

Minutes

Meeting name	Grid Code Review Panel
Meeting number	74
Date of meeting	15 July 2015
Time	10:00am – 3:00pm
Location	National Grid House, Warwick.

Attendees

Name	Role	Initials	Company
Ian Pashley	Chair	IP	National Grid
Alex Thomason	Code Administrator	AT	National Grid
Julian Wayne	Authority Member	JW	Ofgem
Andy Vaudin	Large Generator (>3GW) Member	AV	EDF Energy
Alastair Frew	Large Generator (>3GW) Member	AF	Scottish Power
Philip Jenner	Large Generator (<3GW) Member	PJ	Horizon Nuclear Power
Guy Nicholson	Generators with Novel Units Member	GN	Element Power
Kyle Martin	Generator (Small and/or Medium) Alternate	KM	EnergyUK
Steve Cox	Network Operator (E&W) Member	SC	ENW
Alan Creighton	Network Operator (E&W) Member	AC	Northern Powergrid
Richard Lowe	Transmission Licensee (SHE Transmission) Member	RL	SHE Transmission
Alan Kelly	Transmission Licensee (SP Transmission) Member	AK	Scottish Power
Robert Longden	Suppliers	RLo	Cornwall Energy
Graham Stein	NGET Member	GS	National Grid
Audrey Ramsey	NGET Member	AR	National Grid
Rob Wilson	NGET Member	RW	National Grid
Richard Woodward	NGET Member	RJW	National Grid
Campbell McDonald	Large Generator (>3GW) Alternate	CMD	SSE Generation
Guy Phillips	Large Generator (>3GW) Member	GP	E.ON
Richard Lavender	NGET Advisor	RLa	National Grid
Franklin Rodrick	NGET Presenter	FR	National Grid
Richard Ierna	NGET Presenter	RI	National Grid
Alastair Ferguson	SPT Presenter	AFe	Scottish Power
Honor Hynes	Observer	HH	National Grid

Apologies

Name	Role	Initials	Company
Alan Barlow	Non Embedded Customers Alternate	AB	Magnox
Sigrid Bolik	Generators with Novel Units Alternate	SB	Repower
Tom Davies	Non Embedded Customers Member	TD	Magnox
John Norbury	Large Generator (>3GW) Member	JN	RWE
Marta Krajewska	Generator (Small and/or Medium) Member	MKr	Energy UK
Gordon Kelly	Network Operator (Scot.) Member	GK	Scottish Power
Ivan Kileff	NGET Member	IK	National Grid
Jim Barrett	Large Generator (>3GW) Alternate	JB	Centrica
Tom McCartan	Externally Interconnected System Operators Member	TM	SONI
Nick Rubin	BSC Panel Member	NR	ELEXON

1 Introductions & Apologies

4078. Apologies were received from AB, SB, TD, JN, MKr, GK, IK, JB, TM and NR.

2 Approval of Minutes

a) May 2015 GCRP Minutes

4079. Comments were received from JW, JN and RL. The minutes were approved by the Panel.

ACTION: AT to upload minutes onto the National Grid website

3 Review of Actions

a) Summary of Actions

4080. AT noted that there were four actions outstanding on the Actions Log, but that the actions relating to minutes 3994, 4030 and 4047 were all covered by items on the meeting agenda. **Minute 4072: GCDF and Open Governance.** AT provided an update to explain that there would not be much change to the GCDF under Open Governance, other than possibly the name of the forum. The Open Governance proposals envisage an “advisory forum” where issues could be developed. It would not be mandatory to take new modifications to the forum – stakeholders could take issues directly to the Panel if they wished to. AT noted that the GCDF is in its infancy and is based on agenda items raised by stakeholders.

4081. CMD asked whether all of the actions had been completed in relation to the Scottish Standards. AT noted that all three actions that had been recorded by the GCRP were complete but that in addition to those, AFe would be presenting Scottish Power’s proposed revised Electrical Standards later in the agenda.

4 Grid Code Process Overview

a) Issues Paper Template

4082. RJW explained the origin of action 3994 which arose from the GC0063 Lessons Learned presentation and required a ‘terms of reference’ template for a standard Workgroup to be produced. RJW explained that he had expanded the action to include a wider end to end review of the modification process including the documentation that is used throughout the process. RJW noted that he had also provided a draft ‘Issues Paper’ template for the GCRP’s review.

4083. RJW ran through his initial thoughts in conducting the end to end review, noting that the Grid Code is a highly technical document. He made reference to the ongoing GC0086 Open Governance Workgroup but commented that the existing process could still be reviewed and updated for best practice prior to GC0086 concluding. RJW presented a list of process improvements that he felt could be addressed. CMD asked whether there were any thoughts on prioritising issues; AT explained that there is nothing in the Grid Code now that would prevent the Panel from prioritising issues and potentially diverting resource from an existing issue onto a new one raised, if the Panel felt that were appropriate. CMD commented that there are a number of issues which have been parked due to limited resources or external factors, such as awaiting implementation of European Network Codes.

4084. RJW asked the GCRP whether they felt a wider process review was appropriate, CMD responded that he felt the Workgroup process needed to be looked at. RJW went on to present a revised Issues Paper template. RL suggested that the use of “succinct” in RJW narrative was a more appropriate term for a proposal than “precise” as used in the written paper, noting that one of the issues RJW had identified is making the Grid Code accessible to all parties, which might require greater explanation. JW commented that the detail is needed, but that a summary is useful. RLo noted that precisely describing the defect is difficult for the

Grid Code, as the paper is used to raise an “issue”, rather than a “defect”. RJW acknowledged that the Issues Paper has multiple uses. RJW ran through the revised template at a high level, noting the use of tick boxes to guide the user through the form. CMD commented that there was no reference to European Network Codes in the revised template; RJW suggested that the ‘European Law’ option under the “How has the issue originated?” section could be used. CMD suggested flagging European Code interaction earlier on in the process would be helpful. RJW asked GCRP members for comments on the proposed revised form by return.

4085. AC asked whether there was a current version of the Issue Paper form and asked for a link to it to be circulated to the GCRP. IP asked Panel Members to provide comments to CMD. AV asked whether, in an open governance world, the same form could be used. RJW noted that the form would need to be revised again, as certain elements of open governance such as Fast Track Self-Governance, would need different documentation.

ACTION: GCRP members to provide comments on Issues Paper template to RJW
ACTION: AT to circulate link to current Issues Paper template to GCRP members.

b) Workgroup Terms of Reference Template

4086. FR introduced the proposed revised template for a standard set of Workgroup terms of reference. GP observed that a Workgroup Report should list who the Workgroup members are and the level of support for the proposals. GN commented that some Workgroups have a large membership at the start of the process, citing GC0087 as an example, which dwindles once the Workgroup’s terms of reference are finalised and as time progresses.

ACTION: FR to update Workgroup Report template to include Attendance Register and level of support for the proposal.

4087. CMD noted that currently, when a Workgroup has been running for a year, only a verbal update is given to the GCRP and that the proposed change to the Workgroup Terms of Reference template would require a written update. GP suggested that a presentation should be given at the anniversary meeting, rather than a written report. JW asked what problem was trying to be fixed with the introduction of a written report; GN responded that it was due to a historical Workgroup which had been running for 5 years. IP summarised that the Workgroup Chair should attend the GCRP on the anniversary of a Workgroup to explain the defect the Workgroup was set up to address, the current status, progress and when the Workgroup should conclude and that at present GCRP could require a written report of progress if this was felt to add value.

ACTION: GCRP to provide comments on the draft Workgroup Term of Reference
ACTION: RJW to continue wider review of end to end modification process

5 New Grid Code Development Issues

a) Demand Connection Code (DCC) Workgroup

4088. FR gave the background to the European connection codes, noting that the Requirements for Generators (RfG) code has just been voted on at a European level and that the DCC is anticipated to be voted on in September or October 2015. FR proposed to set up a joint GCRP/DCRP workgroup for GB implementation of the DCC as had been put in place for RfG implementation, and to start in around September 2015. FR noted that a GB stakeholder workshop had been held with DECC and Ofgem on the issues affecting GB and that DECC will feed those back at a European level. JW commented on a statement in page two of the Issues Paper about applicability of the DCC to existing distribution networks, noting that there is still ambiguity in this area. JW also had comments on the proposed terms of reference, noting that the reporting lines seem to conflict; IP agreed and responded that National Grid would be seeking approval from the DCRP to set up the joint Workgroup. JW commented on the scope of the Workgroup, noting that there were no references to the Distribution Code and asked whether there should be. IP acknowledged this omission and responded that the terms of reference would be updated to include Distribution Code matters.

4089. AV asked how the three Grid Code workgroups related to the European Connection Codes would be coordinated overall, in terms of potentially having multiple versions of the Grid Code. AF felt that the three workgroups should be able to seek coherent solutions where common requirements existed. IP suggested updating the terms of reference to specify the need for coordination.

ACTION: FR to seek approval from DCRP to establish DCC Workgroup

ACTION: FR to update Workgroup Terms of Reference for HVDC, DCC and RfG

4090. KM asked whether the Smart Energy Code could have representation on the DCC Workgroup and offered to provide contact details to National Grid for a representative to attend. GS asked when the DCC Workgroup was proposed to be set up, noting that the next DCRP meeting is on 3rd September. RW responded that both Workgroups (DCC and HVDC) are proposed to be set up from September or October 2015, after Entry into Force; the codes should have two years from that point for GB implementation. GN raised a concern that the Workgroups could be set up and then sit inactive as happened for the RfG. RW responded that he felt there was value in setting the Workgroups up now as had been proven by the work carried out to date by the RfG workgroup which had allowed various complex issues to be progressed and with the intent of allowing Users the maximum time between completion of implementation and compliance in which to reflect updated requirements in equipment specifications.

b) HVDC Workgroup

4091. RJW presented an Issue Paper and accompanying Terms of Reference to the Panel for the set-up of a Workgroup to progress GB implementation of the HVDC European Network Code. RJW noted that the proposed HVDC Workgroup would be initially under the governance of the GCRP only, but that there may be impacts on the STC and SQSS. It was originally expected that the HVDC code would be voted on in Europe in July 2015, but this has now been put back to September 2015.

c) EDL/EDT Housekeeping Change

4092. AR explained that IK had reviewed the Grid Code for use of terms relating to EDL and EDT and was asking for the proposed revisions to go straight to consultation. GP had a query in relation to the Interface Standard, noting that the Issues Paper stated that it had been amended but that colleagues had been unable to find the revised standard. GP also asked whether the MODIS specification could be included in the Interface Standard and noted that the Interface Standard appeared to have been updated without following the Electrical Standards approval process.

4093. IP asked JW whether Ofgem would be comfortable with National Grid submitting a report to the Authority, having consulted with the GCRP during the July meeting, rather than conducting a full industry consultation process.

ACTION: JW to let NGET know Ofgem's views on submitting a Report to the Authority for the EDL/EDT housekeeping changes

ACTION: AR to report back to September 2015 GCRP on the inclusion of MODIS within the Interface Standard and the process followed to update the Standard

d) Grid Code Requirements relating to 220kV equipment

4094. GS noted that two papers had been circulated on this issue and that NGET's proposed approach was to do nothing at this point in time. GS explained the background that 220kV subsea cables were being used in SHE Transmission's Kintyre to Hunterston connection and that the Grid Code does not currently include a reference to 220kV equipment. GS proposes to keep a watching brief on the SQSS work which is considering the requirement for any changes. GP asked how the TOs came to the decision on using 220kV equipment and the impact on users. RL gave some background information, noting that the driver for using 220kV is due to the need to optimise the sizing of the subsea cables to deliver the required capacity of the link with the most efficient and cost effective design. RL noted it was a £200m

project and the design had been looked at from an efficiency and cost effective perspective. Subsea cable technology for operation up to 220kV has developed due to this being a European standard system operating voltage, and is capable of delivering higher power transfers per cable than 132kV. For the purposes of the Grid Code, it was not intended as a connection for new users. GP thanked RL for the explanation. The Kintyre cables have an operational voltage range of +/- 10% which is consistent with GB standards as they apply to existing 132kV and 275kV infrastructure. GP asked to what extent the Grid Code had been considered when the decision regarding the appropriate technical solution had been made – JW was not aware from an Ofgem perspective, but offered to find out. IP summarised GP's questions as wondering how future changes might be anticipated.

ACTION: JW to check whether Ofgem considered Grid Code in their decision making process.

4095. RL noted that the TO could have asked questions regarding code changes earlier in the process, but given the similarity of the proposed design with the existing operational voltage capability of 132kV and 275kV equipment, this was not regarded as a major issue, and felt that it was appropriate for use of new operating voltages to be dealt with on a case by case basis. AV noted that NGET as SO should have also signed off the design. GS responded that responsibility for design sits with the TO. GP reiterated his concern that the issue had been raised to the SQSS and Grid Code, via the GCRP, late in the process and that it was fortunate that the impact in this case was low. AFe noted that the Scottish Power standards includes a 220kV in their revised standards – AFe asked whether there is a process to consider, e.g. HVDC assets, which are on land and rated at 600kV. CMD suggested that this issue may come up again in the future in relation to European Network Codes, where voltages at 110kV are relevant. GN asked whether there are any European impacts in terms of introducing a new voltage into the Grid Code. RW responded that he was not aware of any impact, as the division was at 110kV. The Panel confirmed that it was happy with GS' proposed approach to keep a watching brief.

e) System to System Intertrip

4096. GN presented the background to his Issue Paper, noting that two CUSC Modification Proposals had already been raised. Tullymurdoch is an embedded generator which has signed a Bilateral Embedded Generator Agreement (BEGA). GN noted that the offer made to Tullymurdoch, which included a one-off charge, was accepted, due to timing issues related to ROC deadlines. GN explained the power flows on the SHET network which required the use of a system to system intertrip to prevent through flow on part of the network. AF asked how the windfarm is affected by the intertrip. GN responded that the windfarm is not affected and not tripped by the intertrip, but the issue is that the user has been issued with a one-off charge. RL noted that the windfarm is implicated as it increases the pre-fault load on the network. AF asked whether, if the windfarm was not on the network would the network still need to be split. RL responded that the windfarm has driven the need for reinforcement. RLo confirmed his understanding that the windfarm would not be tripped off if the intertrip was used; GN agreed this was correct. AR questioned whether, in that case, this was an intertrip scheme at all or more accurately a post-fault automatic switching scheme.
4097. AF noted that operational intertripping is defined in the SQSS and refers to tripping off generation or demand. GN responded that he had looked at the one-off charge in the CUSC and followed the definitions set out in the CUSC and Grid Code, including GB-ECM-01. GN explained his proposed changes to the codes, including new text in Section 14 of the CUSC in relation to charging for one-offs. To support this, GN proposes a new category 5 Intertripping scheme which would be defined in the Grid Code.
4098. RW asked whether the one-off charge is due to the intertripping scheme or due to the works being brought forward. GN responded that a one-off charge is not explicitly defined within the CUSC and can be levied for whatever is included within the Appendix B of a User's agreement. GP commented that his understanding was that the assessment made by the TO for a one-off charge was that a TO was unable to allocate the costs to either CAPEX or OPEX. CMD noted that he did not support the approach of including Category 5 within the Grid Code due to future implications.

4099. GN concluded his presentation by asking the GCRP to send the issue to industry consultation. GP shared CMD's concerns about introducing a new category of intertrip which raises uncertainty about how the charges would be levied in future. GP felt that the charging provisions should be understood before a Grid Code change is proposed. IP made a suggestion, based on concerns raised, that the Grid Code changes could be discussed alongside the CUSC issues. AF, CMD and RLo all noted that the SQSS interaction should also be considered alongside the CUSC and Grid Code issues. IP asked AT whether it would be feasible for a Grid Code representative to attend the CUSC Workgroup meeting. AT responded that it would, but that the CUSC Workgroup's terms of reference would need to be adjusted to allow for a broader scope of work. AT noted that the first CUSC Workgroup meeting is currently planned for Friday, 17th July 2015. IP proposed that the CUSC Workgroup's terms of reference be extended to include Grid Code and SQSS impacts.
- ACTION: IP to ask the CUSC Panel to extend the CUSC Workgroup (CMP245/246) terms of reference to include Grid Code and SQSS issues**

f) SPT Electrical Standards

4100. IP introduced AFe from Scottish Power, who noted that the SP Electrical Standards were out of date as they had originally been created at BETTA and the published versions are around 10 years old. There were 7 documents in the suite of Electrical Standards, this has been reduced to 6 by merging two documents. AFe explained that the changes proposed were not considered fundamental, although they do include references to 220kV equipment, which had produced discussion earlier during the GCRP meeting.
4101. AFe ran through the presentation slides, showing the changes proposed to each of the Standards. AF noted that the references to frequency requirements used in the SPT standards are different to the Grid Code requirements and that the Grid Code asks for a wider and longer period than the proposed SPT standards. AFe proposed to review the requirements.
4102. AFe noted the proposed changes to BETTA-11-003; CMD queried the lack of references to European standards in the document. AFe noted that there is the potential to include reference to thousands of documents in the Electrical Standards, however this was not practical. CMD asked why the SHET and NGET standards needed to be different to SPT's. AFe responded that the systems are different and the fault levels are different, for example, a 275 to 33kV connection is routine in Scotland, but unusual in England & Wales. RL explained that SHET's proposed approach was to review each standard to understand why they were different, rather than just using the NGTS and rebranding them. AFe agreed and noted that there are very distinct differences between the systems and therefore the standards required.
4103. AFe commented that BETTA-11-04 was reformatted but had no other significant changes made to it. BETTA-11-006 is the amalgamation of two documents (11-006 and 11-007), but very little other changes have been made to them. BETTA-11-008 replaces references to NGTS with references to Scottish Power's internal documents and also refers to ENA resilience requirements. AFe invited comments from the GCRP. GN noted that previously the industry had not wanted the whole range of NG standards if they were not relevant to the users and the user interface. GN asked how many of the SPT standards were relevant to users. AFe responded that SPT does have its own standards and that it is right to make these visible to users. AFe hopes that the documents give enough information regarding what is expected at the interface point and that previously this had not been the case. AFe explained that the SPT documents are effectively a summary of a large number of other documents.
4104. IP summarised the issues that had brought the standards to the Panel, noting that the National Grid standards had undergone a period of review and that the requirement was for the standards to be fit for purpose. IP asked the Panel how it wished to proceed with the proposed SPT standards. GS explained that the process states that the if there is broad consensus among the GCRP, then National Grid approves the standards and that if there is not, the standards would be taken to a Workgroup. CMD suggested that it would be efficient to do the SHET standards at the same time, he also questioned why there are multiple

standards and regional differences ten years after BETTA. AFe responded that there are valid regional differences to be taken into account. RL agreed that the two sets of standards should be looked at together, including any differences between the two, to understand the implications on users. CMD asked whether SHET's workshop would consider changes to the standards after the Workshop; RL agreed that SHET would and proposed to bring something back to the September 2015 GCRP meeting, whether a revised set of standards or an explanation of progress.

4105. JW asked whether there is a longer-term issue and asked what GB should be aiming for, noting that having separate standards because you had regional differences was a self-fulfilling prophecy – the regional differences would continue which would in turn justify the continuation of separate standards. GP suggested that there is a two-stage process; the first is to have an up to date set of Scottish Standards and the second is to think about having one single set of standards for GB. IP suggested that the SHET and SPT processes could be reviewed during the same timeframe.

ACTION: SHE Transmission and SP Transmission to report back to September GCRP meeting on progress with reviewing consistency of the standards with the Grid Code

6 Existing Grid Code Development Issues

a) GC0023: Protection Fault Clearance Times and Back-Up Protection

4106. FR gave an update on progress with GC0023, noting that an action had been given previously to hold a workshop. The proposed legal text has since been circulated to interested parties and comments have been received including from JN and PJ who felt that the need for a workshop had been mitigated. FR proposed now to draft an Industry Consultation to include the revised legal text and to circulate it to GCRP members for 3 weeks for comment prior to issuing it directly for consultation.

ACTION: FR to circulate draft Industry Consultation to GCRP members for comment

7 Workgroups in Progress

a) GC0048: European Network Codes – RfG Implementation

4107. RW provided an update on the GC0048 Workgroup, which will be holding a two day code mapping session for RfG on 20th/21st July now that it is in its final version. This will be used to draft a task register to populate another level of detail in the project plan. The workgroup will also be trying again to progress banding threshold proposals for consultation. CMD asked whether the terms of reference for the RfG Workgroup needed to be updated in light of the final version of the code being published. RW agreed that he would be reviewing them. AK asked which codes the RfG would be mapped against. RW responded that it would be mainly the Grid Code and the Distribution Code but also supporting documents such as G59 and G83 and other relevant British Standards. PJ asked whether the workgroup's remit included setting parameters, RW responded that it does and that there is a process of national implementation that needs to be gone through. RW noted that the steer from workgroup members at the beginning of the process was to go for minimal possible change from current GB arrangements.

b) GC0062: Fault Ride Through

4108. GS noted that there is a meeting on 29th July which will look at a first draft of the Workgroup Report. The legal text proposed is fairly extensive and the Report will also be fairly lengthy. CMD commented that there is part of the Workgroup's terms of reference that he is not entirely comfortable with and its interaction with the GC0048 Workgroup.

ACTION: GS/RW to coordinate GC0048/GC0062 Workgroup terms of reference to ensure they remain fit for purpose

c) GC0086: Grid Code Open Governance

4109. AT provided an update on progress of the GC0086 Workgroup, noting that a meeting would be held on 17th July 2015 to finalise the original proposal and associated legal text, consider a potential alternative option raised by one of the Workgroup Members and to finalise the Industry Consultation document. AT noted the key differences in the proposed alternative are for no independent chair, no self-governance process and for the workgroup consultation to not be mandatory. The next steps will be to update the draft Industry Consultation document on the basis of the final workgroup discussions and circulate it to GCRP members for review, then seek to run the consultation hopefully prior to the September GCRP meeting. AT agreed to confirm the timeline and process for future Panel elections at the September panel meeting.
4110. CMD asked whether there was anything relevant in the recently published CMA report that needed to be taken into account. AT responded that the findings so far have been more general and at a higher level, but that the recent Ofgem consultation on Code Governance Review post-implementation review might be more applicable in the shorter term. AT explained that among the Ofgem proposals were suggestions for Independent workgroup chairs and the need for Panel members to act independently. AT noted that more might be known after an Ofgem workshop on Code Governance Review on 22nd July 2015.

d) GC0087: Development of Grid Code Frequency Response Provisions

4111. GS noted that Centrica had raised a point during the first meeting that the Workgroup's scope prevented it from addressing significant frequency control issues. The terms of reference were challenged by the Workgroup who wanted to include anything related to frequency response in the RfG code. The next Workgroup meeting is scheduled for 10th August 2015 at which the terms of reference will be reviewed to decide where the work best sits, whether in the GC0087 or the GC0048 Workgroups. AV noted that two aspects became apparent at the first Workgroup meeting, that nothing would change within the next two years as the Grid Code is not amended retrospectively and that a problem statement had not been defined for the GC0087 Workgroup, other than to set parameters for the RfG.
4112. GS disagreed with AV that the GC0087 workgroup had not identified a defect and commented that the Workgroup meeting had not had time to discuss the defect identified and that this would be discussed during the second Workgroup meeting. AV imagined that the Workgroup membership will reduce dramatically after the first meeting as the first meeting had been more like a Workshop to set the scope of the Workgroup. GS noted that the Workgroup was due to conclude by January 2016, but that this was unlikely to happen. AF considered that all the RfG issues related to frequency should be dealt with by GC0087 as the same people need to be involved no matter which group looks at it.

8 Workgroup Reports

GC0075: Hybrid Static Compensators

4113. IP welcomed RI to the GCRP to present the Workgroup Report on GC0075. RI explained the issues raised by the TOs, the SO, developers, manufacturers and generators. RI noted that the Workgroup carried out a survey of manufacturers to assess costs, many of the manufacturers cited a zero increase in costs, but one developer had questioned this, particularly for smaller sites.
4114. RI explained the Workgroup's discussions around the cost benefit analysis and the conclusion that improving the performance of the switches is the best outcome. RI noted comments received from RWE on the Workgroup Report, relating to an existing anomaly in the Grid Code Connection Conditions, which could be interpreted in different ways. RWE proposed to amend the Grid Code to provide clarity on the interpretation of CC.A.7.2.3.1(ii) and (iv). After further discussion with interested parties, variants of (ii) and (iv) were developed and agreed with RWE. AF asked whether this was included in the version of the Workgroup Report

circulated to GCRP members; RI confirmed that it was not. GP asked whether the proposed change would remove the need for Annex 7 in the Workgroup Report; RI agreed that it would. RI summarised the conclusions of the Workgroup, including a range of views as to whether the proposal should be implemented.

4115. RI asked the GCRP to approve the Workgroup Report and progress GC0075 to Industry Consultation. AF commented that the legal text was confusing and asked whether the clause CC.A.7.2.3.2 would remain in the legal text in the form presented in the report. He also asked for clarity on the text regarding what an “event” is and noted that it needed to be more clearly defined. RI explained that the Workgroup’s approach to this aspect of the legal text had been the subject of lengthy discussion. AF suggested that the 90% of unity to 0.95 needs to be included in the legal text. GS proposed to take the legal text back to the Workgroup to get them to agree a final version that does not require any additional explanation.

4116. GN requested that an attendance register be included in the Workgroup Report and the Workgroup’s views be summarised in the report as he had received comments from users and it was difficult to know whether or how to address these without additional information. GN asked for an issue from 2011 to be referenced in the Workgroup Report. GN also asked whether what happens when the plant is not on the system had been taken into consideration.

ACTION: GS to get GC0075 Workgroup to review and agree legal text that does not require additional clarification

ACTION: GS to produce an Industry Consultation for GC0075 to include a summary of Workgroup views on the proposals, an attendance register and updated legal text

9 Industry Consultations

GC0028: Constant Terminal Voltage

4117. GS noted that GC0028 is out for consultation and closes on 10th August 2015.

10 Reports to the Authority

4118. There were no Reports to the Authority.

11 Progress Tracker

4119. IP noted that the Progress Tracker had been circulated.

12 Pending Authority Decisions

4120. JW noted that GC0076 Rapid Voltage Changes had been submitted to the Authority on 10th July 2015.

4121. JW raised two other issues for consideration by the GCRP. The first was that GC0042 was approved in 2014 and requires additional information to be submitted in Week 24 data from 2015 onwards. RW responded that the data in question is not required to be submitted until Week 28, which was the week before the Panel meeting, but noted that not all DNOs had yet submitted the data required. The quality of the data submissions had not yet been reviewed by NGET. RW asked SC to prompt DNOs to provide the data.

ACTION: SC to remind DNOs to provide Week 24 data

4122. The second issue relates to the way that code changes are evaluated where there are multiple code changes being investigated in response to a single problem (JW gave the example of the various workgroups responding to increasing system ROCOF). The current approach is to assess the cost of the changes individually against the cost of managing the problem. JW’s concern was that this approach double/triple counted the cost of managing the

cause of the problem as that whole cost was assessed against each change mod. JW proposed that the true reflective way is to assess the total cost of all the changes against the cost of managing the cause. RLo agreed with JW and asked how this fed into the System Operability Framework (SOF) work that NGET was leading on. GS responded that things can only be incorporated into the cost benefit analysis that are known about. GP agreed with RLo in that he thought the SOF would be looking at this issue. GN noted that the Operational Forum was dealing with this kind of issue but not in the same way as the GCRP and there is a question about how these forums work together. JW asked for this to be discussed at a future GCRP meeting. GP noted that the SOF had been presented to an earlier GCRP meeting. RW summarised that there was a balance to be found between progressing individual issues and seeking joined up solutions, although this could only be based on current knowledge.

ACTION: IP to invite SOF to be discussed at September GCRP meeting

13 Standing Items

a) European Network Codes

4123. IP noted the documents circulated to the Panel.

b) Joint European Stakeholder Group

4124. IP noted that the JESG Headline Report was circulated to the Panel.

c) Grid Code Development Forum

4125. IP noted that the GCDF Headline Report was circulated to the Panel. RW commented that the next meeting is on 12th August 2015 and asked for any agenda items.

14 Impact of other Code Modifications or Developments

4126. IP noted that the Codes Summary document was circulated to the Panel.

15 Any Other Business

a) CACOP Principle 13

4127. AT noted that the final draft of CACOP Principle 13 that is proposed to be send to Ofgem for implementation had been circulated to the Panel. There were no comments on the final draft.

b) CACOP Annual Review 2015

4128. AT also noted that National Grid is the coordinator for the 2015 Annual CACOP Review and that a draft letter had been circulated to the GCRP. There were no comments on the draft letter.

c) EBS

4129. CMD asked for an update on EBS, noting that a meeting was due to have been held on 16th June and that no update had been received since. AT responded that following the last Panel meeting, an email had been circulated inviting GCRP members to sign up to an EBS Stakeholder distribution list and that that group had received an email including the latest EBS Newsletter in June. CMD had not received that update.

ACTION: Add all GCRP members to EBS distribution list.

18 Next Meeting

4130. The next meeting is planned for 16th September 2015 at National Grid House, Warwick.