

**WIND STEERING GROUP
Meeting No 1
CR2**

Ref: CER/04/094

**Wednesday 21st January 2004
14:30 - 17:30hrs**

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Attendees | Denis Cagney | CER | Chairperson |
| | Eugene Coughlan | CER | |
| | Cliona McNally | CER | Secretary to Group |
| | Claire Beausang | CER | |
| | David Naughton | CER | |
| | John McCann | SEI | |
| | Morgan Bazilian | SEI | |
| | Simon Grimes | ESB NG | |
| | Gay Kirwan | ESB Networks | |
| | Tony Walsh | ESB Networks | |
| | Paddy O'Kane | IWEA | |
| | Paddy Teahon | IWEA | |
| | Grattan Healy | MnG | |
| | Jan Olesen | MnG | |

Apologies Adele Sleator (ESBNG); OFREG

IWEA – Irish Wind Energy Association

MnG – Meitheal na Gaoithe

Introduction

CER welcomed members and gave a summary of the background which gave rise to the formation of the steering committee.

1. Agenda

The proposed agenda was agreed.

IWEA raised a query regarding conditions and timing of end of the moratorium on wind grid connections. If specified agenda items could be resolved, or are likely to be resolved, can the meeting take it that the moratorium will be lifted on 31 March?

The CER said it could not give any undertaking in that regard now. Each matter has to be dealt with and the CER cannot anticipate the outcome or what the overall picture will be regarding wind connections. CER is anxious to have the moratorium lifted as soon as possible. There is also the point that CER cannot anticipate at this stage what ESBNG will propose, quite apart from whatever decision it (CER) takes on this proposal.

MnG noted that the moratorium could, if maintained, potentially be in breach of the Renewables Directive 2001/77/EC and noted that there were targets set down for Ireland for 2010. The CER acknowledged that the Directive must be considered but noted that the grid access provisions were without prejudice to maintenance of the safety and reliability of the national grid.

2. Grid Code for Wind

ESBNG gave an update regarding the process. Special meeting held on 14th January. Programme has been accelerated. First submission to CER scheduled for 16th March and second final paper by 9th April.

At these points CER will publish the papers for consultation. CER anticipates a shortened consultation process. If we assume consensus on a Wind Grid Code emerges from the process – though we cannot take this for granted – then it would probably warrant exceptional considerations to emerge from the public consultation process for the proposed new Code to be amended, or at least materially so.

IWEA queried if the delivery of this would be sufficient to lift the moratorium. CER noted that it would be a necessary but, on its own, not a sufficient condition.

In the interim any derogation requests will be evaluated according to the emerging draft Grid Code for Wind.

3. Interactions between Distribution Code and Grid Code for Wind

CER stated that a meeting with the ESB Networks and ESBNG had been held to discuss the differences between the Codes and the areas where it would be appropriate for the Distribution Code to be brought in line with the Grid Code for Wind. There are currently two codes: one for the distribution system and one for the transmission system. The “grid code for wind” will not be a new code, as such, but rather an adaptation of the transmission grid code to take account of the special characteristics of wind generators. A separate distribution code will remain but will have to be compatible with the grid code, including its provision for wind. ESBNG and ESB DSO undertook to move this forward such that the two papers submitted to the CER for consultation would address both Codes.

MnG stated that the requirements appeared more onerous than in other countries. ESBNG stated that this was not the case and the provisions were comparable with requirements in Spain, Germany, Denmark, England and Scotland.

MnG noted that wind farms below a certain threshold (they proposed 6MW/20kv connection) should not be subject to any new Distribution connection conditions.

ESB Networks invited MnG to discuss any issues they may have with the DSO Wind representative on the Distribution Code Review Panel and with DSO as well.

ESBNG invited MnG to attend the Grid Code for Wind Group regarding Minimum Size.

4. Survey of Existing Offers

CER stated that it had hired Liam O’Donnell, a consultant experienced in the area of Irish wind farm set up, to review all the connection offers currently live and in the process. The purpose of survey is to get a realistic view of what will be connected and over what timeframe that would be anticipated. CER will provide the results of the survey to the steering group subject to confidentiality requirements.

SEI offered an excel spreadsheet database of all planning applications and where in the process they are.

IWEA asked that the survey consider what amount will be connected and in what timeframe. IWEA stated that the survey should allow more wind on the system if it appears that a lot will not connect. CER agreed that this is the thinking behind the survey. The survey will inform CER decision-making as well as any future proposal ESBNG may make.

5. Reconciliation of Connection Offer Processes

CER stated that a meeting had been held with ESBNG and ESB Networks to discuss the various differences between the connection offer processes. The issues of timing, validation and payment format were considered.

CER to follow up with ESBNG and ESB Networks regarding reconciling the offer processes to the CER. A more detailed timeline will be worked out with CER.

IWEA queried if applications were still being taken by the TSO and DSO. ESBNG and ESB DSO stated that they were.

ESBNG and ESB DSO noted that whenever the moratorium is lifted, with the volume of applications waiting to be processed (currently 45) most, if not all, offers will not issue within 70 business days. A queuing system will be put in place to maintain the first come, first served principal.

6. Programme for Modelling Wind Generation Plant

ESBNG stated that they had received no validated turbine models to date from the manufacturers since the industry forum on 17 December. In its efforts to obtain these validated models ESBNG has formally written to all developers with accepted transmission connection offers requesting the validated models, made direct approaches to manufacturers and is considering going to Denmark to meet with manufacturers directly.

ESBNG are looking at going to Denmark to meet with the manufacturers and see their models.

ESBNG stated that they had a visit from a senior manager in ELTRA, the system operator in west Denmark. Up to quite recently it appears that ELTRA was not too concerned about the dynamic performance of WTGs because of its strong AC interconnected with Germany. However, with the increasing wind penetration levels in northern Germany it is now becoming an issue for them.

It was noted that the generic model for wind turbines can be inaccurate.

IWEA suggested that model validation take place on site with whatever existing turbines are in place.

It was commented that there is no validation of wind turbine models in academic or other literature – therefore it is unknown how this much wind would operate on the system. There could be things which need to be done to the network systems or something else – this is completely unknown at this point.

It was noted that the island of Ireland is leading the way in so much as we could soon have a higher penetration of wind on a single system than anywhere else. Therefore the need for modelling has never been as much of an issue for other countries who are integrated into an AC meshed network of much greater size. It was also noted that there does not appear to be a fully validated model anywhere.

SEI suggested that it would be useful if the process to get acceptance in terms of wind turbine modelling were defined.

MnG suggested that the connection offer process could be contingent upon parties applying providing models and independent validation of those models by certain dates of the connection offer would not be valid.

MnG stated that the fault ride through requirement was creating the need for models for wind turbines. ESBNG stated that there is nothing new in them looking for turbine models for connection agreements. MnG said that where there is no fault ride through requirement (e.g. for very small turbines/wind farms) a model may not be required either.

CER requested that ESBNG report back to CER and to the group regarding the status of the modelling programme and

7. Workplan

The CER undertook to work with the TSO and DSO to deliver an indicative workplan to be circulated to members.

8. AOB & Discussion

IWEA stated that there was a concern that there would not be clarity regarding when and how the moratorium would be lifted.

MnG stated that a representative from another utility with wind system operation experience should be included. ESBNG suggested that they join the Wind Grid Code review group and come and meet with TSO. This was agreed.

MnG stated that modelling should not be a barrier to smaller projects as it was not as important for them.

The issue of constraining of wind farms was raised but not discussed in any detail.

9. Date of next meeting set as – 12th February 2004 at 2.30pm in CER offices.