

## Minutes

<b>Meeting name</b>	Grid Code Review Panel
<b>Meeting number</b>	66
<b>Date of meeting</b>	19 March 2014
<b>Time</b>	10:00am - 4:00pm
<b>Location</b>	National Grid House, Warwick.

## Attendees

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Initials</b>	<b>Company</b>
Ian Pashley	Chair	IP	National Grid
Emma Radley	Secretary	ER	National Grid
Jackeline Crespo-Sandoval	NGET Member	JCS	National Grid
Guy Nicholson	Generators with Novel Units Member	GN	Element Power
Daniel Webb	Large Generator (<3GW) Member	DW	Seabank Power
Guy Phillips	Large Generator (>3GW) Member	GP	E.ON
Alan Barlow	Non Embedded Customers Member	AB	Magnox
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
Robert Longden	Suppliers	RLo	Cornwall Energy
Richard Lavender	NGET Advisor	RLa	National Grid
Robyn Jenkins	NGET Advisor	RJ	National Grid
Robert Wilson	NGET Member	RW	National Grid
Graham Stein	NGET Member	GS	National Grid
Ivan Kileff	NGET Member	IK	National Grid
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
Alastair Frew	Large Generator (>3GW) Alternate	AF	Scottish Power Generation
Tom Davies	Non Embedded Customers Alternate	TD	Magnox
Mark Waldron	National Grid Presenter	MW	National Grid
Richard Price	National Grid Presenter	RP	National Grid
Alex Thomason	Code Administrator	AT	National Grid
Pavel Miller	Small / Medium Generator Observer	PM	Energy UK
Anthony Johnson	NGET Presenter	AJ	National Grid

## Apologies

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Initials</b>	<b>Company</b>
Roger Harris	BSC Panel Alternate	RH	Elexon
John Lucas	BSC Panel Member	JL	Elexon
Julian Wayne	Authority Member	JW	Ofgem
Neil Sandison	Network Operator (Scot.) Member	NS	SSE
Gordon Kelly	Network Operator (Scot.) Alternate	GK	Scottish Power
Richard Lowe	Transmission Licensee (SHE Transmission) Member	RL	SHE Transmission
Brian Punton	Transmission Licensee (SHE Transmission) Alternate	BP	SHE Transmission
Barbara Vest	Small / Medium Generator Member	BV	Energy UK
Dave Draper	Large Generator (<3GW) Member	DD	Horizon Nuclear Power
Sigrid Bolik	Generators with Novel Units Alternate	SBO	Senvion
Lisa Waters	Small / Medium Generator Alternate	LW	Waters Wye
Alan Kelly	Transmission Licensee (SPT) Alternate	AK	SPT
Brendan Woods	Externally Interconnected System Operators Member	BW	SONI

## 1 Introductions & Apologies

3590. The Chair welcomed the group and the apologies were noted. It was announced that this would be John Morris' last Panel as he is retiring. JM said a few words about his time on the Panel and thanked the group for their support.

## 2 Approval of Minutes

### a) January 2014 GCRP Minutes

3591. CMD commented that the slides presented at the previous Panel meeting, regarding Frequency Changes during Large Disturbances, did not reflect the Workgroups discussions or recommendation. GS noted that they were accurate at the time, and the detail which appeared to be missing was in the footnotes to the legal text shown. RJ agreed to make this clearer on the published slides.

3592. **Action: RJ Update slides and re-publish and forward to CMD for information.**

3593. JN made a comment regarding Space Weather and noted that at the last E3C meeting Chris Train at National Grid advised that there was additional work required and there were sensitivities expressed by National Grid regarding Control Room responses. JN added that it is still ongoing and it is not clear when further information will be brought to light. RJ responded that discussions are ongoing outside of GCRP (such as in E3C) and that there are no modifications as such. JN felt that there is relevance to this Panel and that this issue will be enacted within the remit of this Panel. MK commented that it is appropriate that a body like E3C decide what is required but that this Panel ensures it is happening efficiently. He added that caution needs to be taken over what information is disseminated.

3594. The Panel approved the minutes for publication.

3595. **ACTION: ER Upload minutes on to the National Grid website.**

## 3 Review of Actions

### a) Summary of Actions

#### *Revision of Engineering Recommendation P28*

3596. Minute 2866 – ER noted that the ENA aimed to have a Chair for a joint GCRP / DCRP Workgroup by March after which an invite for Workgroup nominations would be sent out. MK advised that a suitable Chair has not yet been found but he would seek an update.

#### *GC0063: Power Available lessons learned*

3597. Minute 3219 – ER noted that an update on this would be provided in May.

#### *GC0077: Suppression on Sub Synchronous Resonance from Series Compensators*

3598. Minute 3532 – GS advised that this had been considered and it would be explored in this year's ETYS. He advised that frequency ranges will not be provided at this time but it will be in the ETYS process to discuss how best to manage issues in future.

#### *Membership*

3599. Minute 3588 – Please see item 4.

## 4 New Grid Code Development Issues

### a) GC0074: GCRP Membership

3600. AT presented pp14/17 and introduced the background to this subject. AT noted there had been a discussion regarding the last elections and National Grid as Code Administrator had agreed to draw up a straw man proposal in order to put forward some options. AT gave some background as to the role of the Code Administrator

and noted the impartial advice and help that they give to industry and their role in other Code Panels.

3601. AT moved on to note the reasons for reviewing the membership, such as concerns that the Grid Code Panel does not reflect the changing generation mix and that Panel Membership should allow equal access to the Panel. AT also noted the practical issues in relation to the size of the Panel.
3602. AT went through the core elements of the Panel noting the representatives in this category. CMD asked if the TO representative could also be National Grid. RJ noted that the intended parties for this role are the Scottish Transmission Owners, and National Grid would not seek to fill it as they have a separate defined position. CMD considered whether the Panel should distinguish representation from National Grid in terms of SO and TO. RJ commented that the representation is for NGET – representing one licence. IP confirmed that generally the National Grid representatives are representing the SO. GP asked if membership could be considered separately from the National Grid Role in determining issues to be submitted to the authority. AT asked whether it would be possible to get the representation on the Panel right without changing its nature.
3603. JM asked for clarification on the voting rights. It was noted that the Code Administrator, Panel Secretary and Ofgem do not have a vote. The Panel Chair has both a vote and a casting vote in the event of a tie.
3604. AT explained that the straw man proposed a new role for Manufacturers and added that RLo is here in a new capacity as a supplier representative. RJ advised that it was considered that this would be a useful role in having a representative concerned with manufacture of compliant equipment. CMD expressed a concern that a manufacturer would be having influence in this role when they are not paying for anything.
3605. The Panel considered what constitutes a Voting Member. RJ advised that they have to be an Authorised Electricity Operator, but recognised that this is a very vague constitution. AT reassured the Panel that in addition to assessing the membership, the election process will also be reviewed in order to create a more formal procedure. AT commented that there are concerns that members do not know who their constituents are and that this can be addressed through this process to make sure that views can be aired. GS suggested that there could be an open advisory role in an observer/expert position. RJ advised that the Code Administrator would work with the Panel to agree and define these positions.
3606. MK felt that it is appropriate to have cooperation with Manufacturers. CMD asked what the role of this Panel is regarding the European Network Codes. It was agreed to consider this at a later stage.
3607. MK highlighted the issue of the DCRP being represented here and added that the role is to advise DNOs on the Distribution Code. He stated that he did not think it appropriate to seek DCRP representation at the GCRP, nor reduce the DNO representation. However he did note that the generator representation and other governance issues were common to the DCRP too and he suggested that it would be pragmatic to discuss doing this in conjunction with other Code Administrators.
3608. GN commented that the SQSS and STC would be similar and that there are linkages and overlaps so a conversation on how those relationships work is necessary. IP noted that there is a distinction between coordination of Panels and having various code representatives attending all the various Panels.
3609. AT noted that there is a BSC representative on the Grid Code Review Panel and pointed out the potential inconsistency with not having specific representatives for the other codes, but noted that it is useful to have this representation. MK agreed that it is a useful position to have and the rest of the Panel agreed that this input is valuable.
3610. JN commented that there is a need to understand what status qualifies a plant to be eligible count towards the MW needed for a position on the Panel, e.g. planned, being constructed, operational etc. GN stated that there is still a need to represent “novel” generators i.e. new generators or users which may drive changes to the Grid Code. MK replied that there needs to be an appropriate balance. IP noted that there is a general issue regarding how to capture the future in the Panel constitution now. RJ highlighted that it is the responsibility of affected parties to have the right representation in those posts and that there needs to be a set of definitions and

descriptions agreed by affected parties and robust process behind this regarding elections.

3611. AF asked who would administer these elections and AT responded that the Code Administrator would, as they do for the other codes.
3612. AB commented that little of the Panel business actually concerns Non-Embedded Customers. However, he added that looking at the EU Demand Connection Code, they may be affected more and it would be difficult to say whether this role might become more relevant in the future. AT responded that if the seat is removed, there is still the ability for Ofgem to add this seat back in. RJ also added that part of the Code Administrator role is to be a 'critical friend' so they will be able to help Parties who are not directly represented. MK added that DNO's would struggle to represent the interests of non-embedded customer, or indeed customers in general. RJ suggested getting in contact with some of the Directly Connected Customers to get their thoughts.
3613. GN considered whether there is a role for Interconnectors. MK replied that it was for consideration taking into account the inter-TSO co-operation required by the Third Package and the EU Network Codes whether any EU interconnexion should be directly represented at the GB G Code Panel. GN agreed that this should be considered. He also noted that the Panel can invite any parties where relevant to meetings as an observer / expert.
3614. AT went through the various options that had been drawn up. On the first option (Generation election – no change to number or categories but a more transparent election process), GP noted that this maintains the status quo but that other options reduce representation. He suggested that he would like another option about adding another generator representative to cover power park units, tidal etc. GP added that he would completely support a more transparent election process given the recent experiences of this.
3615. AT highlighted that there are 9 generator representatives in the room today and in some categories both the Member and the Alternate had attended. The group had a discussion about why the Member and Alternate attend. JB felt that the idea was for one or the other to come to the meeting and questioned the logic of having both there. JB suggested that there could be more representatives such as 14 instead of 7 but then only allow either the Alternate or Member to attend. RJ felt that, if the number of Panel members and Alternates increased, it would be more of a forum than a Panel. IP advised that there is a distinction between a forum or Workgroup, and a Panel. He added that the Panel should be a small body to progress issues and general governance. Detailed debate should take place outside the Panel, such as in the Workgroups organised to progress specific issues. RLO responded that the Panel must be sufficiently representative. JB noted that the principle aim of being a generator representative is to prevent costs increasing. IP responded that the principle role of the Panel should be to develop the Code such that it continues to deliver its objectives. RJ felt that those conversations regarding costs should take place in the applicable Workgroup, not the Panel. GP highlighted that National Grid still has the unique ability to determine whether issues go to Authority and if this changes, membership and voting takes on a greater importance.
3616. JN went back to the issue regarding Alternates and noted that they would generally qualify as representatives in their own right in terms of MWs they represent, as opposed to individuals with no direct MWs being nominated by the Member. He also commented that a panel which included a greater number of generator representatives may result in a more efficient overall process. For example, if there is an issue discussed at the Panel and the appropriate representation is not present, the result could be that the issue ends up coming back to Panel anyway as there could potentially be problems flagged up by industry parties in the consultation that haven't been considered because of lack of representation. In addition, a reduced number of generator representatives may lead to parties are disenfranchised from the Panel and possibly less likely to participate in workgroups.
3617. GP asked why there is a need to reduce the size of the Panel. He felt that logistics is not a good enough reason. IP replied that it comes down to duplication and what the Panel's role is, which is a place to make decisions and not a discussion forum. GN felt that having more members gives more expertise and knowledge which is needed for the technical subjects that are discussed. CMD added that the risk of reducing

numbers is that experience is lost, and also expressed a concern that with fewer representatives, members would not be able to truly represent their category. GP advised that this goes back to the issue regarding how generators are classified. PM commented that he does not see how reducing numbers will be more effective. JB advised that there is need to review the election process and it needs to be simple and transparent. CMD advised that if a party is not happy about representation, then it is up to the generator representatives to address and make themselves available to be able to represent them. GP added that parties that voted were the ones that nominated themselves. RJ responded that there would be an industry wide election.

3618. AT summarised that the general view seems to be that members would not want to reduce the number of seats and instead could address representation by re-evaluating the election process.
3619. AT moved on to looking at Option 2 (reduce number of generator seats from 6 to 5 and allocate by size). JB asked why there the options were not labelled Band A, B, C and D as per the bandings in the Requirements for Generators code. RJ advised that this discussion did take place and it is another option. TD felt that this would be a fundamental change.
3620. AT looked at Option 3 (generation by fuel type) and TD felt that there would be merit in this. AF commented that it would be good to see what the generation split is by fuel type. GN suggested that this could also be done by seeing what is on the TEC register. RJ responded that this can easily be looked at and categories could be assigned accordingly. JB considered whether we need a category at all.
3621. Moving on to Option 4 (open generation elections) AT asked the group for their opinions. JB felt that if this changed to 12 to 8 (from 6 to 4) then this is practical, but he does not want to see a reduction in generator representation, and that 12 seems the right number. MK noted that we need to be clear about other aspects of constitution and that progression of issues does rely on voting, even that is limited to establishing unanimity or lack of it. GP noted that the Panel needs to be balanced so that the Chair's casting vote would carry.
3622. AT moved on to looking at the timescales and advised that we need to have this in place by the end of November in order to be ready for the next election. The Panel agreed that a workshop would be a pragmatic way to discuss this. RJ advised that an invitation would be sent out for this. The majority of the Panel advised that they would be interested in attending.
3623. GN emphasised that it is important to ensure that some representatives are able to provide useful input regarding the European Network Codes as they become more relevant.
3624. SB summarised that good justification is required if representatives are removed from the Panel and that it is preferable for the Panel to come up with solutions which Ofgem can then endorse rather than having Ofgem make decisions. SB added that it is important to ensure that whatever the industry comes up with as a solution to Grid Code issues, that it is in the interest of consumers overall and that Ofgem would act as a check and balance in this regard. AT responded that it would be valuable to have an Ofgem representative on the membership workshop. SB agreed and added that they would not want to signal how things should go, but to help the debate and to maintain the overriding principles whilst protecting the interests of consumers.
3625. JB expressed his thanks to AT and the team for providing the options and prompting the discussions. IP noted that the input from all parties to this debate is fundamental and appreciated.
3626. **Action – AT Set up workshop and send out invitations.**  
**Action- AT to speak to MK about Panel representation and potentially joint Workshop with DCRP.**

## 5 Existing Grid Code Development Issues

### a) GC0080: RES Update

3627. GS presented on pp14/18 and advised the group that discussions had taken place about the best way to apply this. GS explained that the paper has an amendment

record contained within it so the audience could see the change record. GS advised that National Grid has circulated the paper to Panel Members and there is a default 20 business day objection window. GS added that if anybody does want to raise an objection, then it would be useful to relate the objection to a specific document in the pack so that other documents can continue to progress if possible and also that it would be good to get a steer in objection comments on what to focus on.

3628. AJ explained the paper in more detail. He advised that the paper had been revised to ensure that additional NGTS' effectively capture the appropriate elements. If approved, they would simply refer to relevant RES. AJ noted that the authors had taken the opportunity to have a fundamental re-think of the RES structure and how updates could be managed. If approved, the generic technical appendices will be updated to say what part of RES it refers to and it will be clear and transparent. AJ summarised by saying that the RES has been updated, and governance changes and administrative arrangements have been revised within National Grid in order to ensure that it is updated regularly. .

3629. CMD asked what happens to BCAs and AJ responded that they continue to apply. CMD suggested that this means that a party could sign their BCA, and then the RES might change, so they could be signing an agreement that refers to something that has changed. AJ responded that for historic connections they would have to meet historic requirements. CMD asked about new requirements. AJ answered that there is a clause in the BCA saying that National Grid and Users will agree what standards to use. GS advised that there is no intention to obligate parties to comply with any new standards. CMD asked how this affects connections to a network in Scotland and AJ advised that this comes under Scottish TOs so is not covered under RES which only applies to England and Wales. MK asked why this is not being dealt with together as an industry as opposed to separate licensees; National Grid is the body responsible for contracting with end Users and it is via National Grid's connexion process that Users are bound into relevant standards. He did not think it was acceptable from a connexion process point of view not to tie up the arrangements in Scotland with the same clarity as E&W. AJ advised that to the existing process is intended to enable network owners or Users to update the appropriate documents as and when necessary, and in this case it was National Grid in their England & Wales role as a TO who were proposing the update. JD noted that he is aware that a piece of work is required in this area and it can tie in with what has been done in this respect. CMD suggested that the Scottish TOs report back to the Panel with suggestions. JN felt that if the Scottish TOs are satisfied with the requirements set out in the Scottish Electrical Standards (dated between 1992 and 1999) and are not looking to impose any different or additional obligations via the BCA then there is probably not an issue. CMD felt that clarification is needed. AJ reiterated that RES captures largely England and Wales issues. CMD asked why it does not apply across GB. GS answered that from a National Grid Electricity Transmission point of view, they would like to get into a routine of updating documents.

3630. AT noted that there is a RES Guidance document on the web and if this is updated it would be useful to help resolve the confusion.

3631. **Action: GS/AJ Update RES Guidance document after updated version agreed and publish on website.**

3632. JN had some minor comments on the document, for example different terms relating to National Grid and the transmission system are used and it is difficult to understand to what extent the RES applies offshore. He also suggested that it might be useful to carry through the copyright that is on the Grid Code and it might be useful to put the date rather than just issue number on the relevant document and in Part 4 of the RES .

3633. SB made a point about good governance, with regards to the fact that the National Grid technical standards appear to be updated first and then modifications are proposed to the RES. SB felt that this does not seem the right way round. MW advised that it is a question of terminology and that the National Grid technical specifications are an internal standard for their own services and when they are changed and the clauses are relevant to the RES, then National Grid proposes those changes to the RES, if appropriate. MW advised that the Panel then has governance over whether they believe the change to the RES is appropriate and will ultimately decide whether the RES is changed. SB highlighted that if the Panel did not support the change, there was potential for the relevant parts of NG technical specifications to

continue to diverge from RES. MW advised that there would then need to be a discussion as to the effect of that, and whether the technical specification was incorrect. SB accepted that the two documents are different and serve different purposes but they should be consistent with each other. He suggested that in view of past issues regarding inconsistency, good governance practice / control processes need to be put in place to ensure that the two documents are managed effectively to achieve this.

3634. CMD noted that the RES still imposes standards that affect procurements of assets. MW advised that one of the objectives of the proposed update was to keep this interaction to the minimum necessary. MW confirmed that the document has been prepared in the same way as the original RES.

3635. GN had a concern about the direction that this is heading in and advised that as a user he would want to see a set of standards relevant to users and does not need to know National Grid's internal standards. IP reminded the Panel that the question is around what happens when there are two different standards, i.e. if the RES does not get agreed and therefore the NGTS requirements continue to be different. MW advised that it depends on what the specification is. GS advised that there are always likely to be grey areas and National Grid needs to be able to make decisions about its own equipment as an asset owner. MK pointed out that ultimately the application of standards to a User's connexion was determinable by the Authority. MW advised that the starting point for any change proposal would be an issue relating to performance on the network and the proposal then goes through a formal change using the process set out in the Grid Code.

3636. JB asked if the objection process is based on the principle of what is being done or if it is to do with the technical content. He noted that there is a concern about not being able to read the entire document in the time given. GS responded that the objections should be based around the technical content. JB asked if any new standards are being introduced and GS answered that Users would self-certify compliance. IP highlighted that this is not about retrospectivity. JB commented that there is a concern about unknowingly becoming non-compliant and felt that a 20 day objection window is not long enough. MK suggested that at least 8 weeks is required to review the document in detail. AC added that he would want to review the document line by line to make sure the requirements in the RES seemed reasonable. JN suggested that, in order to expedite implementation of the proposed RES, an assurance that it will be reviewed soon after might help. GS agreed that the Panel should do at least an annual check and MW agreed that this is a two way process and there is a responsibility as a Panel to push back if there is a potential issue.

3637. **Action: All – review and submit comments on the updated RES.**

#### **b) GC0083: European Transparency Regulation.**

3638. JCS presented on GC0083, providing the background and noting that there is a mandatory go-live date of January 2015 as the Regulation is European Law. The proposed changes are to insert a new paragraph in OC2 to specify the regulation purpose and requirements, to add a new table in DRC Schedule 5 (Users System Data) containing all ETR articles where 3rd party data is required (existing and new) and a change to PC.4.3.1 to align NG fuel type to ETR production type.

3639. JN asked if the proposed table in the DRC is a collection of data from other parts of the Grid Code that will be changed. JCS confirmed that, for clarity the table will have references to other areas of the Grid Code where the relevant information is specified, in particular OC2.

3640. JCS confirmed that the next step is to circulate the Industry Consultation document to GCRP members for comments with view to publishing it before the next GCRP.

3641. RP introduced himself as the business lead for the IS Project for ETR and gave a high level overview of where the project is currently. RP noted that an IS workshop was held last November followed by an Industry Consultation. A report was then issued and is available on the National Grid website. A further workshop on the specifics of the IS solution is being held on 2 April 2014 at National Grid House in Warwick. RP advised that a new Market Operation Data Interface System (MODIS) will be developed for ETR and Remit purposes. This is currently in the design phase and



testing will begin in September 2014 with plan to go live in December 2014 in time for the 4 January 2015 deadline.

3642. GN asked who this impacts and what level it goes down to. It was noted that additional data is required for articles 7 and 15 and this will impact some demand and generating units.
3643. JN asked if National Grid is envisaging standard fallbacks in the event that IT systems are not available, or if not what the fallback position is. RP advised that this is a detail that still needs to be discussed further. IP commented that transparency regulation has a small section on what happens in this situation. RP clarified that it is recognised that there are circumstances where IT systems fail so it does not necessarily mean that there is a breach of licence in this situation. He added that there will be 24 hour support for the system and there will be a mechanism in place in case of failure.
3644. JB asked if it is clear to everyone what the triggers are in terms of submitting the data and it was noted that parties have a legal obligation to comply with the Regulation.
3645. JN asked if the data that needs to be provided via the MODIS is identical to the one provided under EDT. RP responded that it is not the same data but there may be some overlap. JN advised that he would hope that National Grid will be able to extract as much information as possible from the data that they are already receiving. RP advised that at the December industry workshop several options for obtaining the data were discussed and the general consensus at the end was to try to minimise changes to existing systems whilst meeting the deadline. CM asked if it is possible to choose not to use MODIS. IP advised that he would not expect the Grid Code to go into that detail.
3646. RJ asked if the Panel are happy that the consultation is circulated and comments are received via email rather than waiting for the next GCRP Panel meeting. The Panel agreed that this would be a pragmatic approach.
3647. **Action: JCS - Circulate draft industry consultation for comments to DECC, Ofgem and Panel members.**

#### **c) GC0084: Significant Systems Event Report**

3648. GS discussed pp14/19 noting that it is due every 12 months and that it lists frequency deviations that are classified as significant events. The purpose of the report was to highlight network performance with respect to Rate of Change of Frequency (RoCoF) and a Workgroup is in progress to examine RoCoF related issues. GS advised that measured RoCoF does not go much above  $0.125\text{Hzs}^{-1}$  as would be expected under current constraints. AF commented that the trend seems to show that it has gone up in the last couple of years. MK noted that in the past we would never see a RoCoF above  $0.08\text{Hzs}^{-1}$  and that the margin of safety has been hugely eroded. Additionally MK pointed out that National Grid had agreed to report on all significant events including voltage disturbances, so that issues like FRT could be monitored. He asked that National Grid check that there were no such other events that should have been included.
3649. GN noted that the last three phase fault was recorded in September 2006. IP advised that more detail is contained within the Transmission System Performance Report which is available on the National Grid website.
3650. **Action ER – send out website link for the Performance Report to the Panel.**
3651. **Action – GS – investigate including three phase faults in the Significant System Event Report.**

## **6 Workgroups in Progress**

#### **a) GC0048: ENC Requirements for Generators.**

3652. RW presented pp14/20 to the Panel for approval and advised that the updated Terms of Reference as circulated provided clarification in some areas but were not fundamentally changed.
3653. CMD asked about item (iv) under the Scope of the Workgroup and whether this could refer to any new versions of Engineering Recommendations, and in which case how



this would apply to existing equipment. MK responded that any ER (generally) applies from the date it is issued and is not retrospective. RW also added that while a process to deal with specific retrospective application in exceptional circumstances is enshrined in the code, by default RfG does not apply retrospectively.

3654. RW confirmed that the next Workgroup meeting is being held on Monday 24 March 2014.

3655. The Panel approved the updated Terms of Reference.

**b) GC0075: Hybrid Static Compensators**

3656. GS provided an update on GC0075 and advised that a Workgroup meeting is scheduled for 1 May 2014. He noted that the original invite for Workgroup members, using the normal Grid Code distribution list, only gained 3 responses, whereas a revised circulation list of people known to National Grid received 20 responses.

**c) GC0035/79: Frequency Changes during Large System Disturbances.**

3657. MK noted that the original Industry Consultation proposed a blanket  $1\text{Hzs}^{-1}$  RoCoF setting on all Generation, both existing and new. A second Industry Consultation, to assess the revised DCode and G59 text, proposes a longer implementation period, plus a lower RoCoF setting for existing synchronous generators. The Consultation commenced on 14 March with a closing date of 4 April 2014. MK added that this covers Distributed Generation of 5MW and above and that the Workgroup are starting to look at smaller plant.

## **7 Workgroup Reports**

3658. None.

## **8 Industry Consultations**

**a) GC0063: Power Available**

3659. RW noted that it is out for consultation currently and closes on 7 April 2014.

**b) GC0076: Rapid Voltage Changes**

3660. GS noted that the draft consultation was discussed at the last Panel and is under development to incorporate comments received. The consultation will be published shortly.

**c) GC0077: Suppression of Sub Synchronous Resonance from Series Compensators**

3661. GS noted that the draft consultation was discussed at the last Panel and the consultation will be published after GC0076 in either late March or early April in order to stagger the consultations.

**d) GC0050: Demand Control**

3662. IK noted that the report had been sent to the Authority.

3663. MK commented that DNOs have some more work to do on this as there is a gap in the Grid Code and D Code in terms of the so-called Independent Distribution Network Operators.

**e) GC0042: Information on Small Embedded Power Stations and Impact on Demand.**

3664. GS noted that this is currently out for consultation in conjunction with the DCRP and closes on 25 March 2014. GS added that the main affected parties are DNOs and small generators as they have to exchange more information.

## **9 Progress Tracker**

3665. ER asked the Panel to note the Progress Tracker that was circulated. The Panel had no further comments.

## **9 Pending Authority Decisions**

3666. RJ noted that GC0068 Grid Code New and Revised Unit Data and Instructions had been approved by the Authority with an agreed split implementation date of 1 July 2014 for changes to the Reactive Power and Frequency Response Fax Forms in BC2 and the remaining changes to be implemented in line with the go-live date of EBS.

## **10 Standing Items**

### **a) European Network Codes**

3667. IP noted that pp14/22 the ACER update on the European Network Codes was circulated to the Panel.

### **d) Joint European Standing Group**

3668. IP noted that pp14/23 the JESG headline report was circulated to the Panel

### **e) ECCAF**

3669. IP noted that pp14/24 the ECCAF headline report was circulated to the Panel and that the next meeting is scheduled 27 March 2014.

3670. IP also noted that pp14/35 had been circulated regarding the ECCAF structure.

## **11 Impact of Other Code Modification or Developments**

3671. A codes summary, pp14/25, was circulated to the Panel.

## **12 Any Other Business**

3672. The group thanked John Morris for his 10 year period on the Panel and for his positive and helpful contributions over this time.

## **13 Next Meeting**

3673. The next meeting is planned for 21 May 2014.