

Draft report Stakeholder feedback template:

AEMO Review of technical requirements for connection (NER 5.2.6A)

Stakeholders making a submission on the recommendations set out in the AEMO draft report may use the below template to provide feedback. Please consider the confidentiality disclaimer at the end of this document.

Stakeholder: Goldwind Australia

Schedule 5.2 Conditions for Connection of Generators

5.2 Generator Recommendation feedback	sue Sc
---------------------------------------	--------

NER S5.2.1 – Outline of requirements

NER S5.2.5.1 – Reactive power capability

Voltage range for full reactive power requirement	We support both option 2 and option 3. However, we would like AEMO to provide more clarification on whether option 3 offers any additional benefits, and consider choosing option 2 instead. Option 2 is easier to implement and evaluate, and would prevent investments in marginal cases. Additionally, since generators are typically in voltage droop control, it is unlikely they will operate when exporting reactive power during high voltage situations.
Treatment of reactive power capability considering temperature derating	We support Options 2 and 3.
Compensation of reactive power when units are out of service	

S5.2.5.1, S5.2.5.5, S5.2.5.7, S5.2.5.8, S5.2.5.10

Simplifying standards for small connections	
---	--

NER S5.2.5.2 - Quality of electricity generated

Reference to plant standard	We support Option 2



NER S5.2.5.4 – Generating system response to voltage disturbances

Overvoltage requirements for medium voltage and lower connections	We support Options 2 and 3.
Requirements for overvoltages above 130%	We support Option 3. Regarding option 4: Which factors influence the upper threshold? Identifying the appropriate upper limit may necessitate a thorough analysis to establish a suitable limit that caters to the majority of industry applications, without showing favouritiem towards any particular technology.
Clarification of continuous uninterrupted operation in the range 90% to 110% of normal voltage	We are in favour of the proposed changes to the CUO requirements. However, it would be beneficial if AEMO could provide a definition for what constitutes a "substantial" drop in active power (preferably as a percentage of Pmax), even if it is just a guide number that is included with the final rule change.

NER S5.2.5.5 – Generating system response to disturbances following contingency events

Definition of end of a disturbance for multiple fault ride through	We support option 4. We would like AEMO to provide more clarification on whether the time required for voltage recovery to remain within the range of 90 to 110% of normal voltage may vary depending on the technology used?
Form of multiple fault ride through clause	
Number of faults with 200 ms between them	
Reduction of fault level below minimum level for which the plant has been tuned	We support the implementation of Options 4 and 6.
Active power recovery after a fault	We support Option 2.
Rise time and settling time for reactive current injection	 We would suggest the following: Add a commencement time requirement, less than 20 ms, with response in a direction that opposes the change in voltage at the production unit terminals. We recommend that AEMO provide a clear definition for the term "adequately controlled".
Commencement of reactive current injection	We support Option 2.
Clarity on reactive current injection volume and location and consideration of unbalanced voltages	 We support option 3 and recommend that it be implemented at the connection point, but only be applicable during fault conditions and not during normal operation of the plant. Regarding option 5 to capture the negative sequence contribution, the current requirement is to agree on the ratio of negative sequence to positive sequence with both AEMO and NSP. Should this requirement be changed? We recommend that it should be changed because the ratio of negative to positive sequence is not fixed and varies depending on the fault's nature.
Metallic conducting path	
Reclassified contingency events	

Issue



Issue

Schedule 5.2 Generator Recommendation feedback

NER S5.2.5.7 – Partial load rejection

Application of minimum generation to energy storage systems	
Clarification of meaning of continuous uninterrupted operation for NER S5.2.5.7	

NER S5.2.5.8 – Protection of generating systems from power system disturbances

Emergency over-frequency response	We support Options 2 and 5.

NER S5.2.5.10 – Protection to trip plant for unstable operation

Requirements for stability protection on asynchronous generating systems

NER S5.2.5.13 – Voltage and reactive power control

Voltage control at unit level and slow setpoint change	We support Option 2.
Realignment of performance requirements to optimise power system performance over expected fault level (system impedance) range – Voltage control	
Materiality threshold on settling time error band and voltage settling time for reactive power and power factor setpoints	
Clarification of when multiple modes of operation are required	
Impact of a generating system on power system oscillation modes	

Definition – continuous uninterrupted operation



Schedule 5.3a Conditions for connection of MNSPs

Issue

Schedule 5.3a HVDC Recommendation feedback

NER S5.3a.1a Introduction to the schedule

Alignment of schedule with plant-type rather than registration category

NER S5.3a.8 – Reactive power capability

Reactive power

NER S5.3a.13 – Market network service response to disturbances in the power system

Voltage disturbances	
Frequency disturbances	
Fault ride through requirements	

NER S5.3a.4 – Monitoring and control requirements

Remote monitoring and protection against			
instability			

New standards

Voltage control	
Active power dispatch	

Multiple Schedules

Issue	Multiple schedule Recommendation feedback		
NER Multiple clauses			

References to superseded standards

Confidentiality disclaimer



Under clause 5.2.6A(d)(2), AEMO is required to publish all submissions received about this Review on its website. Please identify any part of your submission that is confidential, which you do not wish to be published. Please note that if material identified as confidential cannot be shared and validated with other interested persons, then it may be accorded less weight in AEMO' s decision-making process than published material. AEMO prefers that submissions be forwarded in electronic format.