nationalgrid

# Minutes

| | |
|---|---|
| **Meeting name** | Grid Code Review Panel |
| **Meeting number** | 62 |
| **Date of meeting** | 17th July 2013 |
| **Time** | 10:00am - 4:00pm |
| **Location** | National Grid House, Warwick, CV34 6DA |

## Attendees

| Name | Role | Initials | Company |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ian Pashley | Chair | IP | National Grid |
| Robyn Jenkins | Secretary | RJ | National Grid |
| Steve Brown | Authority Member | SB | Ofgem |
| John Lucas | BSC Panel Member | JL | Elexon |
| Alastair Frew | Large Generator (>3GW) Member | AF | ScottishPower |
| John Morris | Large Generator (>3GW) Member | JM | EDF Energy |
| Alan Creighton | Network Operator (E&W) Member | AC | Northern Powergrid |
| Richard Lavender | NGET Advisor | RLa | National Grid |
| Thomas Derry | NGET Member | TD | National Grid |
| Rob Wilson | NGET Member | RW | National Grid |
| Graham Stein | NGET Member | GS | National Grid |
| Audrey Ramsay | NGET Member | AR | National Grid |
| Alan Barlow | Non Embedded Customers Member | AB | Magnox |
| Damien McCluskey | Presenter | DMC | National Grid |
| Mike Edgar | Presenter | ME | National Grid |
| Joseph Dunn | Transmission Licensee (SPT) Member | JD | SPT |
| Barbara Vest | Small / Medium Generator Member | BV | Energy UK |
| Julian Wayne | Authority Alternate | JW | Ofgem |
| Sigrid Bolik | Generators with Novel Units Alternate | SBO | REpower |
| Jim Barrett | Large Generator (>3GW) Alternate | JB | Centrica |
| Campbell McDonald | Large Generator (>3GW) Alternate | CMD | SSE Generation |
| Guy Phillips | Large Generator (>3GW) Alternate | GP | E.ON UK |
| Ian Povey | Network Operator (E&W) Alternate | IPo | Electricity North West |
| Alex Thomason | NGET Observer | AT | National Grid |

## Apologies

| Name | Role | Initials | Company |
|---|---|---|---|
| Roger Harris | BSC Panel Alternate | RH | Elexon |
| Xavier Pinchaux | Externally Interconnected System Operators Alternate | XP | RTE |
| Neil Sandison | Network Operator (Scot.) Alternate | NS | SSE |
| Lisa Waters | Small / Medium Generator Alternate | LW | Waters Wye |
| Richard Lowe | Transmission Licensee (SHE Transmission) Alternate | RL | SHE Transmission |
| Alan Kelly | Transmission Licensee (SPT) Alternate | AK | SPT |
| Tom Davies | Large Generator (<3GW) Member | TDA | Magnox |
| Gordon Kelly | Network Operator (Scot.) Member | GK | ScottishPower |
| Mike Kay | Network Operator (E&W) Member | MK | ENW |
| Guy Nicholson | Generators with Novel Units Member | GN | Senergy Econnect |
| John Norbury | Large Generator (>3GW) Member | JN | RWE |
| Brian Punton | Transmission Licensee (SHE Transmission) Member | BP | SHE Transmission |
| Brendan Woods | Externally Interconnected System Operators Member | BW | SONI |

## 1 Introductions & Apologies

3167. The Chair welcomed the group and the apologies were noted.

## 2 Approval of Minutes

### a) May 2013 GCRP Minutes

3168. The Panel approved the minutes for publication

3169. **ACTION: RJ** Upload minutes on to the National Grid website.

## 3 Review of Actions

### a) Summary of Actions

*Grid Code Modification Process*

3170. Minute 2622 –RJ informed the Panel that the document will be moved once the website is refreshed. This action remains ongoing.

*Protection Fault Clearance Times and Back-up Protection*

3171. Minute 2678 – RJ informed the Panel that there is no update available. This action remains ongoing.

*G5/4 Harmonics*

3172. Minute 2943 – GS explained that National Grid are currently investigating what information can be made available on power quality and a further update will be provided in September.

*Revision of Engineering Recommendation P28*

3173. Minute 2866 – RJ noted that the DCRP are looking for a Workgroup chair, when a suitable person is found, the workgroup will progress. This action remains ongoing.

*Consequential changes from CA049*

3174. Minute 2872 – RJ noted that this would be covered on the agenda. This action remains ongoing

*Constant Terminal Voltage*

3175. Minute 3034 and 2090 –RJ noted that this would be covered on the agenda. This is action is complete and can be closed.

3176. Minute 2887 – TD noted that the first session is likely to be in September. This action remains ongoing.

*AOB*

3177. Minute 2975 – RJ noted that some photos have been received and any remaining photos will be taken at the end of the meeting.

*GC0062: Fault Ride Through*

3178. Minute 3051– RJ noted that this will be covered on the agenda. This action is now complete and can be closed.

*Workgroup Table*

3179. Minute 3141– RJ noted that a progress tracker has been developed and circulated and will be discussed on the agenda. This action is now complete and can be closed.

## 4 New Grid Code Development Issues

## a) Proposal for a Joint Standing Group to Coordinate Application of European Network Codes across GB Codes.

3180. RW presented paper pp13/38. RW noted that the purpose of this paper is to establish a standing group to advise the Code Panels on the application of European Network codes. The suggested, initial membership would consist of 7 industry members representing Code Panels plus National Grid, DECC, Ofgem and Consumer Futures.

3181. RW highlighted that the intention is to establish ECCAF (European Code Coordination Application Forum) by September or October 2013 to allow for pre-work before the first ENCs complete Comitology.

3182. The Panel are requested to provide feedback on the proposal by 1st August 2013 and finalised Terms of Reference will be submitted to the September 2013 GCRP.

3183. RW also provided feedback from the Code Panels on ENC application to GB frameworks; noting that the Code Panels all agreed that existing processes should be used as far as possible.

3184. RW commented on the group comprising DNOs, National Grid and Ofgem who are considering the RFG code and its application to GB. RW noted that two of the areas looked at recently were regarding governance and that, from a governance point of view, the role of DECC is not very clear.

3185. SB asked whether there has been any discussion on how a significant contradiction between the ENC and domestic code would be solved. RW noted that so far there are no absolute contradictions so this is unlikely to be an issue.

3186. JB asked where this suggested Coordination Group would get information to review. RW noted that the group would advise which parameters which are left to member states to establish and on any impact assessments. The process for establishing the parameters themselves would be managed by the relevant panel. RW stressed that ECCAF would not be a substitute for workgroups under the governance of existing panels; it will just help achieve things in a coordinated manner.

3187. BV added some comments from the previous JESG. It was noted that it was not clear whether it would be technical people, or regulatory experts who were wanted as group members, as such it would be good to give the chair the opportunity to review the membership, and add alternates so those with different expertise can attend the relevant meetings. At the BSC panel it was noted that code administrators are classed as advisors but these should perhaps be classed as technical advisors as their expertise will be called upon. A further observation was that people who are not code signatories will be affected but it is not clear who represents them. Also, the gas world is not represented here and so far there has been no coordination across them, so it may be necessary to extend to someone from UNC as an observer. AC added that the potential number of issues seems to be growing and so some overarching coordination seems essential. IP noted that this is all useful feedback and encouraged members to respond to the consultation.

3188. JB suggested that perhaps one of the objectives should be giving guidance on prioritisation within the individual codes. AB queried the time commitment and whether a monthly meeting enough time given the potential volume of material? He suggested that it may be difficult to provide guidance unless an individual is familiar with the existing code and the new one. RW suggested that, to provide effective coordination, it is ongoing, not only meeting once a month. BV suggested that the subgroups would do much of the detailed work and this group would be the overarching coordinator. RW added that caution is needed with the number of representatives on the group, to ensure it is not an information forum. BV suggested that this could take place in line with JESG and use some of the same people.

3189. SBo suggested that this level of detail is necessary to ensure a consistent approach across the industry. JB asked if it is now clear how application will work, will the existing code be re-written or will the be a new code? AF questioned whether this decision should be the first activity of the group. AC suggested that the coordination group would identify which areas of which codes would need to be reviewed / changed but that the normal code governance process would be used to ensure any changes were acceptable. JB suggested awareness needs to be given to that fact that at some point there may be duplicate or different requirements for different generators.

3190. BV asked about the internal NG structure and whether it would be the code drafters or the existing code governance teams who will be attending the meetings. IP noted that this was to be decided. CMD asked if there will be any guidance from DECC on how to implement the ENCs noting that direction is necessary here. RW noted that National Grid are trying to progress a closer relationship with DECC.

3191. **ACTION: ALL** Provide feedback on the Terms of Reference by 1 August 2013.

## 5 Existing Grid Code Development Issues

### a) Progress Trackers

3192. RJ presented the progress tracker, pp13/39, noting that it is intended to replace both the workgroup table and the issues list. If Panel members have any suggested improvements they are requested to talk to RJ.

### b) GC0028: Constant Terminal Voltage

3193. GS presented paper pp13/40. GS explained that Constant Terminal Voltage for synchronous generators had been highlighted to the Panel because there were some generating stations where compliance was not achieved and this suggested there is an issue of interpretation of the code to be dealt with. GS added that looking forwards to RfG, which specifies +/-0.9 power factor on the HV side of the generator transformer, a different requirement is likely to be in place from what GB has now. Given that RfG could affect this issue, GS asked the Panel whether they feel that this should be looked at now, or as part of the wider RfG works.

3194. GP suggested that if GB is in the position where there was still a Grid Code for generators pre RfG it be worth clarifying in the Connection Conditions for those Generators. AF suggested that the benefit in doing this is for generators connecting in the future, but as RfG will capture them there is no benefit to clarifying the old code.

3195. JB asked how many generators are being asked to operate at the extremes which seem to be where the problems are. GS noted that there are more now than in the past. JB queried whether generators, who have previously been affected by this, accepted the risk that they may need to operate at the extremes to be compliant.

3196. GS added that the Panel could make a statement on its interpretation of the current requirements are and questioned how many people are in the process of specifying a generator transformer at the moment who are at risk of interpreting requirements incorrectly. GP added that existing stations replacing transformers may require clearer requirements. IP questioned whether new equipment at existing stations would fall under the requirements of RfG.

3197. SBo added that in RfG there appears to be a move towards individual voltage control for each generator, and a move away from direct power control, and questioned whether these voltage control requirements could be achieved with a tap changer.

3198. IP asked the Panel which approach should be taken.

3199. GP suggested that the text in the Code should be improved, whereas CMD suggested that it may change again subject to RfG. JB added that this is an existing code issue and should be addressed and, if following that, some generators don't comply then either derogation or replacement may be necessary. GP added that if it is a case of clarifying the code then it would be a short workgroup focused on improving the legal text. GS suggested that an appropriate way forward is to get interested parties together for a few hours to see what can/cannot be done.

3200. SBo noted that, as we know which existing generators have an issue and what that issue is, we could have a minimum requirement which says if built by this year have this. GS agreed to arrange a meeting with synchronous generator representatives and come back to the November panel. GP first thing would be to have a workshop prior to the September panel to look at the issues. GS noted that he will not be able to do this before September. GP suggested that as RFG is not due to come out of comitology and this is a minor issue, there could be a proposal for this done by Q1 2014. GS agreed to summarise the views raised at the proposed workshop and suggested ways forward in an issue paper with terms of reference for the November Panel meeting.

3201. **ACTION: GS** Draft Issue Paper and Terms of Reference for the November 2013 GCRP.

### c) GC0062: Fault Ride Through

3202. GS presented paper pp13/41 asking whether the Panel thought we were in a position to progress this to a Workgroup.

3203. CMD noted that the decision to take this forward as part of RfG was the result of a discussion which generators were not part of and as this was raised initially by JM, does RFG actually answer the questions?

3204. IP suggested the low risk option might be to do this as part of RfG unless there is an issue which means this needs to be done sooner than that.

3205. JM suggested that this should be progressed now as it is a problem for existing plant, and there is no indication that this will change for large generators under RfG. AF agreed that this could be looked at now with RfG coming in the background. CMD questioned whether any change would be retrospective. GS noted that would be looked at by the workgroup. JB questioned whether part of the process would be to do a high level Cost Benefit Analysis. JB added that the ToRs say Fault Ride Through requirements are less onerous in RfG, as such would changing GB code to match RfG be a solution? GS noted that the workgroup would look at both of these points.

3206. The Panel agreed that the Workgroup can be established.

### d) GC0065: Consequential Changes from STC modification CA049

3207. AR provided an update noting that the STC changes have been approved and the Grid Code changes are now being drafted and will be brought to the panel in September.

## 6 Workgroups in Progress

### a) GC0042: Information on Small Embedded Power Stations and their Impact on Demand

3208. GS provided an update noting that the workgroup has drawn conclusions and a draft workgroup report has been circulated and comments are welcome before the final workgroup report is brought to the September panel.

3209. GS highlighted that the workgroup are focussing on plant larger than 1MW. JW asked whether a second phase of work would be done to look at smaller sites. GS noted that for now, that is unachievable. JL suggested that, as it stands, this proposal will not provide the information for the transparency guidelines as those requirement go lower than 1MW and they are split by production type not ENA fuel type. GS suggested that his interpretation was reporting is on individual sites above 1MW. JL added that for some aspects there is not a 1MW threshold. JL noted that he thought this Workgroup was going to deliver the information needed to apply the transparency regulations and, if that was never in the terms of reference, then there has been some miscommunication or confusion adding that there seems to be an issue that the information needed comply is not being looked at. IP noted that there are other people within National Grid who are looking at what is required for transparency.

3210. AC noted that if, for example, fuel type is needed as part of GC0042 and for compliance with the transparency requirements, having a single consistent set of descriptions would be desirable. GS added that he would rather not specify fuel types in the code otherwise there will need to be a code change whenever a description of fuel type changes.

3211. AC suggested that, if the Workgroup report is not due till September, there is time for National Grid to clarify what or whether there are any further works required. IP suggested that a statement on transparency is made within the workgroup report

3212. **ACTION: GS** Include statement on transparency in Workgroup Report.

### b) GC0050: Demand Control

3213. AR noted that the Workgroup have been examining the timing of demand control delivery, and some of the issues around unclear understanding of the process. National Grid and the DNOs are developing process changes. Further issues are around how much voltage reduction can actually be delivered, and tests are planned for September. Such tests are subject to the control room being happy to reduce demand in September. The aim is to provide a completed workgroup report in November, but this may change if the dates of the tests change.

### c) GC0063: Power Available

3214. ME provided an update highlighting the background to Power Available, the deficiencies which the Workgroup are aiming to address and an overview of the options the workgroup identified. These options include a consistent approach to MEL submission, a Dynamic MEL (formulaic approach) and a separate signal (possibly Power Available) refreshed frequently with MEL used for connected capacity.

3215. ME noted that the Workgroup is yet to assess the impact, and look at how the signals would be communicated adding that the Workgroup Report is drafted but needs further work as it does not fully reflect the Workgroup considerations. The finished report is now likely to be presented in November

3216. AF noted that C/11 was supposed to be a temporary solution and questioned what will happen with that upon completion of this Workgroup. ME suggested that this will be addressed in the workgroup report. CMD noted that the use of headroom and what MEL provides in terms of frequency response is down the mechanism in which frequency response is performed, as such it would be useful for the procurement to be changed for wind farms. ME noted that this is important and the unique properties of wind need to be explained properly in the report. CMD noted that all of these signals mean extra costs on the developers. ME noted that this would be part of the impact assessment.

3217. AT asked that the Panel be informed as soon as possible if there is any slip from November. AT also suggested as part of the presentation of the workgroup report could a slide on lessons learnt be included. IP agreed that this should be included.

3218. CMD noted that as part of the lessons learnt, can it be ensured that the defects are clearly identified in any future Terms of Reference..

3219. **ACTION: ME** Include slide on lessons learnt at the November 2013 GCRP. …

## 7 Workgroup Report

### a) GC0035: Frequency Changes During Large System Disturbances

3220. GS presented paper pp13/42 noting that no changes are proposed to the Grid Code at this stage, but the proposals are relevant.

3221. GS noted that this phase of work focuses on generating plant at stations of greater than 5MW in capacity. Loss of mains (LOM) protection is a requirement of the Distribution Code and is designed to protect against unintended islanding. It is estimated that up to 10GW of distributed generation has some form of LOM protection fitted and for the purposes of the workgroup's analysis it has been assumed that half will have RoCoF based protection. AF asked if the system does not get inertia form synchronous machines because control systems are taking it out, what would happen and would it be a serious issue. GS responded that frequency would fall quicker and it would be a significant issue which may need to be considered in other areas work (eg the development of rapid frequency response).

3222. GS summarised the predicted average system RoCoF. The figures presented are based on estimated inertia, up to 2020, during high wind conditions and high wind/high imports. The demand levels used were 20GW and 35GW. For larger losses RoCoF values reached in excess of $0.5Hzs^{-1}$.

3223. The workgroup had asked the University of Strathclyde to conduct a hazard assessment to examine the risks of higher RoCoF settings. GS noted that different measurement periods have different effects and, as shorter periods are very sensitive to local changes, the Workgroup recommends a 500ms measurement period. GS

noted that all of the probabilities presented are based on a population of synchronous generators as the group's view was that the probability of an asynchronous generator sustaining an island in the absence of additional control mechanisms was extremely low. The Workgroup concluded that the risk to individuals from an islanded network fell into a range generally viewed as acceptable as the risks calculated were less than $1x10^{-6}$. However, the group noted that the risks of out of phase re-closure under its preferred settings were significant and that further work was required to examine and perhaps mitigate risks at synchronous generator sites if new settings were adopted. The Workgroups expectation was that affected generators would be responsible for undertaking these risk assessments and implementing any associated remedial works; an estimate of the cost of these activities had been included in the draft Workgroup report. GS noted that the overall level of risk reduced or increased in direct proportion to the number of synchronous generators.

3224. GS noted that the DCRP have approved the Workgroup recommendations, subject to some minor points of clarification that arose at the DCRP, which are to change the recommended setting for plant of 5MW and above to 1 $Hzs^{-1}$, to continue to consultation. The Workgroup recommends that for synchronous generators a site specific out of phase re-closure risk assessment may be necessary. CMD suggested that in Scotland there is large potential for islanded areas and a risk of out of phase re-closure given the settings in which the DAR operate. GS noted that this is the reason for recommending site specific assessments.

3225. The final recommendation is that the Workgroup continues and looks at developing a proposal for RoCoF withstand capability and developing proposals for generators less than 5MW.

3226. GS summarised the costs of implementing the proposals by looking at the cost of making a protection setting change, noting that assumptions of these costs have been included in the workgroup report but it would be useful to get some feedback on the number of sites affected.

3227. GS noted that the benefits of implementing the proposals are that the risk of involuntary demand control through operation of RoCoF will significantly reduce and it will take the first necessary step to eliminating balancing services expenditure (which could vary from £10-100mpa) on RoCoF risk management. Full delivery of these benefits is dependent on completion of the next workgroup phase. CMD asked whether the cost forecast is in conjunction to move to largest infeed loss. IP asked whether further change will be required to cope with an 1800MW loss. CMD added that a lot of this cost will be on small independent generators and they may have other costs. AF suggested that, generators who are connected near a large generator which trips then may already see very large rates of change of frequency over very short periods and proving that plant can withstand it. GS noted that if settings could be changed to 1 $Hzs^{-1}$ then it was less likely that protection settings and techniques would have to be revisited before 2020.

3228. JB queried whether the balancing service costs quoted are avoided costs rather than the cost of an event happening. GS confirmed that they are the amount National Grid would not have to spend procuring balancing services.

3229. GS summarised the programme of further work which includes looking at generation in the smaller capacity, including inverters and where multiple generators are feeding an island. The workgroup will also start looking at withstand criteria and at vector shift techniques.

3230. GS invited the panel to note the Workgroups recommendations for D-Code changes, provide comments and feedback on the recommendations for inclusions and invite the Workgroup to complete its programme of further work. GS noted that during the Industry Consultation there will be further stakeholder engagement and asked the panel whether they feel the workgroup should target those affected or have a general invite again.

3231. GP noted that in G59, there was text which allowed for alternative settings for generators which could not achieve the required. GP also asked who would need to do an assessment and who would pay. GS noted that the workgroup recommends a single setting across all generators and that under current arrangements the burden for assessments would fall upon the generator.

3232. IP asked whether the workgroup had considered the questions they would like to ask. GS noted that the workgroup report summarised questions for consultation. CMD noted that he would like to see more investigation into what the risks to generators are. IP asked whether CMD is looking for the workgroup to make a statement on that or to ask the question of generators to provide information. GS suggested that, for the consultation, the issues can be expanded upon are but the workgroup are looking for feedback. CMD queried whether this increased setting means that, in effect, RoCoF protection is removed and questioned whether the DNOs are planning to ban it in the future. AC noted that, as the proposal stands, it is to increase the settings not remove the protection all together. AF added that he would expect the generator protection to bring the generator off the system if there is a difference in phase detected; and in practice there is little difference between this and a sudden short circuit.

3233. The Panel are happy to note the recommendations and continue the programme of further work.

### b) GC0057: High Wind Speed Shutdown

3234. ME presented paper pp13/43. His presentation highlighted the background to the issue. CMD noted that not all wind turbines behave the same as the graph shown in the presentation. ME noted that the graph demonstrates the perception of wind farm behaviour at the start of the Workgroup.

3235. ME noted that through the Workgroup have learnt a lot about turbine behaviours and how they are affected by many different things including the circumstances at which cut out may occur.

3236. ME noted that the System Operator are reasonably comfortable with the situation and propose using the OC7 and OC10 requirements to request data which will be used to support improved forecasting. The GCRP is recommended to review the issue in two years or sooner if the System Operator requests.

3237. The Panel noted the recommendations of the workgroup and agreed that the Terms of Reference have been discharged.

## 8 Industry Consultations

### a) GC0022: Frequency Response

3238. TD provided an update including the conclusions from the Workgroup report and the progress to date.

3239. The CUSC remuneration mechanism was discussed at the June BSSG and is due to be discussed in more detail at the September BSSG.

3240. TD noted that the review of the current Firm Frequency Response service was discussed at the CBSG and generally people were supportive of the review. Workshops are due to be held later in 2013.

3241. GP noted that he thought there were going to be terms of reference for a new Workgroup coming to the panel. TD noted that the intention is to have further interaction with these groups and then publish the technical consultation.

3242. SBo queried whether there is a month when the consultation is likely to go out. TD commented that there is a lot of work to go through, but Q4 2013 is expected and this will include legal text. SBo added that consultations seem to pop up fairly randomly and it is quite hard to schedule work. TD agreed to ensure that the GCRP was aware of an exact publication date once it had been confirmed.

3243. CMD asked whether the FFR is a mandatory requirement. TD noted that the mandatory requirement is likely to come in post 2016 and, in advance of that, National Grid intend to tender for the service to get access to the product sooner. CMD noted concerns about the mandatory aspects as the industry is trying to get new technologies to market but then change the requirements making it difficult..

3244. AF asked whether National Grid are still looking at response delivery profiles for synchronous generators, TD confirmed that it was part of the Frequency Response work.

### b) GC0037: Offshore BMU configuration

3245. GS presented paper pp13/44 highlighting the changes proposed and inviting comments on the consultation as drafted. AT asked if the consultation could include the original Workgroup Terms of Reference and Membership. JB noted that there is no commentary over whether there is a discriminatory aspect, as this will allow wind to swap BMUs to continue generating but other generators cannot do that.

3246. The Panel are happy for this to go to consultation. RJ added that this will likely to be towards the end of the summer to avoid publishing too many consultations at once.

### c) GC0071: CGR (Phase 2) Significant Code Review

3247. DM presented paper pp13/45 providing an overview of Significant Code Review, highlighting that this is a code review process initiated and led by the Authority.

3248. JB asked where this sits under the code change philosophy for ENCs and is it something which takes away the Panel's role adding that the definition of significant is not clear. DM noted that Ofgem will indicate what is significant and why. AT provided and overview of project TransmiT which was a CUSC SCR. AT noted that there are two aspects to an SCR, what happens during an SCR and then what happens when something comes out of it, Ofgem lead on the first aspect, and anything which comes out of an SCR will be given to the relevant Code Panel to progress under normal governance. BV noted that these proposals aim to bring the Grid Code in line with the other Codes.

3249. DM asked the Panel if they are happy to take the proposal to consultation and noted that National are happy to hold discussions with anyone offline as required. The Panel agreed that the Consultation can be published for 20 working days.

### d) GC0072: CGR (Phase 2) Code Administrator and Code Administration Code of Practice

3250. DM presented paper pp13/46 providing an overview of the role of the Code Administrator.

3251. The Panel agreed that this issue can proceed to consultation for 20 working days.

3252. BV suggested that when the consultations are over National Grid do a session which says what is being done differently as a result providing the Panel with a better understanding of the issue.

3253. **ACTION: AT** Present a comparison between the old and new administration resulting from the Code Administrator CGR (Phase 2) at November 2013 GCRP.

### e) GC0071: CGR (Phase 2) Send Back Process

3254. DM presented paper pp13/47 providing an overview of the Send Back process.

3255. The Panel agreed that this issue can proceed to consultation for 20 working days.

## 9 Pending Authority Decisions

### a) GC0040: Information Required to Evaluate Sub-Synchronous Resonance

3256. JW noted that GC0040 was sent to the Authority initially on the 27 June 2013, Ofgem then requested we resubmit the report based on some queries they had with the legal text. The report was resubmitted on the 15 July 2013. A decision is due at the beginning of August.

### a) GC0044: Grid Code Changes resulting from BSC Modification P276.

3257. JW noted that GC0044 was sent to the Authority on 19 June 2013; and a decision is expected later this week or early next week.

3258. JW asked what the next Grid Code modification that would require an Authority decision would be. TD said that the next one to be sent to the Authority would be GC0033, which would likely be sent in 4-6 weeks.

## 10 Standing Items

### a) European Network Codes

3259. IP noted that pp13/48 the ACER update on the European Network Codes was circulated to the panel. RJ noted that the Ofgem update will be circulated after the meeting.

### b) Joint European Standing Group

3260. BV noted that there were 24 attendees, at the JESG on 16 July 2013, some of which were new parties. BV noted that there was discussion on the difference in definitions between the ENCs. BV requested that if there are any other trade associations engaged in the issues then Panel Members should please ensure that this issue is flagged up. BV added that on the National Grid website there is now a summary on where the codes are

3261. BV noted that discussions were also on the transparency regulations and any consequential modifications, the application group proposed earlier and the operational planning and scheduling network code which has issues including national scrutiny and poor consistency. BV highlighted that, if there are any issues with this code, there is an Ofgem/DECC stakeholder meeting in August.

## 11 Impact of Other Code Modification or Developments

3262. A codes summary, pp13/50, was circulated to the Panel.

3263. IP highlighted that there is a consultation out regarding two things under EMR, two new products and encouraged the Panel to respond. RJ agreed to circulate links to the consultation after the meeting.

3264. GS asked SQSS could be added to this document. RJ agreed to do this in time for the next meeting.

3265. **ACTION: RJ** Add SQSS to the Code Summary.

## 12 Any Other Business

3266. TD noted that the Energy Bill 2013 contains elements relating to the Enduring Offshore Regime which will require changes to the CUSC and Grid Code. The Energy Bill changes will create an exception from the Electricity Act 1989 for generators undertaking generator build during commissioning. Ofgem, with support from National Grid, have started to look at the code drafting required to support the Energy Bill changes. Ofgem are going to consultation in August/September 2013 and will be holding workshops to support stakeholder involvement.

3267. GP noted that there are a number of National Grid Technical Standards (NGTS) referenced in the Appendix F's to the Bilateral Connection Agreement (BCA) which are outside of the Relevant Electrical Standards. GP queried whether this is an oversight by National Grid or whether they will be brought to the panel for consideration. Examples of references to NGTS may be found in F5.1, F5.11, F5.12 and F5.13 (see Generic BCA Templates available at

http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Electricity/Codes/gridcode/associateddocs/). IP agreed to take these away for consideration.

3268. **ACTION: RLa** to investigate and provide an update at the September Panel meeting.

## 13 Next Meeting

3269. The next meeting is planned for 18 September 2013.

3270. RJ noted that the conference rooms at National Grid will be undergoing refurbishment and so the next meeting will be held elsewhere. IP added that we are proposing to hold the meeting at the Crowne Plaza at the Birmingham NEC unless there is sufficient desire from Panel Members to consider an alternate location.