nationalgrid

Minutes

Meeting name	Grid Code Review Panel
Meeting number	64
Date of meeting	20 November 2013
Time	10:00am - 4:00pm
Location	Hilton Hotel Warwick; Junction 15 M40, A429 Stratford road, Warwick, CV34 6RE, United Kingdom

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
Ivan Kileff	NGET Member	IK	National Grid
Thomas Derry	NGET Member	TD	National Grid
Alan Barlow	Non Embedded Customers Member	AB	Magnox
Mike Kay	Network Operator (E&W) Member	MK	ENW
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
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
Julian Wayne	Authority Alternate	JW	Ofgem
Garth Graham	Small / Medium Generator Alternate	GG	SSE Generation
Alan Mason	Generators with Novel Units Observer	AM	Repower
Mike Edgar	National Grid Presenter	ME	National Grid
Damien McCluskey	National Grid Presenter	DM	National Grid

Apologies

Name	Role	Initials	Company
Roger Harris	BSC Panel Alternate	RH	Elexon
Xavier Pinchaux	Externally Interconnected System Operators Alternate	XP	RTE
Lisa Waters			
Alan Kelly	Transmission Licensee (SPT) Alternate	AK	SPT
Guy Nicholson	Generators with Novel Units Member	GN	Element Power
Brian Punton	Transmission Licensee (SHE Transmission) Member	BP	SHE Transmission
Brendan Woods	Externally Interconnected System Operators Member	BW	SONI
Barbara Vest	Small / Medium Generator Member	BV	Energy UK
Sigrid Bolik	Generators with Novel Units Alternate	SBO	Repower
Neil Sandison	Network Operator (Scot.) Alternate	NS	SSE

1 Introductions & Apologies

3367. The Chair welcomed the group and the apologies were noted.

2 Approval of Minutes

a) September 2013 GCRP Minutes

3368. The Panel approved the minutes for publication

3369. **ACTION: RJ** Upload minutes on to the National Grid website.

3 Review of Actions

a) Summary of Actions

Grid Code Modification Process

3370. 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

3371. Minute 2637 - RW noted that the legal text for this issue has been circulated and thanked those who provided comments. JN commented that the view from RWE's protection experts is that there should be a meeting to conclude the industry discussions that took place previously and solve anything outstanding. A group of industry protection experts had been convened following the GCRP meeting on 20th November 2008 and met on one occasion but the issue was not concluded. RJ suggested that we should consult on the text and only have a meeting if it is necessary after the consultation.

3372. JN noted that this issue was originally raised by NGET at the GCRP meeting on 20th September 2007 and that the current proposed text does not seem to have changed substantially from the text proposed in pp08/43, tabled at the GCRP meeting 20th November 2008. In addition it does not reflect previous discussions by the protection workgroup. RW noted that there is a certain amount of history to the issue and that the words now need to reflect subsequent changes since it was first brought up. The intention is to consult then have a meeting if required. JN suggested that the most efficient way to develop a sensible consultation is to first get industry protection experts together to produce an acceptable technical solution.

Revision of Engineering Recommendation P28

3373. Minute 2866 – RJ noted that the DCRP are looking for a Workgroup chair; when a suitable person is found, the Workgroup will progress. MK added that the ENA are trying to recruit someone with appropriate experience and suggested an update is provided in 3months time as the ENA should have a name by March.

Grid Code Education Session

3374. Minute 2887 – TD noted that the agenda has been drafted. National Grid are looking at holding the seminar in the week commencing 13 or 20 January. JB queried who will be invited, TD suggested that there will be an open invite to the industry. The venue is TBC but will likely be in London.

GC0062: Constant Terminal Voltage

3375. 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

3376. Minute 3219– RJ noted that a presentation on lessons learnt will be given following the conclusion of the Workgroup and Industry Consultation but this issue will be covered on the agenda. This action remains ongoing.

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

3377. Minute 3253 – DM gave a presentation highlighting that NGET will be the code administrator and 'critical friend' under the requirements of CGR2.

3378. GG questioned whether the CACOP will be incorporated into the Grid Code. DM suggested that the principles will be incorporated

3379. DM noted that the KPIs proposed have been taken from the CACOP themselves and will be reported to the GCRP annually. GG suggested that National Grid may want to look at incorporating the industry cost for modifications into the final reports. IP noted the suggestion. DM noted that National Grid will report back in 6 months providing an update on progress.

3380. MK added that the D-Code will be publishing a short consultation on this subject later this month. This action is complete and can be closed.

Notification of Outages

3381. Minute 3366– IK noted NGET have spoken to SSE and SHET about provisions under the STC about agreeing outages with the generator.

3382. CMD stated that this issue has been raised about both TOs and nothing has been done adding that NGET appear to have done nothing since the last Panel meeting. RW suggested that is not a fair comment; and that National Grid have been looking into it within the context of OC2 and the STC and have also carried out significant analysis into the specific examples raised. CMD queried whether the Grid Code needs modifying. IK suggested that the whole of OC2 is about communication of outages and it may not be fair to give generators the right to veto outages.

3383. CMD stated that he has been left messages from National Grid asking for suggestions on how to improve the situation adding that this is between the SO and the TO to determine what is wrong. IK added that, from an SO perspective we are following the codes, but that where a generator has non-compliant connection the system would clearly benefit from improved co-ordination between affected parties. IK added that National Grid have tried previously notifying generators in advance of an outage being accepted into the plan and subsequent outage movement had been frustrating for the generator, whereas if we wait until it is accepted into the plan then the inference is that the notification is too late.

3384. CMD queried whether SSE are the only generator who is making these complaints. GG noted concerns over making statements suggesting that because the generator is non-compliant it does not get the same rights and clarified that the generators in question are compliant, but that they had conditions in their connection agreement that managed their particular connection arrangements.

3385. IP suggested this issue can be distilled to generators wanting certainty over outages, whereas the TO want to give certainty but cannot until an outage is confirmed into the plan by the SO.

3386. RW noted that in each of the examples CMD gave the outages had previously been planned and communicated through OC2, but had been subject to late change, and questioned whether rather than just code changes the issue was to do with best practice and communication.

3387. CMD stated that he has now raised this issue 3 times and it needs to be dealt with. IP suggested a meeting was held outside of the GCRP involving TO, SO and Generator to discuss and deliver a solution to prevent it coming back to the panel. A further proposal was to use the STC.

3388. SB suggested setting a deadline for holding the meeting. IP noted that, in his view, this action has not been discharged and the SO and TOs need to have a discussion about making the processes work.IK noted that one of the NGET senior managers has met with SHET and it was believed that the codes were adequate.

3389. **ACTION: IK arrange to meet with the TOs**

3390. IP noted that we will look at availability but will aim to hold a meeting before the January panel.

3391. IK added that we believe the codes are being followed. CMD noted that he will have to look at what can be raised in terms of a change to the code adding that the code might be followed but the question is whether the process is reasonable. IP suggested that the meeting should look at whether the code is reasonable or whether there could be a change which allows greater engagement.

3392. JL noted concerns that we will be here again in two months and there should be someone at the meeting who will be able to represent the generators.

3393. RL added that NS received a phone call requesting the meeting but nothing further.

3394. SB noted that during CGR Ofgem decided self governance was not suitable for the Grid Code Review Panel yet because there was not full representation of the whole industry and consumer groups across the Panel and anything that involves wider consultation beyond those directly affected would be seen as a positive and a step in the right direction.

4 New Grid Code Development Issues

a) GC0080: Relevant Electrical Standards

3395. GS presented pp13/64 noting that the paper sets out a response to Panel members' enquiries rather than being a new development issue. The paper explains the governance process for the RES. GS added that NGET are working towards providing an updated RES at the March GCRP. The governance process for RES allows NGET to progress changes outside Panel meetings, but given the length of time since the last update sufficient time has been allowed for presentation to the Panel in March. In February a revised RES will be sent out. If there are no questions it will be accepted; if there are questions, they will be discussed at the Panel and go to a workgroup if necessary. GS added that there will also be an update to the technical appendix templates NGET uses as a basis for its Bilateral Agreement technical appendices.

3396. JN thanked GS for bringing this to the Panel adding that it represents a positive way forward. JN stated that the benefits go further than explained in the paper as it also ensures consistency of approach and means that the relevant text only is targeted at the User as opposed to Users having to identify the relevant text contained within a NGTS.

3397. JN queried whether there will be a process to remove recent references to NGTS from the BCAs. JN added that a consultation on the proposed changes to the RES would be welcomed since, for example, the requirement for dynamic system monitoring is an area where there has been limited open discussion and Generators would welcome this opportunity.

3398. RLa suggested that as the BCA is mutually agreed, where there is an agreeable change necessary this can be done, but RLa was unsure whether there will be a process to update them all.

3399. JN suggested an open letter from NGET to go with the Grid Code change to clarify that compliance with the NGTS has fallen away so that compliance is now with the RES.

3400. MK queried whether there is something defining the Appendix F in the CUSC, is it therefore appropriate to have a process in the CUSC stating that out-of-date appendix Fs do not need following. RLa noted that the form for Appendix Fs may be in the CUSC, but the technical detail is contained in the Connection Conditions. GG suggested that an open letter saying which Technical Standards apply has the benefit of treating all users equally.

3401. GS thanked the Panel for some useful ideas and stated that NGET will progress the technical documentation and develop its thoughts on the implementation process.

3402. AC queried the amount of changes to the RES. JN noted that this problem is probably due to the document not having been revised since 2006. GS added that it is unlikely the Panel will view the changes to be insignificant.

5 Existing Grid Code Development Issues

a) Progress Trackers

3403. RJ presented the progress tracker, pp13/65, asking the Panel to note its contents. The Panel suggested that the progress tracker would fit better further down the agenda to avoid pre-empting later items.

3404. AC asked whether there is any update on the timescales for GC0042 (Information from Small Embedded Generators). GS suggested that there will be some ideas presented to the DCRP in December and from there we will determine whether we take this forward as a single or joint consultation.

b) GC0048: RfG Workgroup

3405. RW presented pp13/66 noting that this is the second time of requesting this joint GCRP/DCRP Workgroup and that on the previous occasion that this went to the Panel in September the questions were in particular around why we need to set this up now?

3406. RW noted that the urgency point is because the code is expected to come out of comitology in Q1 next year, and applies to generators which will let contracts for major plant items from Q1 2016. Given the leadtime required by contractual negotiations, and the work that will have to be done in GB application of the code, including setting of parameters and deciding on structural alternatives for GB code alignment, this gives a sufficient impetus to progress this workgroup now as is set out in more detail in the paper answering the points raised previously by the Panel.

3407. GG suggested that RfG will have to go through European parliamentary acceptance which adds 6 months to the timescales. RW noted that the timescales are based on the latest dates from the Commission and that some delay is likely, probably to mid-2014. JB asked for clarification that, to be classed as an existing generator, you have 2 years to show that you are contractually obligated to build a plant. RW confirmed that is the case and if you do not do that you are classed as 'new' and therefore caught by the code.

3408. RW noted that RfG applies right down to domestic levels of embedded generation. While for the larger stations connection dates of 'caught' stations are unlikely to be much ahead of 2020, for smaller parties the turn-around time of contracts may well mean compliance is required from 2017. For all parties as well there is an immediate and pressing need to achieve contractual certainty for parties letting contracts.

3409. JN questioned whether, if these changes are not brought in via the code, then are parties still bound to comply with the legislation. RW stated that, even without any code changes, there is still an obligation to comply with European Law which takes precedence over GB Law and codes. JB suggested that it is likely that there will be a rush to let contracts before the deadline in 2016. MK noted that for the reasonable sized embedded generator which is caught by the Grid Code at present then we need to have a joined up approach between the Grid Code and Distribution Code. As such it is important to progress and understand this as soon as possible. MK added that at the domestic end of the market there are different drivers such as feed in tariffs so we need to have documentation in as early as possible.

3410. RW noted that the Workgroup will look at two areas – determining the National parameters which account for up to 50% of the code and also considering possible code structures. Previously the industry steer is that RfG needs to be delivered through the existing structures and processes but there are different ways to do this and doing a proper analysis will take time.

3411. RW noted that other comments on the paper include whether it is right to set up a Workgroup ahead of ECCAF, should it not be in their remit? RW clarified that ECCAF are an advisory and coordination body; they will not have the same detailed knowledge of the current codes and there is precedent for joint

Workgroups. Other comments included a wish for clarification on retrospectivity and possible exclusion from the immediate scope. RW noted that on the subject of retrospectivity the code does apply by default only to new generators unless a proposal is approved by the relevant NRA subject to a positive cost benefit analysis on a societal basis. As such retrospectivity has been removed from the Workgroup scope, as it is a distraction and no immediately pressing concerns have been identified save areas such as RoCoF and Fault Ride Through which are already being looked at.

3412. Regarding transparency RW noted that while for expediency there has been an ad hoc group comprising NGET, Ofgem and the DNOs looking at structural alternatives, this is not a transparent process, so we want a Workgroup to be more transparent and contain appropriate representation across the industry. RW recommended starting this Workgroup as soon as possible.

3413. GG stated that he has set out a different structural approach to go to ECCAF. In his paper he adopts a 'copy and paste' approach from EU and GB codes to give a reduced number of new codes that will need to be referenced by new users. RfG may set the precedent for how we implement all of the EU codes. GG added that if we go down the current route there would be parts of code applying to different people, and also as more ENCs are implemented we run the risk of having to change the code several times. Mapping of the RfG requirements to GB codes would be complex leaving a question of whether we have actually applied RfG correctly. GG added that he is happy for the strawman to be circulated, as it provides the opportunity to look at governance and code structure.

3414. GG noted that the Grid Code was set up by parliament and there are broad parameters which set out what it can include, and questions over whether RfG can be transposed simply into the code under national law. However, a process of alignment with GB Law is necessary for clarity.

3415. RW stated that we are not looking to pre-judge structural decisions by setting up a Workgroup. Importantly from the point of view of what we are trying to set up today, the workgroup is needed to determine the national parameters and will be a vital body to feed into the decisions.

3416. JB questioned who is charged with making the structural decision. IP noted the long term understanding has been we will use existing frameworks. We accept there are more ways to do this and GG has raised an alternative. Ultimately structural matters such as this will be for Ofgem and DECC to agree.

3417. SB noted that this has been discussed internally, but Ofgem support the setting up of the Workgroup and would like to attend.

3418. The Panel suggested that the table on page 5 [of the paper] should include high level criteria to help discussions; there should be a date set for the work and a deliverable to review next steps before it disbands.

3419. MK commented that he largely agrees with GG, but with minor differences in interpretation of history. Echoing IP he said the licensees have been thinking about how to do this for a while and it is appropriate for ECCAF to consider options and come to a conclusion on what seems to be a sensible approach for GB. This Workgroup is sensible for feeding into ECCAF, and the Workgroup outputs can inform ECCAF. As such we need to start the Workgroup although it will likely be the New Year before it starts.

3420. CMD noted that previous versions of the paper gave the impression that it will be implemented into existing codes adding that he is more comfortable now retrospectivity has been taken out, however the draft needs changing to reflect today's discussion and should reference ECCAF or other forum. JN agreed with CMD suggesting that we take RfG as a baseline, add national parameters to this and then the Grid Code would reference that document for new generating plant only.

3421. GG noted that he is happy to join the Workgroup.

3422. AB asked if there is a possibility we could get tied in a legal knot. We are talking about a Workgroup to set the National requirements. AB queried whether the GCRP have the power to do that when the ENCs are following a different legal

route. IP suggested that in the scope of the joint Workgroup we can have these discussions.

3423. GG stated that the drafting says the TSO will determine the national parameters so it is welcomed that National Grid are involving stakeholders. IP suggested that this is linked to the current arrangements as currently only NGET can propose changes, but we use stakeholders to determine what they should be and this is the same process. GG suggested that he had been under the misapprehension that TSOs would just define them, so it is very welcome that stakeholders will have a hand in helping to determine them. IP stated that informed decisions will be taken giving consideration to stakeholder requirements. RW added that there are many parameters also subject to national regulatory approval. GG added that this is not as many as we would like, and anything determined at national level should incorporate NRA approval.

3424. CMD noted that he is still apprehensive of this because we don't have any idea of the license framework and we should not go too far without knowing these conditions. MK added that network licensees have been concerned about this for a long time and have been lobbying DECC to understand their views. In the past everything like this has been done with Secretary of State powers, but in this case DECC are not taking this approach and the message from DECC and Ofgem is that we should use existing processes.Network Licensees have licence, and new legal, obligations to change the codes to implement EU law.

3425. AB questioned whether the Workgroup will actually draft whatever format/structure/choices we decide. AB added that he sees that as a clerical exercise rather than a Workgroup exercise and it is very time consuming. IP suggested that this depends on the solution, as normally National Grid provide Grid Code drafting which is commented and consulted upon. AB suggested then that we could remove drafting from the scope, as it is a massively time consuming exercise.

3426. AF suggested that, without drafting, could the parameters being chosen by this Workgroup be different to the format that has been chosen. IP suggested that the two are independent. GG added that the ENCs could result in quite radical changes as they may expand what is in the Grid Code but the technical experts need to go through this and decide. IP noted there may be a different level of desire to be involved in the detailed drafting across industry parties.

3427. MK suggested that, within the paper, the first number (i) [NB references formatting error in numbering of scope points in paper] is important as it recognises that RfG is the first code ENTSOe has put on us, we can try and write the RfG into everything else and recognise that many of the other codes are retrospective. Within the paper, the second number (i), this Workgroup should hold responsibility for the drafting. MK noted that he had imagined that the licensees would do the physical work of typing it out because we have to adding that documents such as G59 and G83 will need completely rewriting. GG suggested that if you put ENCs into G59 and G83 then they will also need to cover commercial conditions as they potentially provide frequency response and, at present, there is nothing specified for remuneration or settlement.

3428. JB noted that the implementation guidance notes from ENTSOe have actually added more technical confusion and in the ECCAF role the linkage to the rest of Europe is not clear. JB expected ENTSOe or NGET to be feeding into this process. IP stated we will note this for ECCAF but cannot provide an answer today.

3429. RW suggested the ENTSOe guidance document was helpful to a point, but it is only advisory, not binding and as far as can be established, other European member states are currently having the same conversations regarding application.

3430. The panel ran through the terms of reference.

3431. (i) CMD suggested this has to be completed before can move on to (ii) and question if there is any approval by GCRP needed. IP clarified that the scope items are not intended to be consecutive.

3432. JN queried whether the second (i) captures engineering documents, and if not could a reference be added.

3433. IP suggested (iii) is dependent on the structural decision and should be removed.

3434. GG added that we also need to consider the operational codes. IP suggested making the paper broad enough to say 'relevant European codes' and the first Workgroup meeting could be used to finalise the wording.

3435. AB queried why the proposal only accounts for GCRP and DCRP, should it include the other codes? IP noted that there is the potential to approach the other code panels where necessary.

3436. The Panel approved the Workgroup.

3437. The Panel noted that membership had not been discussed, CMD suggested there may be subgroups, RJ suggested that it could be agenda dependent.

3438. MK noted that the DCRP meeting is at the beginning of December and we can send a revised paper to take account of the GCRP discussions.

3439. JB questioned whether, in setting up this Workgroup, there are other things which should be put on hold to allow this to happen. IP suggested we can pick this up with the tracker.

c) GC0075: Hybrid Static Compensators

3440. GS presented pp13/67 and pp13/68 noting that there is a long standing issue of interpretation. There have been discussions in the past and in September National Grid held a workshop with manufacturers and generators to see if it is still a problem and how material it is.

3441. GS stated that manufacturers informed NGET that there are many different interpretations of the current provisions which was making it difficult to tender for projects and from a developer point of view, it is difficult for them to specify the requirements. Provision of reactive current during a fault is also a subject of some uncertainty. GS added that this issue is substantial enough to require a Workgroup, but we do need to consider timescales. GS added that there was a strong desire from workshop attendees to start the work.

3442. JB questioned what issue we are trying to solve, is it that some equipment does not do what we want it to do, or is it the code and are we trying to get the equipment changed, or a change to future equipment? GS stated that we will be looking at future equipment and would like to come to an agreed position of how equipment should perform in the future and the code description needs to reflect that. JB suggested that he sees this as more of an interpretation problem. TDa noted that we also need manufacturers to agree that they will achieve the technical requirements. JB suggested that he does not see this as a technical issue. RL noted that if reactive support is non-continuous there is a technical need to understand the implications of this, as it has a link to whether you switch individual components or collectively. AF noted that a letter was issued to all new manufacturers which says National Grid are currently accepting these Hybrid Statcoms, but that there may be a change to the definition and retrospective action may be required. RL noted the need to be careful as technical delivery of equipment which may be non-compliant by the definition of continuous could be technically acceptable in terms of delivery. This means the technical need to be continuous may not be absolute meaning ultimately it is a technical issue to resolve.

3443. AF suggested that the open letter definitely had a reference to retrospective action. GS added that from the discussion it is clear that there are a range of views and the objective is to set up a Workgroup to consider and revise the code. CMD questioned whether that means that anyone currently without a FON would get a FON. GS suggested that the desired objective is to draw a line under that.

3444. The Panel approved the Terms of Reference. GS stated that it is likely to be March before this Workgroup could start and any suggestions to move it forward would be welcome.

d) GC0028: Constant Terminal Voltage

3445. GS presented pp13/69 noting that National Grid had held a workshop and made some good progress. One aspect which became clear from the workshop is that, in order to work out what a generator has to build, developers have to look at

many different areas of the code. The workshop attendees developed a plan of action which should make the Workgroup efficient. GS noted that NGET now needs to develop a proposal to clarify the code.

3446. GS highlighted that this paper sets out the action plan and terms of reference for a Workgroup as developed in the workshop.

3447. JN thanked NGET for raising this and would support progress leading to a change in the code as soon as possible. GS added that the intention is to commence this Workgroup sooner than March and we would like to try to arrange a meeting in January.

6 Workgroups in Progress

a) GC0050: Demand Control

3448. IK noted that the voltage control tests are taking place; the next Workgroup meeting is scheduled for the 21 November. IK added that the results so far are as expected and the report will be brought back to the Panel in January.

3449. JW queried whether there are any interactions with the LCNF projects. MK added that the CLASS project is being done in partnership with National Grid.

7 Workgroup Reports

a) GC0063: Power Available

3450. ME presented pp13/70 highlighting the 3 solutions and associated benefits being considered by the Workgroup.

a) consistent approach to MEL submission.
b) Dynamic MEL, defining refresh rate of 10mins
c) Separate signal (Power Avail) via SCADA.

3451. ME noted that the Workgroup have tentatively identified that option 3 would most efficiently address the deficiencies identified, however, this is subject to a proposed workgroup consultation seeking wider industry views particularly on costs of implementation. ME noted that draft consultation questions were circulated with the report however the Workgroup have not yet had a chance to review the questions.

3452. AF commented that the report paragraph 10.2 stated that the majority of the Workgroup does not support retrospective action querying whether, if it is not applied retrospectively, will C/11 become permanent. ME noted that the Workgroup have looked critically at what the deficiencies are and that there is a recognition of the benefits of retrospective application however there is also a recognition that there is a cost associated with retrospective application and this would need to be justified. It was also noted that draft questions were included seeking wider views on retrospective application.

3453. JN noted that this proposal does not fully meet what was envisaged in C/11 and may make the situation worse as it effectively detaches the PN submission from the data National Grid would actually use to issue BOAs. ME noted this concern and stated that the proposals could be used by the BSC for BOA settlement if this was considered appropriate. The workgroup had addressed the Terms of Reference and proposed solutions that addressed the Grid Code deficiencies.

3454. CMD suggested that this Workgroup was not formed to assess the change from C/11, which assessment will still be going on and will feed into BSC considerations. AF suggested that C/11 implemented a temporary fix, whereas this Workgroup was formed to develop a permanent solution.

3455. ME noted that there is some concern that any perceived changes to revenue that might come about because of these proposals are sensitive for some parties. However, this does not preclude using the signal to address the deficiencies in BOA settlement if this is deemed appropriate. ME noted that there are already mechanisms in place that may support improved PN accuracy, for example information imbalance (currently set to £0), however provided PN submission and

wind generator forecasting processes are linked the accuracy should improve because it is in the interest of wind farms to get the forecast right as they are trading on this basis.

3456. JB questioned whether the cited benefit of giving renewable generation the opportunity to earn additional revenues may be discriminatory and that wind generators tended to generate as much as they can when they can. ME highlighted that, as the volumes of intermittent generation grow, the most efficient way of operating the system would be to use wind for balancing services particularly during high wind, low demand periods. Facilitating this would lead to additional revenues for renewable generation but he did not consider this to be discriminatory as this was more to do with avoiding using out of merit generation. CMD suggested that the proposal was about giving confidence of renewable generation balancing services performance to the SO.

3457. CMD noted that options 1 and 2 potentially put a requirement on a wind farm generator to update MEL every 10 minutes and to do that manually is a huge cost and could be classed as discriminatory. ME noted that this is an indicative signal and if it goes to physical settlement, then there is a lot more work to do on getting accuracy into the definition. JB noted that the original problem was inaccuracy in PNs which C/11 permitted while Power Available came up with a longer term solution.

3458. ME invited the panel to note that the Workgroup have provided a report to the panel addressing the Terms of Reference and that it was appropriate to undertake a Workgroup consultation particularly on the impact of these solutions, which will allow the Workgroup to conclude and for the Panel to consider the recommendations made. ME added that the workgroup consultation questions will be developed by correspondence with Workgroup members.

3459. MK questioned whether LEEMPS would be captured by this proposal. ME's interpretation is that it does not account for Embedded generators unless they are BM units but that it will be made clear in the report.

3460. GG suggested that the eligibility of LEEMPS generation may change following the implementation of RfG.

3461. The Panel approved the report for consultation.

8 Industry Consultations

a) GC0077 SSR

3462. GS noted that this issue was brought to the panel in September - since then a proposal has been developed for consideration by the Panel but feedbackreceived highlighted that there are some material questions which still need addressing. GS added that NGET have a plan to discuss the issues and aim to bring the Consultation to the meeting in January.

b) GC0068: New and Revised Unit data

3463. RJ noted that this consultation closes on Tuesday 3 December

Progress tracker

3464. IP suggesting revisiting the Progress tracker and asked whether Panel members envisage a role in planning and prioritising the issues?

3465. GG suggested that the RfG Workgroup takes place around the same time as ECCAF.

3466. IP commented that, internally, National Grid look at what is coming up and ensure that the most important things are dealt with first. Panel agreed to continue with this approach.

3467. GG noted that if the ENCs are on schedule, and subject to any decisions on structure, there could be a lot of work being done by the industry and there will be a lot of work in the UK.

3468. JN added that, in addition to importance, there is a need to consider urgency, and also the extent to which the workload would fall on the same or different parties needs to be considered. He is in favour of the proposed approach but for the avoidance of doubt JN added that he is keen to progress Constant Terminal Voltage.

9 Pending Authority Decisions

a) GC0037: Offshore Balancing Mechanism Unit Configuration

3469. JW noted that decisions are due in early December and Ofgem are on schedule.

b) GC0065: Consequential Changes from STC Modification CA049

3470. JW noted that decisions are due in early December and Ofgem are on schedule.

10 Standing Items

a) European Network Codes

3471. IP noted that pp13/72 the ACER update on the European Network Codes was circulated to the panel.

b) Joint European Standing Group

3472. IP noted that pp13/73 the JESG headline report was circulated to the Panel

3473. IP noted that pp13/74 is an update to the JESG terms of reference. It takes the information sharing ethos to expand to ENTSOe and ACER/Ofgem and DECC, it specifically recognises discussions already taking place.

3474. The Panel approved the Terms of Reference.

c) ECCAF

3475. IP noted that first ECCAF meeting is scheduled for 21 November 2013.

11 Impact of Other Code Modification or Developments

3476. A codes summary, pp13/75, was circulated to the Panel.

3477. AF questioned whether, in the SQSS modification on normal infeed loss, there is a plan to review the BCAs to change them to 1800MW. RLa suggested that certain recent agreements included a reopener concerning the infeed loss limit as the potential for change was known at the time. RLa added that where the 1320MW limit currently appears in older connection agreements, then the intention is that this will be amended.

3478. **ACTION: RLa** Expand on plan to change the BCAs.

12 Any Other Business

3479. RJ presented the 2014 meeting dates, noting that the papers day in January would be 1 week later than normal due to the bank holidays.

3480. RJ noted that the Panel elections are open until 18 December 2013 and the intention this year is to reach as wide an audience as possible.

3481. RJ asked Panel members to inform her if they are attending the GCRP as this does not always happen.

3482. IP noted the EMR paper on the website for information.

3483. IP noted that this would be Tom Derry's last meeting.

3484. JN noted that the UK is in the middle of a period of heightened Space Weather. During 2012 Andrew Richards showed a fax to the GCRP which Generators would receive that included the categories of severity. JN stated that RWE are currently reviewing its planned actions in response to such fax warning but they do not have visibility or understanding of the categories.

3485. RJ noted that the generators who provided information to E3C were provided with their levels of risk. AB clarified that this was only generators who provided information, there was nothing provided to generators who did not provide anything. GG noted that there was a threshold of 100MW.

3486. JN stated that his question is specific; what can generators expect to see in a fax? RJ agreed to contact Andrew for information.

3487. **ACTION: RJ** contact Andrew Richards for information on Space Weather categories.

3488. CMD asked for an update on Delegation of Authority work.

3489. **ACTION: RJ** seek update on the DoA work.

3490. CMD asked whether anything had been progressed with Special Actions adding that they were withdrawn because they were not being used them properly. CMD suggested they were supposed to be redrafted.

3491. **ACTION: RJ** seek update on special actions.

13 Next Meeting

3492. The next meeting is planned for 15 January 2014.