nationalgridESO

Meeting summary

Grid Code Development Forum – July 2022

Date:	06/07/2022	Location:	MS Teams
Start:	09:00	End:	11:00

Participants

Attendee	Company	Attendee	Company
Rob Wilson	National Grid ESO (Chair)	Sean Gauton	Uniper UK
David Halford	National Grid ESO (Tec Sec)	Paul Youngman	Drax
Gareth Stanley	National Grid ESO (Presenter)	Joshua Logan	Drax
Frank Kasibante	National Grid ESO (Presenter)	Anthony Dicicco	ESB
Sally Thatcher	National Grid ESO	Gavin Baillie	SSE
Banke John-Okwesa	National Grid ESO	Pablo Paredes	SSE
Milly Lewis	National Grid ESO	Ryan Ward	SP Renewables
Steve Baker	National Grid ESO	Lisa Waters	Waters Wye Associates
Mike Kay	P2 Analysis	Sudharsana Govindaswami	Cummins Ltd
Graeme Vincent	SP Transmission	Andrew Larkins	Sygensys Ltd
Alan Creighton	Northern PowerGrid	Paul Crolla	Muirhall Energy
Garth Graham	SSE Generation		

Agenda and slides

A link to the Agenda and Presentations from the July GCDF can be found here

https://www.nationalgrideso.com/calendar/grid-code-development-forum-gcdf-06072022

GCDF

Please note: These notes are produced as an accompaniment to the slide pack presented and provide highlights only of discussion themes and possible next steps.

Meeting Opening – Rob Wilson, NGESO

RW opened the meeting noting that it was being recorded to be put on the website and that agenda items for future meetings were invited. An overview of the agenda items that were to be discussed was also covered.

Early Competition Workstream – Gareth Stanley, NGESO

Discussion themes / Feedback

An overview was provided in relation to the Early Competition Project with key project milestones, and a preview of the Code Change Modification Plan to support the implementation of Early Competition.

Why under the potential STC modifications that could be required as a result of Early Competition, is the connection process for Competitively Appointed Transmission Operators (CATOs) documented when the connection process to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS) is through the CUSC?

While we recognise that connections agreements will need to be picked up as part of the CUSC, the assumption is that a CATO "is" the Network rather than being connected "to" the network (although there might be some complications with regards to interface arrangements). These are working assumptions until we see the legislation.

Why should geographically specific standards apply to CATOs, particularly with reference to the requirements on users wishing to connect to a CATO?

At the moment there are regional differences depending on which TO a user wishes to connect to. A current Grid Code Modification (GC0117) is looking to achieve harmonisation across GB of generator thresholds which would resolve a large part of this.

Is there clarity on what the action would be if the CATO is between two TO areas?

It would depend on the agreed interface arrangements. This is still to be defined but clearly a harmonised approach across GB would remove the issue.

Should we be looking at harmonisation certificate schemes for Grid Code compliance across Europe and will any changes be made to remove the voltage criteria for connections?

While we support the notion of keeping involved in discussions around equipment certificates across Europe, we are no longer part of the European Union, and in terms of voltage requirements at the connection point, this is not part of the scope of this project as those requirements relate to connections to the system whereas the CATO will be part of the system.

Can you outline what we expect to see in the legislation? What issues is CATO attempting to resolve apart from a regime for licencing CATOs?

Whilst the Energy Bill will span several areas, in relation to competition the legislation will set the provisions for Ofgem to introduce competition for any form of network investment including the provisions for distribution as well as transmission. Most of the detail (such as licensing arrangements) will be in secondary legislation.

Do Transmission Operators (TOs) have any role in the governance of the Grid Code currently?

TOs have a seat on the Grid Code Panel but are not required by their licences to comply with the Grid Code. The Grid Code does reference TOs in various sections mainly as an aid to understanding for users.

If for example, a new Grid Supply Point (GSP) was required, could the substation at this GSP be built by a party other than a current TO and then be operated on a day to day basis by this new party requiring replication of current operational interfaces which include new ESO projects such as Black Start and Distributed Restart?

In theory the substation at the GSP could be part of a CATO and owned and operated by this new TO so yes, there could be a future scenario where there will be additional operational arrangements with these new TOs. The evolution of this scenario will take several years in terms of the CATO process coming on-stream and new projects being built.

Has there been any analysis of the potential savings CATO will bring from a customer perspective?

For large and complex projects, we could see the potential for substantial savings taking a precedent from other areas where competition has been established.

When a CATO is set-up, will there be options in terms of whether the CATO builds the asset and then transfers the process of the day to day operation to the incumbent TO?

The current plans would see the CATO continuing to own the asset although it could be possible that the asset is sold to the incumbent TO (or another party) at a later date.

It is important that from a governance point of view, any new CATOs join the existing pool of TOs on the Grid Code panel i.e., the numbers of TO representatives are not increased as a result of more OFTOs being created.

The current thinking is that any new CATOs would join the existing TO pool or have a single representative on the panel on behalf of CATOs; the panel needs to remain balanced between network companies and users.

With the current Early Competition project timelines stating the pretender process starting in Winter 2023, we need to ensure that the current Electricity System Restoration Standard modification (GC0156), due to go-live before December 2026 is taken into account as would require CATOs to have a 24/7, 365 control function as this will be a requirement of the ESRS.

It is acknowledged that this is one of a number of dependencies in relation to the project and will need to be taken into consideration.

Who and how will be monitoring the CATO process in terms of success as it currently feels like the connections process is already challenging in terms of speed of connections which will be vital if we are to hit the governments net zero strategy?

The Early Competition project focus is looking longer term and not at projects that are required imminently. The proposals for how a project is identified for competition will ensure time is built in for the process of competition to take place without delaying the delivery date of the asset. The view is that by introducing new parties into the industry there is a potential that projects could be delivered more quickly due to factors like increased capacity.

It is noted that it is important that in terms of competition, standards are aligned to ensure a harmonised level playing field.

Digitalised Whole System Technical Code Update – Frank Kasibante, NGESO

Discussion themes / Feedback

An update was shared on the Alignment, Simplification and Rationalisation (ASR) Workstream of the Digitalised Whole System Technical Code including current progress and future key tasks.

It was noted that one of the concepts as part of the Energy Code Reform work is potentially code consolidation. Further thinking on this is likely to be part of Ofgem's next steps that will be included in an open letter expected later this year. By developing examples, the ASR workstream will assist in terms of what can be achieved and helps to put into context any thoughts around consolidation of the technical codes moving forward.

It was asked if lessons are being learnt from the digitalisation of the Retail Energy Code (REC) as there are a number of lessons that can be taken from this in relation to implementation?

During the progression of the project, the digitalisation of the REC has been discussed with those involved and we are keen to capture any key learnings from this.

AOB

The Chair thanked the attendees and presenters for their contributions and in closing the meeting reminded everyone that the GCDF is an open forum and agenda items are invited from all parties.

The next GCDF will be held on the 3rd August with the 27th July being the deadline for agenda items and presentations.

Action Item Log

Action items: In progress and completed since last meeting

ID	Month	Agenda Item	Description	Owner	Notes	Target Date	Status
01-2022	July 2022	Connection Agreement Progress	An update of all connection agreements from the past 2 years in terms of progress on original connection date i.e., how many agreements are on track or ahead of the original connection date and how many are behind the original connection date?	Gareth Stanley		September 2022	Open