on RoCoF, EirGrid will need rights to input into the scope of the studies. Robert O'Rourke agreed that cost recovery is not addressed in CER's paper and CER will consider the level of control that would be retained by the generator. CER expects the parties to act reasonably.
- Barry Sherry stated that interactions with the TSOs are likely to impact the 18 month period the generators have to carry out the studies. The period should instead start from when the scope of studies is agreed with the TSO. Jon O'Sullivan suggested this point is sent to CER for consideration.
- Next meeting – 4 December 2013 (Dublin)