

Minutes

Meeting name	Grid Code Review Panel
Meeting number	65
Date of meeting	15 January 2014
Time	10:00am - 4:00pm
Location	Crowne Plaza, Birmingham NEC, Pendigo Way, B40 1PS

Attendees

Name	Role	Initials	Company
Ian Pashley	Chair	IP	National Grid
Robyn Jenkins	Secretary	RJ	National Grid
Julian Wayne	Authority Member	JW	Ofgem
John Lucas	BSC Panel Member	JL	Elexon
Guy Nicholson	Generators with Novel Units Member	GN	Element Power
Daniel Webb	Large Generator (<3GW) Member	DW	Seabank Power
Campbell McDonald	Large Generator (>3GW) Member	CMD	ScottishPower
Jim Barrett	Large Generator (>3GW) Member	JB	Centrica
Alan Creighton	Network Operator (E&W) Member	AC	Northern Powergrid
Mike Kay	Network Operator (E&W) Member	MK	ENW
Neil Sandison	Network Operator (Scot.) Member	NS	SSE
Richard Lavender	NGET Advisor	RLa	National Grid
Robert Wilson	NGET Member	RW	National Grid
Graham Stein	NGET Member	GS	National Grid
Ivan Kileff	NGET Member	IK	National Grid
Richard Lowe	Transmission Licensee (SHE Transmission) Member	RL	SHE Transmission
Joseph Dunn	Transmission Licensee (SPT) Member	JD	SPT
Steve Brown	Authority Alternate	SB	Ofgem
John Morris	Large Generator (>3GW) Alternate	JM	EDF Energy
John Norbury	Large Generator (>3GW) Alternate	JN	RWE
Tom Davies	Non Embedded Customers Alternate	TD	Magnox
Emma Radley	National Grid Observer	ER	National Grid
Kyle Martin	Small / Medium Generator Observer	KM	Energy UK

Apologies

Name	Role	Initials	Company
Roger Harris	BSC Panel Alternate	RH	Elexon
Sigrid Bolik	Generators with Novel Units Alternate	SBO	REpower
Alastair Frew	Large Generator (>3GW) Alternate	AF	Scottish Power Generation
Dave Draper	Large Generator (<3GW) Member	DD	Horizon Nuclear Power
Gordon Kelly	Network Operator (Scot.) Alternate	GK	Scottish Power
Lisa Waters	Small / Medium Generator Alternate	LW	Waters Wye
Brian Punton	Transmission Licensee (SHE Transmission) Alternate	RL	SHE Transmission
Alan Kelly	Transmission Licensee (SPT) Alternate	AK	SPT
Brendan Woods	Externally Interconnected System Operators Member	BW	SONI
Guy Phillips	Large Generator (>3GW) Member	GP	E.ON
Jackeline Crespo- Sandoval	NGET Member	JCS	National Grid
Alan Barlow	Non Embedded Customers Member	AB	Magnox
Barbara Vest	Small / Medium Generator Member	BV	Energy UK
Robert Longdon	Suppliers	RLo	Cornwall Energy

1 Introductions & Apologies

3493. The Chair welcomed the group and the apologies were noted.

2 Approval of Minutes

a) **November 2013 GCRP Minutes**

3494. CMD noted that the November Panel minutes did not accurately reflect that the RfG Terms of Reference would be approved at the first Workgroup meeting.

3495. RJ agreed to amend the minutes and consequently the Panel approved the minutes for publication.

3496. **ACTION: RJ** Amend and upload minutes on to the National Grid website.

3 Review of Actions

a) **Summary of Actions**

Grid Code Modification Process

3497. 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 on 20 January 2014. This action remains ongoing.

Revision of Engineering Recommendation P28

3498. Minute 2866 – RJ noted that there will be an update on this action in March.

Grid Code Education Session

3499. Minute 2887 – RJ noted that the original date was changed due to control room staff availability, the new date has been pencilled in for 19 March 2014, subject to Panel confirmation. The Panel agreed that they were not the intended audience for the education session, and were happy for it to go ahead on the same date as the GCRP. CMD stated the importance of executing this action as it has been outstanding for a long time. IP acknowledged CMD's concerns and agreed that this needs to be progressed as soon as possible.

GC0062: Constant Terminal Voltage

3500. Minute 3201– RJ noted that this Action will be covered on the agenda but this action is complete and can be closed.

GC0063: Power Available

3501. Minute 3219– RJ noted that a presentation on lessons learnt will be given following the conclusion of the Workgroup and Industry Consultation. RJ added that the Workgroup consultation is now open and closes on Monday 27 January. This action remains ongoing.

Notification of Outages

3502. Minute 3366– RJ explained that the issue was presented to the STC panel in December and a Workgroup formed. The Workgroup will meet on 21 January 2014. IK added that he has discussed the issue with CMD, and following the Workgroup he will feedback and invite generators to attend further meetings. RJ suggested this issue be added to the Grid Code Issue Tracker, and an update provided at an appropriate time, as a result the action can be closed.

Changes to BCAs resulting from SQSS modification GSR015

3503. Minute 3477– RLA noted that National Grid have reviewed the agreements and the operational arrangements, there are 2 agreements with a 1320MW restriction in the legal text. RLA added that they will be working with the affected parties to

remove the restrictions. Recent agreements do not need any amendments as the change was anticipated. This action is complete and can be closed.

Space Weather

3504. Minute 3487– RJ explained that NGET are happy to share a copy of the fax, but the categories of severity are only based on National Grid's limited experience and are for internal guidance only. RJ noted that it has not been agreed that National Grid will issue these warnings and that a decision should be made in the appropriate forum which we believe is the E3C.
3505. JB queried whether these categories will match the Met Office categorisation? JB noted that he assumes, if the System Operator needs more reactive power they will be instructing generators onto the system. GS suggested that the correct forum for this discussion is the Operational Forum. RJ agreed to circulate the fax but requested that Panel members do not publish or circulate outside of their organisations. This action is complete and can be closed.

Delegation of Authority

3506. Minute 3487– RJ explained that the MUS (Multi User Switching) work has been completed. The DOA work is ongoing on a company basis, and if a generator wishes to set up a new DOA contact they are asked to approach National Grid. This action is complete and can be closed.

Special Actions

3507. Minute 3491– IK explained that this issue dates back to early 2012 when NGET reviewed their internal procedures as there was an administrative burden on NGET and generators. It was agreed National Grid would only agree special actions where it genuinely was outside of normal run down rates. IK noted that a brief was presented at the Operational Forum in June 2012, and generators who had previously agreed special actions were notified of the new process. Following this, the review was closed and implemented.
3508. CMD thanked IK for the update but noted that generators who had withdrawn from special actions were not communicated with. As special actions are a means of managing risk by the SO, they are outside of the BM. CMD queried, for new generators approached for a special action, where would they find the information about what they do and how they respond, as they will not have seen the special actions presentation or the meeting minutes. CMD noted that special actions is not a defined term so it would be useful if there was some information on the website which explained the process. IK added that there is information in the Grid Code which explains how it would be agreed. CMD also asked how a generator would be paid if a special action instructed a generator off the network for a number of hours? IK suggested that it would be an emergency instruction and it would be settled in agreement with both parties. CMD indicated that this is not visible or transparent to the industry.
3509. IP requested that guidance is drafted and published.
3510. **ACTION: IK** Draft Special Action guidance for generators.
3511. JN noted that many Generators do not like the idea of emergency instructions if they could possibly be avoided, CMD suggested that although they may not like them, they are a mechanism to manage risk which is passed back to the industry through the Balancing Mechanism. IK suggested that it may actually be saving the industry money as the System Operator will always choose the most economic option.

4

New Grid Code Development Issues

a) GC0083: European Transparency Regulation

3512. RW presented pp14/03 noting that the paper sets National Grid's proposals for implementing the European Transparency Regulation into the Grid Code. Transparency became EU law in June 2013 with an 18 month implementation window so the UK need to be able to comply by January 2015; the timescales were seen as challenging but 18 months is an extension from the original proposal of 12 months.

3513. RW noted that National Grid will be implementing this with the help of Elexon, subject to approval on P295 which is still with Ofgem for a decision. RW noted that a lot of the necessary data already exists, but there are a few areas where additional information is needed and there are some changes to the frequency the data is to be provided to the SO. This proposal facilitates implementation of articles 7 and 15 while articles 14.1a is included in GC0042: Information on Small Embedded Power Stations.
3514. RW presented slides which explained the application, frequency and data requirements for each of these articles along with the parties they apply to.
3515. RW stated that National Grid is proposing to take this to consultation, a draft of which will be presented at the March GCRP.
3516. JN noted that he supports this as a vehicle for fulfilling the requirements under the Transparency Regulation.
3517. JB questioned what would actually be consulted on as the act is law and GB has to comply. RW noted that the consultation will be on how the requirements are discharged to ensure the correct changes are made to the Grid Code. IP indicated that, in simple terms, we are saying that there is a reason code¹, which we do not yet receive and would not be able to pass on to another party so we need to change the provisions in the Grid Code to allow that to happen. JN suggested that this seems similar to the process GB went through a decade ago on mothballed plant and alternative fuel data that is captured under the Grid Code specifically for government (DTI/JESS). JN added that he thinks users will welcome this and be happy to do it.
3518. CMD noted that the TOGA process is not open to amendments and the dates and times currently in the Grid Code will have to be removed to allow changes. CMD added that the system will need to be available at any time and this seems to create a problem for the SO as the data could change frequently so perhaps GB systems will need to have a cut off.
3519. JB indicated that this was discussed when we looked at EDL and EDT. IP suggested that there are other forums where the details are being discussed and developed. IP added that there may be questions on what the regulation means by “decision made”, and there are questions over whose decision that would be. RW noted that the data feels straightforward, it is the timing that needs more clarification. IP noted that the next level of detail will be how this is going to work in practice.
3520. MK requested clarification on the article that will be covered under GC0042. RW commented that article 14.1a is to be covered by GC0042 and it relates to total generation capacities. CMD queried who the obligation will be on. MK suggested that it will be on the generator to provide the data. RW added that it feels like there should also be an obligation on the DNOs to provide the mechanism for generators to do so. AC added that the current drafting for the Grid and Distribution Code changes relating to GC0042 addresses this. MK noted that currently there is no contractual relationship with smaller parties and questioned whether there will need to be a consequential Distribution Code change. RJ noted that National Grid will look into that.
3521. JB asked whether there is a requirement to report this data under RfG. MK indicated that this is not a requirement for these regulations.
3522. JL questioned whether bringing the consultation in March gives enough time for generators to comply. JL also asked if this is the route for generators to specify their IT systems. IP suggested that the IT developments will be progressed elsewhere, this issue is only concerned with allowing the data to be transmitted. JN suggested that an industry newsletter would be helpful to Users to ensure that they are aware of the proposed requirements. The Panel requested that the information relating to IT systems needs to be clarified so users know what they need to do to their systems. IP agreed to provide the Panel with more information.
3523. **ACTION: RW** Provide further information on IT systems to comply with the European Transparency Regulation.

¹ Examples could include ‘Planned Outage’, ‘Fault Outage’, etc.

a) GC0077: Suppression of Sub Synchronous Resonance from Series Compensators

3524. GS presented pp14/04 noting there have been discussions on this issue at previous meetings. GS added that National Grid have been involved in tripartite correspondence with the TOs and JM who raised the issue originally. GS explained that the consultation says SSR/SSTI are phenomena which can be experienced and should be managed and the TOs do what the SQSS requires. National Grid still have some questions over whether the wording in the draft consultation is right but we are looking for feedback from the Panel, and whether, subject to comments, this issue can proceed to Industry Consultation.
3525. GN commented that he is trying to understand what the implications of this issue are, National Grid are saying they are going to try and solve the problem but will that be done by putting the requirement to manage SSR on others? JM noted that the aim of this is to make the requirement consistent with what HVDC operators already have to do. GN questioned who is responsible for mitigation if he was HVDC already connected then someone builds a synchronous generator. GS suggested that it is whoever causes the change.
3526. JN noted that he also had difficulty understanding the proposed legal text and how the obligation would be delivered as there is limited guidance in the paper on how this will be ensured. JN added that the draft language seems out of step with other Grid Code clauses and it may be more appropriate to identify the criteria that would be specified in the bilateral agreement. GS noted that we are trying to capture that there is an obligation to make sure this happens.
3527. SBO stated that the text is missing a definition around which direct frequencies the SSR may exist so systems can be designed to avoid them. SBO added that having more guidance which says 'if you are connected to a certain part of the system you should avoid particular frequencies' would be useful. GS noted that it has to be open because it is a generic clause and it is down to a site specific assessment to determine those parameters. JM suggested that there is another clause which says what the data is. RJ noted that this clause formed part of Grid Code Modification A/12. IP noted that for the purpose of this issue, we need to make sure we do not get too specific such that the necessary provisions are put in place. Are there further changes before we seek wider views?
3528. RL suggested that SBO was incorrectly including power system stabiliser frequencies (0-5hz) and he understands that, for the purpose of SSR mitigation, any Series Compensation equipment should have provision for retuning. Designers would aim to tune equipment to avoid SSR, but it may be necessary to do retuning on the live system. RL added that this is trying to put an obligation in the code that says you will do this because there was an imbalance in the obligations, and in practice this is already happening. SBO stated that she believes the current data and model provisions are not accurate enough. RL noted that he will not oppose this proposal going forward as it creates balance and the process happens anyway, however RL added that he would be wary of putting in specific requirements. RW noted that writing this was difficult and the words may change during the consultation. JM suggested that the issues should be consulted on to consider the wider industries views.
3529. GS suggested that some of SBO's comments are covered in the SQSS and could be brought out in the ETYS. GS added that if he were to put the frequency ranges in the Grid Code it is inevitable that someone will say they have seen something else. SBO reiterated that the wording is too open.
3530. GN noted that it is not clear what the SQSS does that the Grid Code does not, and so why does it need to be in both places. GS stated that the Grid Code tells users what they will see from the network and the SQSS tells the TOs what they will do to manage the network. GN added that trying to address the same thing in two codes does not seem efficient. NS suggested that the SQSS puts the requirement on the TO, and the user needs visibility of this in the Grid Code. GS added that the Grid Code says what the user will see, the STC tells the TO/SO to enact them and the SQSS says how, and that if we want the structure to work properly we have to

have something in all of them. GN suggested it would be helpful if that was explained in the document.

3531. GN requested that ETYS inclusion is actioned as the sooner the process begins the better.

3532. **ACTION: GS** Investigate Including SSR/SSTI frequency ranges in the ETYS.

3533. SBO noted that from a development perspective, having something hard coded would be necessary. The Grid Code does not require the necessary models so no one will pay for them. GS suggested that there is enough information in the code to allow that.

3534. IP requested Panel members consider the draft and feed in comments over the next 4 weeks

b) GC0080 RES Updates

3535. GS presented pp14/05, explaining that in updating the RES they have restructured the document. pp14/05 covers the previous discussions, and slide 5 shows what users should see. GS noted that the updated document should be presented in March and should cover the same areas, whilst stripping out any unnecessary material. Going forward, when NG changes a technical specification, our internal process will flag whether there are any RES changes.

3536. JN noted that he is disappointed with continued reference to NGTS, adding that the user facing document is the RES and the user doesn't need to know about NGTS. JN suggested users would like to see all references to NGTS dropped out of the RES, it doesn't need to be bogged down mapping across between the two. CMD and GN agreed with JN.

3537. MK suggested that there is nothing wrong with calling them NGTS, as long as the documents are open. GS noted that the NGTS nomenclature is to identify that it is applicable to NG sites, it helps National Grid that they are called the same, it is only the name. MK suggested that this is akin to G59 in the Distribution Code.

3538. IP asked whether, naming aside, Panel members are happy that this achieves what is necessary. CMD asked how the changes will be signed off. IP noted that it will come to the Panel. MK commented that if a party has accepted an offer against an NGTS that is not in the RES the party has accepted that standard. IP stated that if anyone has comments then they need to feed in to the process as soon as possible.

3539. CMD questioned whether SPT or SHET standards will be included in the RES? GS noted that RES only includes National Grid technical standards. CMD asked what the governance is for Scottish TO standards. JN suggested that there are a number of Scottish standards in the general conditions which may need updating and also references to TP109 / GEGB Operation Memorandum 5 could be incorporated within the RES. MK suggested that the governance may not have been picked up.

c) GC0076: Rapid Voltage Changes

3540. GS presented pp14/04 noting that National Grid are inviting comments from the Panel before publishing externally. National Grid have become aware of sites where there is a potential compliance issue with the current voltage fluctuations section of the Grid Code and that the text itself is quite confusing. GS stated that the issue of compliance is being managed through work arounds and if nothing is changed there would be a need to seek derogations. GS added that the text in the draft consultation tries to achieve a balance between allowing these fluctuations to happen and protecting the equipment.

3541. RL requested the Panel are given a few weeks to look at this

3542. MK commented that in the draft legal text, there is a superscript 1 but no footnote to explain what it means. MK added that if the requirement is to keep the number of voltage excursions in check then that could be managed, but it feels a bit heavy handed to write the requirement explicitly into the code when it should be managed by normal operational liaison. RL suggested that this is relaxing the

requirements. GS noted that National Grid would rather it be as simple as possible.

3543. SBO noted concerns with how overvoltage appears in the text; if it is written with V_o being defined, this could result in equipment needing to be designed to plus or minus 12% on top of the existing 10% and, at present, there is no provision in the Grid Code for the overvoltage at this level. MK suggested that this is nothing new, this is codifying what happens in practice. SBO suggested that these conditions do not normally occur through inrush, it would be a different phenomena. RL suggested that the graphs shows only 5% overvoltage. SBO noted that it is the text which says 12%.
3544. JN suggested that it would be helpful if the consultation had a paragraph explaining the basis of the proposed limits and values of the voltage requirements and also what connections it is actually talking about. JN noted that in trying to understand what will actually be in the BCA, it could be quite an onerous requirement and questioned why the provisions could not be set out in, say, OC2, BC1 or BC2 instead. GS acknowledged that the text is not as clear as it could be noting that the text needs to limit the occurrences whilst recognising that is an overhead on generators.
3545. RL suggested that, as this is an aggregate effect, could there be a requirement which says any party that causes a greater than 3% voltage excursion needs to agree that with the system operator, rather than everybody doing their own thing. CMD noted RL's suggestion but questioned the consequences if the SO refuses to give the generator agreement. RL suggested that it depends whether a generator wants to spend the money designing equipment that stays within the 3% limits.
3546. GN queried the last time a customer complained about the impact of these changes. RL indicated that SHET do receive such complaints, and this proposal means that it is likely they will get more. RL commented that once requirements such as these are relaxed, it will be much harder to do the opposite at a later date. MK noted that the Distribution Code tried to pick a level which was not a relaxation of the requirement; but was a representation of what actually happens.
3547. IP suggested the Panel take 4 weeks to consider the Consultation and provide any comments.

d) GC0025: Power Park Module Extensions

3548. GS provided an update on GC0025, 29 and 41.
3549. GS noted that these are 3 issues on the development list, it was previously agreed to put them on hold and regularly review progress.
3550. GS explained that GC0025 relates to what should happen when a PPM was extended and the additional capacity and moved from the generator from 1 threshold to another meaning they were captured by new requirements in the Grid Code. This was put on hold because National Grid wanted to wait until the ENC generator categories were confirmed.
3551. GS explained the different Generator thresholds also affected GC0041 so that should also be considered post-RfG.
3552. GS noted that the reason for putting GC0029 on hold is stated as for consideration post RfG, however this is slightly different, RfG is probably relevant but not a reason for not progressing. GS added that this is very technical and there will be a lot of work required, currently the people looking to develop this are doing Fault Ride Through and Constant Terminal Voltage so progress cannot be made until Fault Ride Through is complete which probably puts this issue into next year.
3553. The Panel agreed to place all the issues back on hold until January 2015. JN suggested that if a User raises this as an issue in the meantime there should be a reopener.

e) GC0029: Short Circuit Ratio Review

3554. See agenda item d).

f) GC0041: Grid Code connection conditions for Small Embedded Power Station (Operational Metering)

3555. See agenda item d).

6 Workgroups in Progress

a) GC0035/79 Frequency Changes during Large System Disturbances

3556. GS noted that the Workgroup are focussing on RoCoF settings for small distributed generators and are proposing changes to the Distribution Code and G59. Following the Industry Consultation in September the Workgroup have been considering the responses. The Workgroup presented their recommendation to the Distribution Code panel before Christmas. The recommendation takes into account the concerns raised in the consultation, mainly from synchronous generator parties.
3557. GS explained that the Workgroup have developed a proposal which says if a generator is going to use RoCoF protection, it should be set to 1Hzs^{-1} or for existing synchronous generators, they can opt for 0.5Hzs^{-1} . GS presented a slide to the Panel which set the proposal out, but noted that the legal text was still under development and there is a Workgroup meeting scheduled for the 22 January to finalise the drafting. The aim is to have the report to the Authority with Ofgem by the end of the month. GS added that Workgroup members have an opportunity to feed into the report before it is submitted.
3558. RL questioned whether the asynchronous and synchronous categories shown are supposed to be small and large categories as there is a column for medium, MK noted that this is for continuity and could be left out as long as the requirement on medium power stations is not missed. IK noted that the table indicates that medium power stations are required to have intertripping. MK noted that it is not mandatory to have intertripping, but it is mandatory not to have RoCoF.
3559. JM asked whether the Workgroup are still progressing to look at small generators. GS confirmed that the next phase of work will look at sub- 5MW plant.
3560. CMD added that this is a change that will be applied retrospectively, so there is a cost to existing generators with the requirements being due to the change to 1800MW infeed loss and (MK added) the reduction in inertia. CMD noted that this means small power stations have to pick up the costs for large generators.
3561. RW asked what level of generator the obligation will go down to. MK commented that it is likely to be at least 800W, but part of the consideration is practicality, and a cost benefit will determine whether it is necessary. GS noted that if anyone has any expertise in dynamics of small distributed generators then they would be welcome at the Workgroup meeting.

7 Workgroup Reports

a) GC0050: Demand Control

3562. IK presented pp14/07 noting that the Workgroup established there is a requirement for Demand Control through voltage reduction. The Workgroup carried out some tests (Operation Juniper) in which 13 DNOs were involved. The tests demonstrated that the average demand reduction was 1.5%.
3563. IK explained that the Workgroup considered the ENCs and there are no requirements covering Demand Control. The recommendations of the Workgroup are to change OC6.5.3 to improve clarity with regard to explicitly distinguishing between Voltage Reduction and Demand Disconnection and clarity on the implementation timescales. The Week 24 guidance document published by National Grid will also be updated and will allow DNOs to submit to National Grid how they will achieve Demand Control. The proposal also alters the timing, with an increase in implementation time from 5 to 10 minutes for voltage reduction.
3564. IK noted that the changes between the two reports circulated was the removal of the changes to table 12b, the correction of the graphs and the change to

implementation in week 17 to meet the week 24 submission. RJ noted that this timescale change means National Grid would like to go to consultation in the week commencing the 20 January.

3565. The DNO representatives noted that they will need to look at how long SCADA script changes required to implement a third demand disconnection stage will take to develop. MK added that he thinks the DNOs use the same control systems and it seems sensible to eventually look at taking out the human element of voltage reduction and do it machine to machine but this is something to be explored mutually offline. MK noted that paragraph 4.7 says the CEGB implemented Demand Control through its own assets, but that is a misapprehension as demand control through voltage reduction was always implemented at Area Board's primary substations.
3566. JN noted that the report (Annex 2) lists Graham Dawson as a DNO representative, when he was a supplier representative. KM suggested that despite the code changes which identify the problem, the actual issues are still there. IK suggested that the 20% demand reduction was always there, the change relates to the mechanism to achieve that. IP suggested KM discuss his concerns with a member of the Workgroup.
3567. MK indicated that Ofgem are becoming involved in the details of what might happen commercially if GB has demand disconnections and are looking at whether domestic customers should be compensated. IP noted that these aspects are being looked at under the EBSCR. CMD suggested that there are no alternative commercial actions for this. JN suggested that the BPS lists the actions which the system operator can take and demand control would be last as an emergency action. RJ added that other mechanisms would have been exhausted before Demand Control instructions are issued.

8 Industry Consultations

a) GC0066 Grid Code New and Revised Data and Instructions

3568. RJ explained that the Consultation closed on Dec 2013 and 5 responses were received, the responses were supportive in principle with some points raised against specific items, these have been discussed in December's EBSG and we will contact respondents directly on some points
3569. The suggested implementation in the consultation was pending EBS go-live (i.e. all changes to be made in timescales that align to EBS go-live)
3570. Four out of five of the responses agreed with this implementation, one respondent suggested that fax form changes could be brought in earlier than other Grid Code changes since they have no specific dependency on EBS, this suggestion received broad support at December's EBSG. DW confirmed that it was considered that the revisions to the fax form could be brought forward and separated from the main implementation. RJ explained that the fax form changes should remove ambiguity in some of the communications with the Control Room, that there is an operational risk in terms of some of the existing wording, and that there have been incidents in the interpretation of the "lead" and "lag" fields in Reactive Power.
3571. RJ commented that National Grid propose to split the implementation within the Report to the Authority with early delivery of Fax Form changes and later delivery of other Grid Code and DVC&D changes (implementation date to be confirmed pending EBS timescales). EBSG were asked for feedback in the split implementation and, of the 3 responses received 2 were fully supportive, the third was supportive but noted that generators would need a minimum of 3 months following Authority Decision to make the necessary changes to the automated IT system. In response to these comments National Grid is suggesting implementation 4 months after Authority Decision to allow sufficient time for industry to adjust processes.
3572. RJ added that there is precedent for having two implementations as part of a single mod in the UNC (mod 0428) and Ofgem are comfortable with this approach providing it is sufficiently clear in the Report. The Panel were happy with the

approach and RJ noted that that aim is to submit the Final Report to the Authority by the end of January.

9 Progress Tracker

3573. RJ asked the Panel to note the Progress Tracker and highlighted the consultations which were likely to be published over the next few months. The Panel agreed that they were happy for RJ to continue scheduling these.

9 Pending Authority Decisions

3574. RJ noted that there are no pending authority decisions.

3575. JW asked what is likely to be the next Report to the Authority. RJ indicated that it would be GC0066 and GC0035.

10 Standing Items

a) European Network Codes

3576. IP noted that pp14/09 the ACER update on the European Network Codes was circulated to the panel.

b) Joint European Standing Group

3577. IP noted that pp14/10 the JESG headline report was circulated to the Panel

c) ECCAF

3578. IP noted that pp14/11 the ECCAF headline report was circulated to the panel and the next meeting is scheduled for 30/1/14.

3579. JB asked Panel members how they would like the representation to be set out as there is currently no proper method on how to feed concerns in. JB added that ECCAF assumes that you take the current framework and implement the ENCs but it appears as though we are trying to find a "one size fits all approach" for all of the codes. MK noted that the main debate at the November meeting was Garth's paper. MK added that trying to do what the paper originally proposed is going to be quite difficult and Garth's solution would probably need licence changes to change the structure of the existing codes. MK suggested that the options to take this forward should be assessed from the point of view of the users.

3580. JB explained that at the moment, there is no means to collect the information on the Panels behalf to feed into ECCAF. JB added that after the January ECCAF meeting and at the next panel meeting it would be useful to think about how to do this but if anyone has any issues they want to raise at the moment JB is happy to feed them in.

11 Impact of Other Code Modification or Developments

3581. A codes summary, pp14/12, was circulated to the Panel.

12 Any Other Business

3582. RJ noted that the 2014 membership and a role overview for Panel members has been circulated.

3583. JB noted that there was an oversubscription of members and the resolution was not satisfactory to some parties. The letter circulated to Panel members explains the issues but the fundamental question is in the changing portfolio of generation connected to the system, and whether the current membership classifications are correct and set up appropriately. JB added that as we move forward there should be a chance to modify the categories and look at the structure or thresholds as there is a lot of additional interest in this.

3584. RJ noted that National Grid agrees with the generators' concerns, and as code administrator, would like to draft a straw man for a change to the constitution in time for the 2015 elections. We are happy to work with Panel Members on this, and will look to accommodate the suggestions received.
3585. JB noted that this is a very positive response from National Grid and the generators would welcome that, adding that changes by the end of the year would be more than satisfactory.
3586. MK suggested that the DCRP may wish to also work with the GRCP on this and do something similar for the Distribution Code.
3587. JN added that not all parties may be aware of the ongoing Workgroups. RJ explained how Workgroup and Consultation information is published and circulated and requested that Panel members also pass information on to their contacts in the industry.
3588. **ACTION: ER** draft strawman proposal for GCRP membership.

13 Next Meeting

3589. The next meeting is planned for 19 March 2014.