nationalgrid

Minutes

Meeting name	Grid Code Review Panel
Meeting number	63
Date of meeting	18 September 2013
Time	10:00am - 4:00pm
Location	Elexon, 350 Euston Road, London, NW1 3AW

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
John Norbury	Large Generator (>3GW) Member	JN	RWE
Alan Creighton	Network Operator (E&W) Member	AC	Northern Powergrid
Richard Lavender	NGET Advisor	RLa	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
Neil Sandison	Network Operator (Scot.) Alternate	NS	SSE
Richard Lowe	Transmission Licensee (SHE Transmission) Alternate	RL	SHE Transmission
Gordon Kelly	Network Operator (Scot.) Member	GK	ScottishPower
Joseph Dunn	Transmission Licensee (SPT) Member	JD	SPT
Guy Nicholson	Generators with Novel Units Member	GN	Element Power
Tom Davies	Large Generator (<3GW) Member	TDA	Magnox
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
Pavel Miller	Small / Medium Generator Observer	PM	Energy UK

Apologies

Name	Role	Initials	Company
Roger Harris	BSC Panel Alternate	RH	Elexon
Xavier Pinchaux	Externally Interconnected System Operators Alternate	XP	RTE
Lisa Waters	Small / Medium Generator Alternate	LW	Waters Wye
Alan Kelly	Transmission Licensee (SPT) Alternate	AK	SPT
Mike Kay	Network Operator (E&W) Member	MK	ENW
Brian Punton	Transmission Licensee (SHE Transmission) Member	BP	SHE Transmission
Brendan Woods	Externally Interconnected System Operators Member	BW	SONI
Thomas Derry	NGET Member	TD	National Grid
Barbara Vest	Small / Medium Generator Member	BV	Energy UK
Julian Wayne	Authority Alternate	JW	Ofgem
Sigrid Bolik	Generators with Novel Units Alternate	SBO	REpower

1 Introductions & Apologies

3271. The Chair welcomed the group and the apologies were noted.

2 Approval of Minutes

a) July 2013 GCRP Minutes

3272. The Panel approved the minutes for publication

3273. **ACTION: RJ** Upload minutes on to the National Grid website.

3 Review of Actions

a) Summary of Actions

Grid Code Modification Process

3274. Minute 2622 –RJ informed the Panel that the document will be moved once the website is refreshed. RJ noted that the new website is due for release in November 2013. This action remains ongoing.

Protection Fault Clearance Times and Back-up Protection

3275. Minute 2678 – RJ informed the Panel that the legal text should be circulated before the next Panel meeting. This action remains ongoing.

Harmonics

3276. Minute 2943 – GS explained that National Grid are working on the 2013 Electricity Ten Year Statement (ETYS) for publication in November. Harmonics issues will captured in the 2013 document and stakeholders will have an opportunity to influence the development of ETYS content through the ETYS consultation process. This action is closed.

Revision of Engineering Recommendation P28

3277. Minute 2866 – RJ noted that the DCRP are looking for a Workgroup chair, when a suitable person is found, the Workgroup will progress. AC agreed to chase this up with MK. This action remains ongoing.

Consequential changes from CA049

3278. Minute 2872 – RJ noted that the draft Industry Consultation has been circulated and will be discussed on the agenda. The action is complete and can be closed.

Grid Code Education Session

3279. Minute 2887 – RJ noted that we were aiming to hold the first session in September but this may now fall in October due to resource constraints. CMD noted that this was something BV raised and has now been outstanding for a long time. CMD requested that NGET ensure this is addressed soon. IP noted CMDs concerns and added that this will be actioned soon. This action remains ongoing.

Panel Photos

3280. Minute 2975 – RJ noted that some photos and those who hadn't provided would be left blank, this action is now complete and can be closed.

GC0062: Constant Terminal Voltage

3281. Minute 3201– RJ noted that this Action will be updated in November. This action remains ongoing

GC0042: Information on Small Embedded Power Station and Their impact on Demand

3282. Minute 3212– RJ noted that the Workgroup Report has been submitted to the September GCRP and will be discussed on the agenda. This action is complete and can be closed.

GC0063: Power Available

3283. Minute 3219– RJ noted that a presentation on lessons learnt will be given following the conclusion of the Workgroup and Industry Consultation. This action remains ongoing.

National Grid Technical Standards

3284. Minute 3267– RLa noted that in 2006 we published the RES with 18 of the most relevant NGET technical standards included. In principal NGET prefer to have all the relevant specifications in the RES but that is not always practical. At the moment the most efficient way is to update the references to technical standards within Bilateral Agreements. RLa added that NGET are looking to do a full update to the RES in the future.

3285. JN noted that this is a little bit disappointing as a full review of the RES sooner would be beneficial, in the interim it should not be that difficult to put new standards into the RES, recognising the need for the RES to reflect current technology. JN added that, from a Users perspective, it feels like a lot of new obligations are being put into the Appendix F of the BCA which reference the NGTS. This action seems to be circumventing the Grid Code Governance of Electrical Standards process agreed when the RES was created, namely a process which meant that any new standards would need to be agreed by the GCRP before being published in the RES. JN requested that, if the review of the RES is going to take a long time can anything be brought to the Panel in the short term?

3286. RJ agreed to transfer this from the action list to the Progress Tracker to ensure that this issue is captured.

3287. CMD queried whether there are NGTS applicable to SP/SHET area? GS stated that some of them are applicable in Scotland, whereas the RES is applicable in England and Wales.

3288. AC questioned the timescales for bringing the new RES to the Panel? Rla agreed to discuss this with the relevant National Grid colleagues. GS noted that it is clear that the Panel would rather see something in the short-term. AC noted that the scope of application of the RES is not always clear, adding that sometimes when a new BCA is received the Appendix F often seeks to apply the RES to an existing connection point and consequently impose new technical requirements that might be inappropriate. JN noted that since RES was introduced there has never been a follow up review to finesse the document.

3289. IP questioned whether there is a need for a high level plan of how this will be tackled? JN suggested that there needs to be an ongoing process to cover developments of technical standards. GS noted that one of the downsides of the RES is that as technology changes the document needs to continually change. JN noted that the RES is important because it affects contracts for equipment which parties are trying to procure.

4 New Grid Code Development Issues

a) GC0048: RFG Application Workgroup

3290. RW presented paper pp13/53. RW stated that this paper is aiming to set up a joint Workgroup under the GCRP and DCRP to look at changes in the Grid and Distribution Codes necessary to align these with the RfG European Network Code. RW noted that there is a distinction with ECCAF, as that is looking at coordination across European Codes and GB Code Panels. The membership of the Workgroup should include least 1 GCRP representative, but also a broad cross-section of Industry members to ensure that all types/sizes of generators are represented.

3291. JN commented that in the deliverables, it refers specifically to RfG but the other European codes also have an impact on the Grid Code, so should the scope be expanded to cover potential changes from other Network Codes as this may be the most efficient approach? AF agreed that there are some areas which are common across several European Network Codes, notably RfG, DCC and HVDC which all have similar connection conditions, and as such, it seems sensible to look at these together. RW agreed that this could be considered going forwards but noted that there is an issue that we cannot get around, which is that the Codes will all be coming out of comitology and becoming European law at different times. RfG is expected Q1 2014,

while the others may be considerably later possibly up to mid 2015; ECCAF will look at how to best coordinate this work.

3292. CMD suggested that the WG should not be formed before ECCAF has considered how to approach the application, noting that there is a risk ECCAF could recommend something different to the Workgroup. CMD added that at JESG it was suggested that RfG is in pre-commitology as the DNV KEMA study is still being considered, and if that is the case then RFG is unlikely to come out of comitology in Q1 2014. GN echoed CMD's view noting that an RfG Workgroup seems premature, and perhaps should be formed after ECCAF.

3293. JM questioned where the decision about whether the D Code becomes a shell document would lie? RW suggested that this would be in this Workgroup. CMD noted that it feels like National Grid want to do this under the codes they control adding though that the Grid Code in its current form may remain a document for current Generators.

3294. IP noted that what NGET are trying to do with this is to develop a transparent process to deliver what is necessary, and caution must be taken to avoid narrowing down the application options at the moment. IP commented that, in terms of how the groups will work, NGET are keen to get the groups running to determine how they will work together adding that part of this process is preparing ourselves and the Industry for what needs to be done. This is something that will take a lot of time and effort and at the moment the aim is in getting appropriate forums and proposals developed.

3295. JB queried whether we are in danger of doing something too traditional; this has the potential for needing a lot of people possibly working full time. JB suggested that a Workgroup will not work instead a complete re-think of how this works is necessary. JB also suggested that ECCAF is too premature, noting that the magnitude of the task has been hugely underestimated. JB questioned why there is a rush to get processes and groups in place now, RfG only applies to future generation which has not been built or procured. RL questioned when RfG applies following comitology. RW stated that once it becomes European law on completing comitology, there will be a period of 3 years until it must be complied with for new generators (so provisionally Q1 2017). The cut-off point to be held to be a new generator is any project that has not let contracts for major plant items by 2 years after the code's entry into force. IP stated that at the moment the current structures and governance will be used and that this had been the previous feedback from all parties. JB if that means this Panel maintains its purpose, how will we be able to debate and change law? IP noted that the Panel will be looking at how to apply the codes. CMD suggested that when a new European Network Code becomes applicable it could sit above the current Grid Code and will not be subject to governance RW - As European Law ENCs will take precedence over GB codes but a process of alignment with GB codes is essential such that the requirements upon all parties can be fully understood and can be followed. AF questioned who actually makes the decision on whether the current codes are modified, or whether new codes are created, will the decision sit with ECCAF or in a new or different group. GS stated that NGET has an obligation to maintain the Grid Code and match with European obligations, if we do something different that would require a Licence change so that goes back to Ofgem and ultimately DECC. RW noted that non-compliance with European Law means that the Member State is non-compliant and could be fined, but this sanction would then be filtered down through the industry.

3296. RW suggested that the main question is whether the Workgroup needs to be set up now; adding that his feeling is that it should be. RW noted concerns that there is a lot going on in the same area, pulling on the same, relatively small resource pool.

3297. CMD queried whether codes, other than the Grid Code will be affected, IP stated that this proposal is for a joint Workgroup to cover the Grid Code and Distribution Code requirements, whereas ECCAF will look at the breadth of the impact across all the codes.

3298. GN noted that as we have JESG we should get ECCAF up and running before setting anything else up. GN added that thinking about the next steps is positive, but that efforts should be channelled into ECCAF first.

3299. JB questioned whether we have any knowledge on how other countries will apply the codes or whether ENTSO-E will publish anything. RW noted that the RfG drafting team are in the process of producing a guideline on applying the Code nationally, that will be published soon and provide further clarity.

3300. JM asked how a manufacturer in Europe will work out what requirements are necessary in which countries, adding that he thought the original aim of the ENCs was to move away from a place where there are different requirements in different places.

3301. IP stated that, at this moment, it feels like the Panel do not want to go down the line of a new Workgroup, as there are questions over what ECCAF and this will do together.

3302. AC noted that one of the big uncertainties is trying to decide the structure for GB codes at a high level; he questioned whether it is clear that the Terms of Reference for ECCAF will allow them to decide the structure as they suggest that Grid Code and Distribution Code panels will need to do this; it would be appropriate for the GCRP and DCRP to agree the high level structure based on recommendations from a joint WG. (NB In its ToR provision is made for subgroups to be established under ECCAF of which the proposed joint workgroup would effectively be one). RW suggested that ECCAF could make recommendations and leave it to the Panels or relevant Workgroups to agree what the document structures would look like and how these would be fulfilled.

3303. AF suggested that the first step should be to decide the structure and that this does not seem to fit with ECCAF Terms of Reference, instead it looks like they will be assigning actions to various Panels (or subgroups). JN agreed that ECCAF proposed ToR seems to imply that structures will be down to Code Panels to determine.

3304. IP commented that the approach still needs to be finalised, and to do this NGET need to go away and consider how to approach this rather than agree straightaway. RW noted that he would like to get the two groups moving sooner rather than later but there is more reason to set up ECCAF now as it is a higher level group. RW added that from a purely administrative point of view these may both take a while to do.

3305. SB stated that Ofgem have some views on this issue and there is a letter to NGET being drafted which contains their views. SB added that it is being extensively discussed internally.

3306. JB questioned whether our approach would be different if this was a standard rather than a code; he suggested that we have become focussed on having 2 codes when the new codes are mandating new standards, not how they should be achieved.

3307. IP noted the need to go away and consider the structural issues and then come back to the Panel with another proposal.

3308. SB questioned whether Ofgem could have a copy of the draft application guidelines as being written by the RfG drafting team. RW indicated that this was not presently available outside ENTSO-E but that he would ask. JN queried the jurisdiction the guidelines will have. RW noted that they are guidelines and will not ever become European Law, they should be providing advice only.

3309. JB agreed that the GB will need something at some point to carry out the application of RfG and the other European Network Codes, but this Workgroup is not necessarily the right thing or at the right time.

3310. GP noted that ECCAF is an advisory body and the Terms of References state that it will develop a delivery plan.

3311. CMD noted concerns that if this goes to a Workgroup and ultimately Report to the Authority there is a risk that will not match the Authority's vision.

3312. GN noted that the purpose of the European Network Codes was to create a European standard, and as such ECCAF needs to take into account the manufacturers' view. CMD added it also needs to consider the views of companies across multiple member states.

3313. IP summarised that the Panel does not want a workgroup to be established at the moment; instead the Panel requires further information on the strategy for applying the codes adding that we await further information from Ofgem with their views on ECCAF.

3314. **ACTION**: **RW** Provide further information on the strategy for applying European Network Codes and develop a new proposal for a subsequent GCRP.

3315. IP added that the final point on ECCAF is that we need a representative from GCRP. IP added that the DCode, DCUSA, CUSC, BSC and STC have all nominated parties. IP requested Panel members give it serious thought and let IP or RW know if they are

interested. JB queried the required level of commitment. RW indicated that, as a minimum, it was likely to be one day a month.

3316. **ACTION**: **ALL Panel Members** Consider nominating a, or becoming the, GCRP ECCAF representative.

b) GC0077: Suppression of Sub Synchronous Resonance from Series Compensation

3317. JM gave a presentation introducing pp13/54. He noted that Transmission Owners plan to incorporate HVDC and series compensation into their networks. Generally Electricity networks provide some type of positive damping. SSR on transmission system can interact with the torsional mode of synchronous generator. JM stated that pp13/54 is requesting the Relevant Transmission Licensees be required to provide damping to Series Capacitive Compensators (SCC) and progress to Industry Consultation. JM proposed that there should be legal text to extend the requirement for SCC replicating the current requirement on HVDC in CC.6.3.16(a).

3318. GP queried whether the definition of Relevant Transmission Licensee~~,~~. The Panel agreed that the proposal should encompass all onshore and offshore TOs.

3319. JB enquired whether the proposal would require a fundamental redesign or is it a matter of switching on some requirement. JM responded that it is a matter of installing the necessary equipment.

3320. AF noted that the equipment is on order for Scottish Power's network. GK added that they have been procured so Scottish Power will be able to provide the required damping. JB questioned whether the issue is that equipment procured does not meet the requirement? GS added that there is no specific requirement but added that there is equipment that can provide damping, Transmission licensees may choose to install it having assessed the risk of SSR occurring. AF noted that this has been raised before and there is no requirement to ensure Generators do not have a problem with SSR and there are other issues, this is only one of them. JN noted that this issue, namely the need to consider further the potential adverse impact of SSC and HVDC technology on synchronous generators was recognised by Ofgem in their conclusions for GC0040.

3321. CMD questioned whether the Grid Code contains obligations on the Relevant Transmission Licensees. GS noted that the SQSS sets out similar requirements, but that thet only thing in the Grid Code specifies what a user should expect to see at a connection point. As such then a more appropriate place for a requirement on Transmission Licensees would be something in the SQSS. GS did not agree that HVDC and Series compensators are the same thing; adding that they are different and that the addition of damping facilities could have significantly different capital costs. GS agreed that protection on Generators is probably not the first step in mitigation and there is possibly a need to place clearer requirements in the Grid Code, but more importantly in the SQSS. GS asked the Panel whether there is a need to develop that now or do as part of the other issues. AF questioned what is happening with investigating other issues. GS responded that a workshop will be scheduled as soon as possible subject to availability.

3322. IP noted that he would expect Ofgem to want to see some cost benefit analysis on what the best method is, and developing something now may limit the work within the Workshop later this year. IP sought the Panel's views on whether this should be considered in the workshop or separately. AF commented that this was raised at GCRP around two years ago, and at the last workshop it was agreed we would progress changes to the Grid Code to capture information from Generators. That change is now implemented but we little progress has been made in developing requirements for transmission companies to meet. IP noted that this is something which has been dealt with in accordance with the resource available.

3323. JD noted that from SPT's perspective they have a duty under the SQSS to ensure there is not an adverse impact on with respect to any frequency components, and that SPT do not feel there are any gaps in how they have carried out the process, and they have come up with an economic and efficient design. JD added that they are keen to have the next workshop as soon as possible at which they will present the process they have followed, in hope that would alleviate a lot of the issues. JD noted that they have some specific comments on the issue which they are happy to share with JM offline. SPT has already procured the equipment and, where there are any potential adverse

effects, are engaging with the generators so every party knows what should be done. JD noted that suppression of SSR is mitigation of risk, not elimination of risk as it is unlikely, even will full thyristor control for example would not be fully able to eliminate the risk. JD added that their approach is consistent with the SQSS but this is a stability issue which SPT take very seriously.

3324. AF noted that he does not believe anyone is doing anything wrong, but is keen to see a clear obligation on transmission licensees to avoid causing SSR. GS suggested that all parties were likely to be content with statement which tells users they would not be subject to SSR under normal operating conditions. A statement saying Transmission Licensees must install damping control is unlikely to be acceptable as this could dictate an inappropriate or inefficient solution. JM agreed with this approach providing that Generators are not approached and asked to fit SSR protection on their plant. GS agreed to create a proposal and consult on legal text

3325. RL suggested that this is quite a complicated issue that is a phenomena of the network, the risk of which can never be removed and so it seems appropriate that all network parties should be aware of the potential for SSR to be present, and responsible parties should be prepared to mitigate against SSR where required. In this circumstance it seems like SPT have taken appropriate measures. AF stated that it cannot be the Generators responsibility in perpetuity, as they could be connected for years, then someone installs a capacitor bank and that presents a risk to the generator, if HVDC want to connect, they are only allowed to if take steps to mitigate SSR. AF noted that he is not unhappy with what is happening at present, he just wants this to be captured appropriately. JD suggested that we don't need this written down as we are doing it anyway. JD added that he does not feel there is a need for such a requirement, but he would be content with a statement as suggested. JB questioned whether this proposal is unreasonable. JD stated that having a blanket requirement for damping control is not appropriate but it would be reasonable include provisions in the code that stated that Generators should not see SSR.

3326. GS noted that if there is a need to put something in the Grid Code quickly, then it would be possible but that it may delay other work. GS suggested that NGET put together a consultation which differs to JM's proposal but captures the essence. JD noted that Transmission Owner equipment which isn't subject to Grid Code, such as the series compensator equipment, would be outside that. GS agreed, stating that the SQSS says how TOs should design their network; the Grid Code says what Users will see at a connection site, and that the STC section D stipulates that Transmission Owners should design to meet certain Grid Code requirements at the Connection Site.

3327. **ACTION**: **GS** Develop Industry Consultation.

5 Existing Grid Code Development Issues

a) Progress Trackers

3328. RJ presented the progress tracker, pp13/55, asking the Panel to note its contents.

3329. CMD queried which Issue the Rapid Frequency Response was captured in. RJ noted that this was under GC0022 Frequency Response.

b) GC0065: CA049 Consequential Change

3330. AR presented paper pp13/56. AR explained that there was a change to the STC and at the STC panel it was identified that there was a gap in the OTSDUW arrangement so once the STC change went through there needed to be a consequential change to the Connection Conditions to capture these requirements.

3331. JB questioned whether this is a requirement that is aimed at the control room and whether it is something they can currently do. AR noted that it is an obligation to require them do something which they already can, the only difference is that it imposes a timescale. For clarity this is an instruction aimed at OFTO control rooms, requiring them to react within two minutes.

3332. The Panel approved the paper for Industry Consultation.

c) GC0078: Terms of Reference for European Code Coordination Application

3333. pp13/57 was discussed under agenda item 4a).

d) GC0067/68: Revisions to the Balancing Code Parameters and Reactive and Frequency Response Fax Form Information

3334. RJ noted that the papers for Reactive and Frequency Response Fax Forms (13/03) and Balancing Code Parameters (13/04) were originally presented at the January 2013 GCRP as separate proposals. These will now be amalgamated and consulted on in a single modification since the Grid Code changes are largely made to the same sections (BC1 & BC2) and EBSG requested that the number of consultations issued are minimised.

3335. RJ added that changes will also be made to the Data Validation, Consistency and Defaulting Rules, an associated supporting document to the Grid Code. This will be issued as an informal consultation alongside the formal Industry Consultation with the intention that technical issues with the former would not delay progression of the latter; however the timescales for both will be parallel such that the respondents receive both consultations as a package.

3336. The intention is for NGET to circulate the consultations first to the EBSG later this month for review and then to GCRP in early October by email circulation for review. Pending responses from EBSG and GCRP the consultations will then be issued around mid-October.

3337. A related BSC mod has recently been raised at the 8 August BSC Panel and is currently in the Assessment phase.

3338. NGET intend to have both (Grid Code and BSC) modifications ready for submission to the Authority for decision by 13 December.

3339. The Panel agreed with the approach to this Modification.

e) Clarification of interpretation of BC2.7.3

3340. AR noted that this was related to rejection of BOAs on safety grounds. The Control Room thought the parameters in the BM were ok for managing this issue, and they thought that a generator, which rejected a BOA, would also reject an Emergency Instruction on safety grounds. AR noted that any Transmission constraints with a high risk of impacting on cascades would be communicated in planning timescales and any short term issues with cascades should be communicated between Control Rooms so there are no surprises in BM.

3341. AR noted that, following a constraint and water management trial the affected parties are happy with the outcome of this issue and it can now be closed.

6 Workgroups in Progress

3342. RJ referred the Panel to the Progress Tracker.

3343. GS explained that the Fault Ride Through Workgroup has received quite a few responses to the request for members, but not as many synchronous Generators as desirable so if any Panel members would like to nominate a Workgroup member they are welcome to do so. GS noted a general point about Workgroups; a member does not necessarily need to go to every meeting, and they can be a corresponding member if time constraints are a problem.

7 Workgroup Reports

a) GC0042: Information on Small Embedded Generation

3344. GS presented paper pp13/58. The Workgroup recommends that the Grid Code is modified to oblige DNOs to provide information about Generation connected to their network. The Workgroup have considered the impact on DNOs, and the impact on owners of Distributed Generation. GS noted that there will be a consequential change to the Distribution Code and, at the last DCRP the Panel discussed doing that in parallel to ensure any Consultations will be published together.

3345. GS explained that this Modification allows National Grid to discharge some of the Transparency obligations down to 1MW noting that there are some other obligations in

the regulation which would not be covered. The Workgroup debated implementation at length and decided on Week 24 submissions in 2015 but acknowledged the transparency regulations which come into action before that date will be covered by some other means.

3346. AC noted that he had a conversation with the Northern Powergrid Workgroup member who has suggested some minor changes to the draft legal text to make the text clearer.

3347. AF noted that the Workgroup Report indicates that the Embedded Generators are causing some errors in the National Grid demand forecast. AF queried the actual target as the graph shows around plus or minus 200MW difference in demand, which is less than 1%. GS noted that there is not a specific target but the demand forecast feeds into the reserve requirement. IP noted that there is an upwards trend in the error.

3348. JL expressed concern that the report gives a misleading message on the Transparency obligation, it seems to suggest Transparency only applies to 1MW. JL added that he had received an email response from National Grid on this which was satisfactory, and requested that something similar be added to the report to provide an accurate message and there is something on record that shows what the situation is. GS agreed to incorporate that into the Industry Consultation.

3349. The Panel agreed that this can progress to Industry Consultation subject the changes discussed at the Panel being incorporated..

8 Industry Consultations

a) GC0037: Offshore BMU configuration

3350. RJ noted that this consultation closes on Tuesday 24 September

b) GC0035: Frequency Changes During Large System Disturbances

3351. GS noted that this consultation is open until 27 September. GS explained that the first phase of the work has been completed and is the subject of this Consultation. Two workshops have been held to engage with affected parties on the contents of the Consultation and the reasons behind it. GS stated that the Workgroup is moving forward with its second phase, noting that the first phase captures stations with registered capacity of 5MW and above while the next phase is looking at smaller plant and withstand requirements.

9 Pending Authority Decisions

3352. RJ noted that the Reports to the Authority for GC0071, 72 and 73 were submitted for a decision on 13 September 2013. And the Report for GC0033, Offshore Windfarms not connected to an Offshore Transmission System was submitted on 17 September 2013.

10 Standing Items

a) European Network Codes

3353. IP noted that pp13/59 the ACER update on the European Network Codes was circulated to the panel.

b) Joint European Standing Group

3354. IP noted that pp13/60 the JESG headline report was circulated to the Panel but no update was available from the September JESG.

3355. JM questioned what is happening with the recommendations from the DNV KEMA report asking specifically whether ENTSOe are taking the recommendation onboard. RW noted that there was a stakeholder meeting on that recently and the DNV KEMA report was broadly supportive but some of the areas are still being discussed, one of which is Fault Ride Through.

3356. CMD drew the Panels attention to an upcoming DECC/Ofgem workshop of RFG. RW added that National and Ofgem are trying to set up a Stakeholder day on RfG on 28th October. RW noted that we want to get out of the date is an understanding of the main GB stakeholder issues to feed into DECC which they can use in the first cross border committee meeting on the 29th.

11 Impact of Other Code Modification or Developments

3357. A codes summary, pp13/61, was circulated to the Panel.

12 Any Other Business

3358. SB noted that the dates of Ofgem's publishing moratorium over Christmas were not yet known but it is likely that they will be adding 7 working days to any normal KPIs.

3359. RLa noted that Ofgem launched a consultation on 30 August on the Implementation of the Generator commissioning clause for offshore 'generator build' networks. The consultation is open until 25 October and includes proposed drafting of all code changes (inc. Grid Code). RLa added that under the Energy Bill Ofgem can apply changes direct to Grid Code, but they have to consult on them. The consultation propose that National Grid will have to give a Completion Notice to Ofgem when an OFTO asset is operational, this will start the 18month clock for when handover to the OFTO has to be completed. RLa added that the consultation proposes that National Grid will use the ION to trigger the Completion Notice and going forward there will be an ION A and an ION B to provide additional granularity, however, this will only apply to offshore 'generator build' projects.

3360. RJ noted that the 2014 meeting dates are going to be the third Wednesday of the month, as it has been this year.

3361. CMD explained that he has experienced a problem with Notification of outages, by email and late notification. Recently SSE Generation has had 3 outages changed at late notice, one of which is a 4 week outage of a large power station at 2 weeks notice. CMD noted that these stations are connected by a variation to the design standards meaning they can be instructed off due to outages without notification or compensation. CMD explained that the process appears to be compliant with OC2, but the coordination of outages is the main issue, and how can a 4 week outage not be coordinated further ahead for example at year ahead as Generator outages cannot be coordinated at 2 weeks notice?

3362. RW noted that these outages were all known and planned at year ahead, but were subject to very late changes. IP suggested that this is a coordination issue between SSE Generation and the host TO. NS stated that SHE Transmission have to be mindful of maintaining separation between the businesses so discussions need to take place between SHE Transmission and the SO.

3363. AR suggested that these outages came through as requests meaning the Generator did not have to accept them. CMD noted that the issue is that the presentation to the Generator is late. AR noted that these outages were subject to different circumstances; the double circuit outage was rearranged as part of a whole programme of work due to complications the previous year whereas the single circuit outages were late notice. AR acknowledged that visibility of the process is not great. CMD added that he would have rejected the requests but was told that the BCA says you cannot reject, AR suggested that it was only if you accept the outages that the provisions of the BCA come into force.

3364. IP suggested that it sounds as though, if you are not comfortable you can say you do not want the outage but if you do not accept then they will have to happen at some point, but that gives the option to coordinate. AR added that there are the means to have a tri-partite discussion on outages. AR noted that the Scottish regional manager within National Grid Market Operation is aware of this and we will note the concerns.

3365. JN asked whether the issue is that the TSO is not recognising the Generators' costs. NS the issue is where there are outages requested by the TO that are not approved

then they are not in the plan and the generator cannot see them. RL queried whether the request submissions can be copied to the generator to mitigate this problem? AR noted that the only method of submitting Outage requests is via TOGA. NS noted that it would be good if the Generators were aware of the request. GS suggested setting up a meeting to discuss these issues with the relevant parties

3366. **ACTION AR** set up a meeting between SO and TO to look at how to improve this area.

13 Next Meeting

3367. The next meeting is planned for 20 November 2013.