

‘Quick Win’ Improvements to Grid Code Open Governance Arrangements

Presentation of draft
proposals to Grid Code
Development Forum
10 July 2019



Introduction

- Open Governance arrangements in the Grid Code were approved by Ofgem in Feb 2017 in modification [GC0086 'Open Governance'](#)
- Since then, working with the new governance processes has helped to identify a number of areas in which further improvements could be made
- This modification proposes a number of 'quick wins' that will help to improve the speed and efficiency of the process or provide necessary clarification
- Given the upcoming Ofgem [Energy Code Review](#) changes are only achievable if they are agreed to be uncontentious 'quick wins' and can therefore be progressed ahead of this

Potential Change Areas

- NGESO mandatory workgroup participation
- Initial assessment of proposals
- Quoracy
- Assessment of alternatives
- Titles and summaries of proposals
- Role of the Code Administrator Consultation
- Production of draft legal text

NGESO mandatory workgroup participation

- NGESO are currently mandated to be part of every workgroup
- Particularly since the legal separation of NGESO and NGET, on occasion modifications are proposed where NGESO cannot make a significant contribution to development
- Proposal to remove mandatory participation

Initial assessment of proposals

- On occasion proposals are raised where it is significantly unclear at the outset what the solution may be or which parties could be impacted
- Proposal is to add an option allowing the panel to choose to form a workgroup specifically to produce an initial assessment of a proposal before reporting back
(in fact this formalises what panel recently chose to do for [GC0117](#))
- After this report is made, the panel may make a more informed decision on the way forward from the existing options
- The proposer may also be invited to either clarify their proposal or withdraw it but as a principle of Open Governance can choose not to do this

Quoracy

- A workgroup and any meeting of a workgroup is only considered quorate with five members (including NGESO)
- This has been a frequent barrier to progress
- Proposal is to remove quoracy requirements while installing further checks and balances for a non-quorate workgroup
- A non-quorate workgroup must, in addition to normal requirements:
 - Continue to seek further members at key points in the process
 - Always hold a workgroup consultation and prior to this seek panel approval
 - Circulate their draft report to the Grid Code mailing list for comment before presenting it to panel
- Further proposal to clarify arrangements if a meeting of a workgroup is non-quorate to allow work to continue where possible

Assessment of alternatives

- Potential alternatives to a modification proposal are assessed against the Grid Code objectives
- If judged by a majority of the workgroup or the Chair to be better than the baseline the alternative is developed
- Proposal to make a better use of time and resources by changing this to be better than the original proposal (which is the treatment used in the BSC)

Titles and Summaries of Proposals

- Once a proposal has been received, the Panel Secretary allocates it a number and enters its details on the code modification register
- Proposal to allow the Code Administrator (building on their 'Critical Friend' role) to amend the title or summary of the proposal to better reflect its content or intent and to aid in the gaining of members for a workgroup.

Role of the Code Administrator Consultation

- Mandatory for all modifications
- Detailed comments to develop the solution are not sought
- Earlier engagement in the solution is not easily codified but development should be through a workgroup where required
- Additional text added to allow for changes to be made to a solution post-CAC in the case where a workgroup was not formed

Production of Draft Legal Text

- Need for clarification
- NGESO as the licensee ultimately owns the text of the Grid Code
- Under Open Governance, the proposer of a modification or alternative owns their solution (although this may be developed through a workgroup)
- Proposal to clarify that NGESO will draft legal text BUT this must be on the basis of a clear and complete solution

Governance Route

- Normal governance proposed – ie Workgroup development
...but bearing in mind the need to progress only ‘quick wins’ ahead of the Energy Codes Review this should be focused
- Self-governance or not?
 - Ofgem made the decision on GC0086 Open Governance
 - ...but these are ‘quick wins’?
 - Would self-governance be appropriate given that the proposals do not discriminate between users?