

## Minutes

**Meeting name** GSG Meeting

**Date of meeting** 19 March 2018

**Location** WebEx

## Attendees

Name	Initials	Company
Garth Graham	GG	Chair (SSE)
Mike Oxenham	MO	National Grid
Ren Walker	RW	Technical Secretary, National Grid
Robert Longden	RL	Cornwall Energy
Paul Youngman	PY	Drax Power

## Apologies

Name	Initials	Company
Nadir Hafeez	NH	Ofgem
Nicholas Rubin	NR	ELEXON
Angela Quinn	AQ	National Grid

## 1 Introductions and Apologies for Absence

72. Apologies were received from Nadir Hafeez, Nicholas Rubin and Angela Quinn.

## 2 Approval of Minutes from the last meeting

73. The minutes from the GSG held on 3 November 2017 were approved by the GSG. RW is to arrange publication of the approved minutes.

## 3 Review of Actions

74. The GSG reviewed the outstanding actions.

## 4 GSG 2017 Work-plan

75. The GSG reviewed the GSG Work plan. GG advised the GSG that all the dates on the plan should be moved by one quarter.

**Action: LW to update GSG forward Work plan**

## Guidance Documents

76. GG advised that a guidance document paper had previously been circulated to the CUSC Panel. GG noted if the GSG reviewed this document it would allow the GSG to take forward priority 1 on the forward Work plan.

**Action: LW to circulate guidance document to the GSG.**

### **Modifications being raised as WACMS after being rejected**

77. GG noted the GSG have discussed this previously and what this entails. GG noted Industry members are able to do this dependant on if the defect they are addressing is the same defect or not. RL questioned the statute of a similar modification being raised if the previous modification was rejected.
78. GG stated two months after the modification is rejected any Industry Party can raise a modification on the same topic. RL asked if the new Modification is determined to be a reasonable WACM that was objected can the same timetable be applied for the new Modification. GG responded in theory yes, however if the Modification was previously rejected and another Modification was raised then stakeholders might think the Proposer has addressed the reason why the Modification was rejected in the first instance. GG noted there would need to be more evidence from the Proposer as to why they are re-raising the Modification and then the Modification would proceed after the two month period.
79. GG advised there was a suggestion around people raising a Modification which has not yet been decided on and WACMS suggested. GG noted if the Proposal doesn't get majority support then it doesn't go forward. GG advised in essence the Modification should be addressing the same defect from the parent Modification.
80. PY noted currently Industry have the right to raise the Modification, PY advised it would be beneficial for Code Administrators to look at previous Modifications that haven't been addressed as WACMs. RL noted through independent routes there are Modifications in flight that alters the baseline effectively and these are similar issues. MO stated that the Panel has the power to amalgamate Modifications/ Workgroups, therefore could a solution be to raise a new Modification into the original to keep two processes as one to achieve the same outcome.
81. GG stated under Proposer ownership the Panel seek to appointment one Proposer as the owner for the Modification. This would mean that all rejected WACMs could be raised as new proposals and if not amalgamated by the Panel they would go forward as their own Modification(s).
82. GG advised it would be beneficial to keep this topic as a discussion point for the GSG to review again and circulate the discussion to the CUSC Panel.

### **Role Outlines in the Future**

83. GG noted this is to remain on the future Work plan but move by one quarter.

### **Action- RW to update Work plan**

### **Applicable CUSC Objectives**

84. GG advised the GSG this is still with Ofgem to provide guidance on the applicable objectives and how it comes into the license.

### **Action- NH to provide guidance on applicable CUSC Objectives**

### **Combining Workgroup Reports**

85. GG stated this is to remain as it links to the Applicable CUSC Objectives Work plan item. GG noted once the applicable CUSC objectives have been defined the GSG will be able to progress this Work plan item.

### **Review of Templates**

86. GG noted this is a priority for the GSG to review later in the year.

### **Material Impact Review**

87. GG advised to keep this on the Work plan as a future item.

## **8 Any Other Business**

### **Ofgem Innovation Link**

88. MO advised the GSG there is a BSC Modification in flight which is going to Workgroup Consultation. MO noted this Workgroup is looking at extending out the Ofgem Regulator Sandbox into the Code space. MO noted Ofgem have established a process and BSC have also established a process. MO advised the GSG he has attended Workgroups on behalf of Code Admin and Ofgem have advised they are looking to do this with other Code Administrators.

89. MO stated the question Ofgem is asking is if Code Administrators want to facilitate innovation and a Code is a blocker is there a way to derogate to a certain Code prior to formally raising a modification. GG noted he has sent thoughts across to Ofgem on this. GG advised his view from a CUSC perspective is that the CUSC deals with rules for connection to the network and charges that are applicable. GG continued to advise that given that the contract for new connection is to be standard for everyone, as per the RfG, DCC and HVDC Network Codes, would this sandbox introduce a derogation process which he isn't certain that the CUSC can derogate or provide derogation for connection and charges.

90. RL questioned what this will mean in terms of operating the system, he advised he supports the idea but would like to see the case made properly before it is implemented into the Codes. GG stated if at the end of the Sandbox period it is not successful would Ofgem revert back to the original pre Sandbox.

91. MO noted each of the Codes and Standards have their own things to consider, in theory people can do this through design variations so it is important to understand what the scope is. MO advised this is an outstanding action for Ofgem to clarify. RL stated it would be useful to see a real life example and how this affects all the Codes to understand the details. GG noted we need to understand the design variations as once these are sandboxed they would not be visible. GG advised under the CUSC because you have to design a change for a connection agreement, therefore it is hard to see how you can go back from this. RL stated it would be useful for Ofgem to come up with an example to work through. GG noted from a stakeholder perspective he would want to see the process set out in the CUSC as this is a multilateral contract and to have a process that is informal would not be transparent. The procedure for the sandbox is that it goes through the Governance as documented in the CUSC rather than an informal document.

92. MO advised BSC Modification started with the Panel deciding and Ofgem being involved in the start and end of the process. Ofgem will also liaise with the

respective Code Administrators. MO noted the Panel only recommend where derogation should be granted, it is for the Code Administrators to liaise with each other regarding the CACoP principle. MO noted there is commitment from Ofgem as they support innovation and further completion. MO further explained that a Modification will need to be raised on each code as each code will have their own arrangements which will essentially result in the same outcome. MO also advised that BSC are further forward with this process.

93. GG noted that with the EU Network Codes procedure for derogation there are two types of derogations. If you use the BSC derogation approach, this is domestic which would include sandbox and then the EU derogation has a different approach for those aspects of the domestic codes dealing with EU Network Code related matters. GG noted it is important for Code Administrators going forward to recognise this as a sandbox derogation is not permissible for EU Network Code matters.

94. MO advised he agrees with the points the GSG members have raised around the sandbox and advised he will continue to be involved in this process so will feedback more information when available.

95. The GSG had no further AOB to raise.

## **9 Date of Next Meeting**

96. The date of the next meeting is **Monday 4 June 2018**; this meeting will be held as a WebEx.