

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

Minutes and Actions Arising from Meeting No. 49 Held on 19th May 2011 at National Grid House, Warwick

Present:

David Smith	DS	Panel Chair
Thomas Derry	TD	Panel Secretary

National Grid

Graham Stein	GS	Member
Steve Curtis	SC	Member
Tom Ireland	TI	Member
Steven Lam	SL	Presenter
Ben Smith	BS	Presenter
Mark Duffield	MD	Presenter

Generators with Large Power Stations with total Reg. Cap.> 3GW

Alastair Frew	AF	Member
John Morris	JM	Member
John Norbury	JN	Member
Campbell McDonald	CMc	Alternate Member
Guy Phillips	GP	Alternate Member
Jim Barrett	JB	Alternate Member

Generators with Large Power Stations with total Reg. Cap.< 3GW

Tom Davies	TDa	Member
------------	-----	--------

Generators with Small and Medium Power Stations Only

Barbara Vest	BV	Member
--------------	----	--------

Network Operators in England and Wales

Mike Kay	MK	Member
Alan Creighton	AC	Member

Network Operators in Scotland

Dave Carson	DC	Member
Neil Sandison	NS	Alternate Member

Relevant Transmission Licensees

Alan Kelly	AK	Member
------------	----	--------

Generators with Novel Units

Guy Nicholson	GN	Member
---------------	----	--------

Ofgem Representative

Steve Brown	SB	Member
Shijun Yi	SY	Alternate Member

Non Embedded Customers

Alan Barlow	AB	Member
-------------	----	--------

BSC Panel Representative

John Lucas	JL	Member
------------	----	--------

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

1. Introductions/Apologies for Absence

1618. The Chair opened the meeting by welcoming the members to the May GCRP. Apologies were received from Brian Punton.

2. New Grid Code Development Issues

Voltage Fluctuations (pp11/24)

1619. GS presented the paper on Voltage Fluctuations and provided a demonstration to illustrate the impact of various voltage fluctuations. The main recommendation from the paper is for the Panel to approve the setting up of a Working Group to examine the issues. GS noted that a limit of 3% currently applies to a range of voltage fluctuation events with different duration and frequency of occurrence.
1620. The DNO representatives noted the work that had been completed on voltage fluctuations and flicker as part of the G59 review. Information was sparse when examining the 3% voltage fluctuation limit and collaboration between National Grid and the DNOs could shed some new light on the issue. AC also questioned if this review of the 3% limit should be to define a new limit or determine if there is a need to define a new limit. GS confirmed that it is initially a case of determining if there is a need to define a new limit. GN asked if the voltage measurement needed to be more clearly defined (i.e. with respect to phases, averaging period, rms etc).
1621. GCRP members also noted that the paper should consider what the interaction with the SQSS is and GS confirmed that the SQSS sets the context rather than anything specific. Panel agreed that this should be picked up in the Terms of Reference.
1622. SB questioned what the benefit of this review would be, what was the trigger for suggesting a review and what would happen if we did nothing. GS confirmed that National Grid has seen energisation events that have exceeded the current limit and that there are customers on the network that are currently being affected by this. MK pointed out that this was not necessarily an adverse effect, and not when compared to voltage variations caused by network effects much closer to customers. In the absence of a change, customers will be subject to operational restrictions or required to install additional equipment.
1623. MK noted that main driver behind the review on the Distribution Networks was the impact on the planning process. MK also noted that the more prescriptive a limit becomes the more likely there will be an increased cost for the industry.
1624. JB questioned the impact of the European Codes. He noted that as the European Network Codes come into force, there could be changes to the limits for voltage fluctuations. The terms of reference should include an examination of possible EU impacts.
1625. CMD noted that any requirements brought in would need to be applied retrospectively if this is an issue for existing customers.
1626. The Panel agreed that this topic should not progress to a Working Group at this time. AMC suggested that it might be beneficial for NGET to run some informal industry consultation. The Panel agreed for a proposal to be brought to the September GCRP.
1627. **ACTION: NGET (GS)** Create a National Grid proposal taking into account discussion points from today and arrange an informal meeting with interested parties, including DNOs, to discuss work conducted as part of G59. Bring revised proposal to the September GCRP.

Operational Metering requirements on Small Embedded Power Stations (pp11/33)

1628. JN presented the paper on Operational Metering and thanked the GCRP for the acceptance of a late paper.
1629. One of the parties that JN represents is planning to construct a small embedded power station which is proposed to be connected to a GSP that could then export under some system conditions. Small Embedded Power Stations connecting to a DNO's Distribution Network would generally choose to be registered within a Supplier BMU (ie SVA registered), and therefore not required to enter into an agreement with NGET and not required to comply with the Grid Code Connection Conditions. However, in the event that the connection of the power station is behind a GSP that exports to the transmission system, or may export following connection of the power station, in this particular case the DNO may suggest that the Power Station developer considers entering into a BEGA with NGET as part of the connection process. As a consequence, the power station would be required to be registered as a BM Unit (i.e. CVA registered) and comply with Grid Code CC.6.5 as a BM Participant, irrespective of whether it intends to actively participate in the BM.
1630. JN explained that this DNO has a concern around an exporting GSP and has provided three options for the station to connect:
- Do not connect
 - have a management system in place to prevent any possible export from the GSP
 - apply for TEC by entering into a BEGA with National Grid and become CVA registered
1631. JN noted that National Grid have stipulated a requirement for operational metering as a condition of the BEGA.
1632. JN asked the Panel for their views on whether or not it is reasonable to have the Operational Metering obligation apply to a small embedded power station that is not actively participating in the BM. JN's view is that this is potentially more onerous than the requirements placed on Medium Power Stations and over and above what the Grid Code envisages.
1633. JL noted conversations with National Grid in the past about SVA and CVA registration and stated that it should be a genuine choice whether to arrange for registration in SVA (via a Licensed Supplier) or CVA (by acceding to the BSC, or via any existing BSC Party). JL indicated that the National Grid's interpretation is that if small units have CVA registration that they are required to have operational metering and questioned this interpretation.
1634. The Panel questioned why operational metering is required; is it because they are CVA registered or because the information is useful? SC confirmed that it for both reasons.
1635. DS summarised at this point that there seems to be two issues; one being the suggestion by the DNO that the Power Station should consider the BEGA route and the second is being required to have operational metering for a small power station.
1636. JL expressed his concerns that this distorts the market, it seems to be stacking the cards against one trading option compared to another.
1637. MK stated that on a GSP it doesn't matter whether the GSP is exporting or importing. Seems we should be questioning the DNO's position on the issue of exporting GSPs. Issue could be taken up with Ofgem as an unreasonable request. Also noted that there was some work done under the CUSC around exporting GSPs and that things may have changed. AC added that it could be that the DNO

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

is following guidance from National Grid.

1638. MK also noted that there is an Ofgem letter¹ out on Distribution Generation which may be of interest and responses have been requested by 31st May 2011..
1639. **ACTION: DS** To report back to CUSC panel on exporting GSP part of the issue (i.e. DNO suggesting parties should consider signing onto a BEGA).
1640. **ACTION: SC/JL/JN** To have a meeting to seek some resolution on CVA registration and operational metering issue. Report findings at the July GCRP and included the Panel in correspondence.

3. Working Group Reports

Grid Code Requirement for Electronic Communication Facilities between NGET and BM participants (pp11/25)

1641. TD gave a summary of the Working Group Report submitted to the GCRP for their consideration. The main recommendation out of this paper was to progress to an industry consultation.
1642. TD explained that the requirement to install an automatic logging device was historically linked to participation in the Balancing Mechanism. The Working Group recommended that the requirement to install an automatic logging device should be linked to the requirement to provide all Part 1 System Ancillary Services.
1643. JB noted that as the European Codes come into force there could be some impact in terms of the requirement to install EDL. This paper has linked EDL to the requirement to provide Part 1 System Ancillary Services (Reactive Power and Frequency Response) and if the European Codes change the size of units required to provide these services there could be a much wider group of Users that would then be required to have EDL installed.
1644. GN asked for clarification on the costs within the Report and what element the generator would be required to pay. GN also noted that the section on the front of the Report should be expanded to explain specifically which 'Users' will be impacted by the proposed changes.
1645. BV requested that the Working Group Report noted the membership and attendance of the Working Group as an appendix.
1646. The Panel approved the Working Group Report to proceed to Industry Consultation for a period of 20 working days.
1647. **ACTION: TD** To update the Working Group Report to include the above elements. Progress to an Industry Consultation for a period of 20 Working Days.

4. Working Groups in Progress - Update

Frequency Response & Technical sub group

1648. TI notified the Panel that the Working Group is still on track to deliver to a report to the September GCRP.
1649. It was noted within the Panel that bilateral agreements have been drafted and issued with reference to the existence of this Working Group and the work that it is undertaking, but the progress of the Working Group had not been visible to affected users.

¹ <http://www.ofgem.gov.uk/Pages/MoreInformation.aspx?docid=218&refer=Networks/ElecDist/Policy/DistGen>

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

- 1650. **ACTION: TI** To create a summary to explain the current position of this group
- 1651. **ACTION: TI** To review the text in the agreements and consider possible supplementary information that could be added for clarification
- 1652. **ACTION: GN** To circulate Renewable UK paper on Synthetic Inertia

Harmonics

- 1653. GS updated Panel on progress in the G5/4 Working Group. It was noted that the group is discussing a wide range of issues relating to harmonics and that it plans to report to the September GCRP.
- 1654. To date the group has completed a subjective review of different approaches to the 'allocation of rights' but had not yet developed a case for change. The group is also looking at any quantitative analysis that could be completed.
- 1655. Consideration is being given to the Grid Code process for data exchange and there is work currently on going with stakeholders to see if this process can be improved.

Reactive Despatch Restrictions

- 1656. SL updated the Panel on the progress the group had made in resolving the consequences from CAP169 surrounding Reactive Despatch Restrictions.
- 1657. The proposal aims to limit the impact of Reactive Despatch Network Restrictions and proposes to allow National Grid to be able to instruct embedded generators if they are able to achieve 0 MVar.
- 1658. SL noted the issue raised by NS at previous meetings and agreed that it was an issue but separate to the proposed modification. It is proposed to take the issue raised by NS forward separate to this modification.
- 1659. SC noted that we need to try and demonstrate that this a real and practical problem and that he would provide some data to NS shortly.
- 1660. DS noted that there is still further work to be done by the BSSG on this topic to sort out the reactive payment issues.
- 1661. **ACTION: SC/NS** To examine the issue further and bring back recommendations to the GCRP
- 1662. **ACTION: SL** Draft consultation with proposed legal text and circulate for comment around the GCRP

BMU configuration of PPMs Offshore

- 1663. TI provided an update to the Panel on the progress of the Working Group. TI noted that invitations for this Working Group have been sent out and there have been 6 nominations received.
- 1664. It was questioned within the Panel whether this group will specifically only look at offshore and it was confirmed that the group will also consider large onshore. The Panel noted that perhaps the name should be changed to not cause future confusion.
- 1665. **ACTION: TI** Consider changing the title of the Working Group and circulate updated Terms of Reference
- 1666. The first meeting date for this group will take place as soon as the membership has been confirmed.

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

Revision of CC7.7 Maintenance Standards

1667. TI provided an update to the Panel on the progress of the Working Group.
1668. There have been 4 nominations received for Revision of CC7.7 Maintenance Standards. TI noted that there is no agreed quorum for these meetings but another representative for this group would be useful.
1669. AC and MK questioned if there was a DNO representative on this Working Group. TI confirmed that there wasn't. AC and MK agreed to nominate a DNO representative for the Working Group.
1670. **ACTION: AC/MK** To nominate a DNO representative and provide details to TI
1671. The first meeting date for this group will take place as soon as the membership has been confirmed.

Electricity Balancing System Group

1672. TI provided an update to the Panel on the progress of the Working Group. TI noted that invitations for this Working Group have been sent out and there have been 5 nominations received.
1673. The Panel noted the industry impact of EBS and asked National Grid to give consideration to an EBS commissioning Panel.
1674. **ACTION: TI** To find out what the intention is in relation to commissioning of EBS
1675. The first meeting date for this group will take place as soon as the membership has been confirmed.

Grid Code Signatories Consultation

1676. BV, the Chair of this group, updated the Panel on the progress of the Working Group. There have been three meetings to date with a fourth planned for 20th May 2011 at the AEP offices in London.
1677. The next stage is to publish an Industry Consultation which has taken longer than expected due to Working Group debate and identification of issues. This delay has impacted the originally agreed timetable and BV sought approval from the Panel to postpone submitting a report till the September 2011 GCRP. BV also noted that she would provide a verbal update at the July 2011 GCRP following the closure of the Industry Consultation.
1678. The Panel agreed for the report to come to the September GCRP and noted their appreciation at the timeliness of the progress of this issue.
1679. DS noted that in order to press forward with European issues, National Grid is proposing Terms of Reference to allow a shadow Joint European Standing Group to be set up in advance of the conclusion of the code development process. It is proposed to hold the first meeting towards the end of June or early July. It was also noted that Ofgem support the creation of this group.
1680. CMD, the proposer of this issue, noted that he believes there is a risk that setting up this group will negate the need for the formal group and that he still feels that the obligation on National Grid to engage needs to be reflected in the code.

5. Consultations

Operational Broadcast System

1681. SC presented a draft Industry Consultation for the Panel to approve for publication. He noted that replacing the OBS system has been put on hold and delivery is not

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

likely until 2013. There are some elements that would also be unlikely to be delivered at the initial launch. The proposal is an interim solution to allow for messages sent via the OBS to not include faxes. The proposed change would remove the reference requiring the use of a fax and enable the use of alternative communication means.

1682. SY questioned if any thought had been given to the use of wireless communication such as radio. SC confirmed that it hadn't been considered but that the drafting should not preclude the use of wireless communication.
1683. The Panel noted concern around moving away from fax as it is clear and to countersign for instructions. SC confirmed that the paper is not trying to make the fax obsolete but rather allow the use of other technologies. In the future it may be possible to use EDL for System Warnings but currently it is not pragmatic to create a parameter within EDL.
1684. The Panel approved OBS to progress to Industry Consultation for a period of 20 working days. SC to provide verbal update of progress at July GCRP with a final report to come back to September GCRP.
1685. **ACTION: TI/SC** Publish Industry Consultation for a period of 20 working days

6. Consultation Report Update

A/10 Compliance

1686. TI updated the Panel on the progress of the A/10 Consultation.
1687. The Consultation closed on 8th April 2011. National Grid has received some detailed comments but most responses note that the revised proposals are an improvement to the original A/10. National Grid is working through the responses and there will be a response to each of the respondents. The LEEMPS component has been removed from the revised A/10 proposals and will be looked at as a separate element. The current view is that the A/10 report will be submitted to the authority in a couple of weeks.
1688. TI noted that LEEMPS will be covered later in the agenda. The Panel had no comments on this modification.

A/11 - Black Start Amendment to Grid Code resulting form BSC modification P231

1689. BS updated the Panel on the progress of the A/11 consultation. This consultation was issued on 1st April 2011 and closed on 6th May 2011. There were 2 responses, both of which were supportive.
1690. The aim of the proposal is to align Grid Code with the BSC following modification P231. The recommendations from the consultation were:
- National Grid will notify the BSCCo the time of date of the Total/ Partial shutdown (Black Start);
 - Introduce a paragraph so Users of Grid Code provide PNs 10 hours prior to the market returning; and
 - Some minor housekeeping changes.
1691. Next step is to issue a report to the Authority with recommendations within the next couple weeks.
1692. BS also reminded the Panel that BSC Issue 42 (Black Start Generator - Defining a 'Local Shutdown') is seeking members to discuss whether a change to BSC and/or Grid Code is required. The first meeting is expected in June and if Panel members wish to attend please contact Elexon. [Post meeting note: Anyone interested can

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

contact elexon at modifications@elexon.co.uk]

1693. The Panel had no comments on this modification.

7. Pending Authority Decisions

1694. None

8. Outstanding Grid Code Development Issues

Consultation Papers and Development Issues (pp11/27)

Table 1

1695. F/09 - Modification approved, implementation is aligned with P243.
1696. A/10 - Discussed on agenda.
1697. B/10 - TI reported that a technicality at the consultation stage and the National Grid operations centre is determining how to progress. The issue has been deemed a low priority.
1698. C/10 - Discussed on agenda.
1699. D/10 - TI/GS noted that the intention is to submit a Report to the Authority within the next couple weeks. 49 hz will be recommended as the parameter. The change highlights a reliance on LFDD, Demand Control and generator resilience (including embedded generation). National Grid plans to discuss these issues with DNO reps.
1700. A/11 - Discussed on agenda.
1701. TI noted that there are a number of Industry Consultations that are ready to be published and asked the Panel if they would like to release dates staggered or longer response times to deal with the papers. Panel confirmed that the standard response time of 20 working days should be applied and that a staggered release time would be appreciated.

Table 2

Protection Fault Clearance Times and Back-up Protection

1702. TI confirmed that internal discussions are on going to determine next steps. It was noted that 'reserved' needed to be replaced with 'back-up' and 'DC' should be 'directly connected'.

Grid Code Structure

1703. TI explained that work has not begun on this area and that the Regional Differences issue is included within this. Panel agreed that this should remain paused with European Codes being proposed.

Control Telephony

1704. TI noted that this issue is still on going. It was noted that 'SSE' should be 'SHETL'.

Short Circuit Ratio

1705. The review is to be started shortly and an update is due to be sent to Authority in response to their decision letter for G/09.

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

9. Approval of Minutes from previous meetings

Minutes from February GCRP

1706. The Panel reviewed the minutes from February and agreed for these to be published as final minutes once the following changes had been made.
1707. JL noted in paragraph 1534 that P240 is not specific to offshore.
1708. GN noted a typo in paragraph and that the Irish TSO needed to be clarified.
1709. It was noted that paragraph 1579 should have an action for TI to circulate answer.

Minutes from March Extraordinary GCRP

1710. The Panel reviewed the minutes from March and agreed for these to be published as final minutes once the following changes had been made.
1711. Re-synchronise the numbering paragraph numbering to follow on from February GCRP minutes.
1712. Copy the recommendations from pp11/21 within the Continuous Voltage Control section.

10. Review of Actions

Review of Actions (pp11/30)

February 2011 GCRP

1713. TI went through the Review of Actions paper with the Panel. All actions were completed except for the following:
(Minute 1523 & 1524) Governance of GCRP Meetings
1714. On going, Word templates are to be made available online.
(Minute 1552) D/10 Frequency and Voltage Operating Range
1715. On going, a Report to the Authority is due to be published in the next couple weeks.
(Minute 1564) Special Actions
1716. On going, SC to circulate presentation to the Operational Forum.
(Minute 1566) Simultaneous Tap Changing
1717. SC updated the Panel noting that the paper has been circulated to the Operational Forum and the process is going through changes internally.
1718. A test on Simultaneous Tap Changing is being organised to test the effectiveness of the procedure.
1719. JB noted that CCGT units are dispatched as a module and queried whether or not the plan was to active all of the tap changes at once or to do them individually. JB explained that all four taps could not be done at the same time on his units but that all could activated within one minute.
1720. SC stated that ideally it would be done together but as fast a possible might have to be the case noting JB's point.
1721. **ACTION: SC** Clarify what the instructions will be for the test and keep Panel

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

informed

1722. **ACTION: Panel Members** To submit comments to SC
(Minute 1560) F/08 Intertripping Offshore
1723. On going, an Industry Consultation is due to be published in the next couple weeks.
(Minute 1567) G59 Generator Protection Settings
1724. On going, the next E3C is on 2nd June 2011. TI will report back to the July GCRP.
(Minute 1576) Interconnector Update
1725. On going, TI to provide an update on the planned interconnection to the NETS to CMD. Circulate to the Panel.

March 2011 GCRP

(Minute 1610) Grid Code Interpretations

1726. On going, TI to develop guide and KPIs for resolution of Grid Code interpretations

LEEMPS Compliance (pp11/32)

1727. MK presented his paper on LEEMPS Compliance.
1728. MK explained that the original understanding around LEEMPS compliance was that the DNO would simply work as a postbox between National Grid and LEEMPS. However, it is now up to DNOs to conduct the compliance assessment which they do not have the technical experience or funding to do.
1729. MK noted that that the current arrangements are not acceptable to DNOs and National Grid, DNOs and Generators usually end up in tripartite conversations to deal with compliance assessment for LEEMPS.
1730. The whole process of compliance assessment could be simplified if National Grid conducted this work. A specific contract between National Grid and LEEMPS regarding compliance could be created and this framework could be based on existing arrangements with a separate bilateral contract, with the rubric managed as part of the CUSC.
1731. GN noted that many smaller Generators deal with National Grid and the DNO in relation to a number of connection sites (e.g. for 10MW Grid Code compliance in SHETL area) and therefore the LEEMPS compliance issue is one worth opening up to discuss.
1732. The Panel noted that a Working Group would need to consider whether aspects such as; whether a LEEMPS would want to deal with both NGET and the DNO, what CUSC changes would be required and any possible European code impacts.
1733. **ACTION: TI/MK** To draft joint GCRP/DCRP terms of reference for a Working Group that will examine the LEEMPS issue and bring to July GCRP.

Two Shift Limits (pp11/31)

1734. MD presented an updated paper to the Panel. This paper aims to address the issues raised at the March E-GCRP.
1735. MD explained that by using the Notice to Deviate from Zero (NDZ), Minimum Zero Time (MZT) and Minimum Non-Zero Time (MZNT) parameters it was possible to manage a generators operating regime.

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

1736. The Panel understood that it could be done this way but believed that the use of parameters in this way is not appropriate or efficient. Members noted that their interpretation of the Two Shift Limit (TSL) parameter was to indicate to National Grid whether or not they were prepared to be synchronised twice in one day.
1737. MD explained that the TSL parameter only appears in operating codes and is not contained within the balancing codes. National Grid use and adhere to the dynamic parameters for balancing. TSL has been there as a concept for many years but it doesn't sit in the suite of balancing mechanism parameters.
1738. JN highlighted the need to consider the potential impact on BM operation, BM prices and transparency, should National Grid commit to balancing actions that extend beyond the current BM window in managing TSL parameters.
1739. It was noted that this is part EBS but that this will not be delivered until 2013 so there needs to be some interim arrangements. The Panel agreed that there needs to be a common view and understanding of the Two Shift Limit parameter and its use. To that end Grid will convene a meeting of interested parties to agree a common understanding of how generators use the Two Shift Limit and subsequent interpretation by National Grid.
1740. JL also noted that there was a potential discrimination issue arising from current uncertainty about how to apply this parameter (in that some Generators reject instructions that are inconsistent with their own interpretation of the TSL, while others feel obliged to follow them, and may incur exceptional costs as a result) which also had to be investigated, and panel agreed. There should be an action below capture the fact that a discussion has to take place.
1741. BV noted that she recalled action 1532 from the March GCRP stated that National Grid would take the Two Shift Limits paper to the Operational Forum and questioned whether or not this had been done.
1742. **ACTION: MD** To arrange a meeting to discuss the issues around TSL
1743. **ACTION: TD** To circulate email asking for nominations with responses requested by Wednesday (25th May 2011)
1744. **ACTION: MD** To confirm if the TSL paper was circulated to the Operational Forum
1745. **ACTION: TI** Circulate the National Grid internal policy note on Two Shift Limits

Continuous Voltage Control

1746. This item had been discussed in relation to the Extraordinary GCRP minutes.
1747. GN highlighted that users were currently receiving inconsistent messages on this requirement and that some parties were under the impression that National Grid would not accept the use of a hybrid statcom. GS responded that publication of the final Extraordinary GCRP minutes would help resolve short term uncertainties and that publication of a consultation, as agreed by the Panel, would resolve long term uncertainties.

Demand Control (OC6) Paper

1748. SC provided an update to the Panel on Demand Control (OC6). The paper that AC presented to the February GCRP has been circulated internally and the next stage is to determine if it is possible to accommodate a requirement to use demand control into the Grid Code.
1749. SC noted that the National Grid Control Room believes anything that is different to their current assumptions presents a risk and would be nervous to accommodate anything that would do this, however the additional clarity of the present capability was welcomed. National Grid's main concern is uncertainty with using demand

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

control to balancing the system. A 15 minute implementation period was referenced in the paper however National Grid indicated that it was unlikely that instructions would be sent out earlier than 5 minutes even if this was permitted in the Grid Code.

1750. SC noted that more detail and evidence to explain the data that was submitted with the paper would be helpful to further explore the options and possibilities. AC stated that there needs to be a shared understanding about the information that NG would value. MK noted that it could be beneficial to write to DNOs and request that their relevant expert attends a meeting to discuss this issue.

1751. **ACTION: SC/AC:** To facilitate further interaction and determine next steps

11. Standing Items

European Network Codes

1752. DS provided the Panel with an update on the European Networks Codes.

1753. Back in March 2011 the final version of pilot code published was published and the comments received on the pilot code are to be published shortly. ACER has closed the formal consultation on Framework Guidelines. ACER is recommending that the final Framework Guidelines go to the commission shortly. ENTSO-e will then be asked formally to start work. There will be limited consultation and stakeholder engagement and more than one consultation is unlikely.

1754. BV mentioned discussions with ENTSO-e representatives who were asked whether there had been any clarification calls back to respondents regarding comments submitted on the pilot connection code. ENTSO-e explained that this had not happened, that some comments had been amalgamated together whilst others discounted as deemed to be invalid.

1755. DS noted that a letter was published on 29th April 2011 by ENTSO-e which stated that they expect work to start on the connection code around September 2011. DS suggested to the Panel that they have a look at the proposed approach to stakeholder engagement.

1756. **ACTION: DS** Circulate ENTSO-e letter

12. Issues

1757. None

13. Impact of Other Code Modifications or Developments

CUSC

1758. The CAP189 Working Group Report will be going to the May Panel to request progress to Company Consultation.

1759. National Grid will be requesting that the CUSC Panel agree to the establishment of the interim Joint European Standing Group. The first meeting is proposed for the end of June/early July.

BSC

1760. JL noted that P270 (The Application of Line Loss Factors to GSPs that are not Transmission-interconnected) is out for consultation and will close on 26th May 2011.

Grid Code Review Panel Meeting

Cross Code Forum

1761. TD informed the Panel that the next cross codes forum is taking place on 17th June at the Elexon offices. This cross codes forum will have a specific focus on Europe.

Operational Forum

1762. TI informed the Panel that BritNed, the interconnector between the UK and the Netherlands, went live on 1st April 2011.

1763. DS noted that there was a constraints incident over the 5th/6th April 2011 which required the output of several windfarms in Scotland to be reduced. This resulted in approximately £875,000 to be paid to windfarms. In October 2010 there was a similar event which resulted in approximately £18,000 being paid to reduce output.

14. A.O.B

BMRS Review Group

1764. TI informed the Panel that a review group meeting is being held today at Elexon to discuss BMRS (Balancing Mechanism Reporting Service) zones, OC2 zones and Seven Year Statement (SYS) zones. The review group will look at seeing if there is any benefit in aligning these zones.

1765. TI noted that there is likely to be a second meeting in two weeks time and asked if a Grid Code rep like to attend. There was no nomination from the Panel.

Data Requests

1766. CMD noted that he had received a request for additional data on one of his stations and questioned if anyone else on the Panel had received a request. A few Panel members confirmed that they too had received requests from National Grid.

1767. GS noted that the request is related to HVDC connection interactions and stated that a paper would be brought to the July pane.

15. Date of Next Meeting

1768. The next GCRP is 7th July at the AEP offices in London.