

Minutes

Meeting name	Grid Code Review Panel
Meeting number	73
Date of meeting	20 May 2015
Time	10:00am – 3:00pm
Location	National Grid House, Warwick.

Attendees

Name	Role	Initials	Company
Ian Pashley	Chair	PH	National Grid
Alex Thomason	Code Administrator	AT	National Grid
Julian Wayne	Authority Member	JW	Ofgem
Mayure Daby	Authority Alternate	MD	Ofgem
John Norbury	Large Generator (>3GW) Member	JN	RWE
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
Marta Krajewska	Generator (Small and/or Medium) Member	MKr	Energy UK
Mike Kay	Network Operator (E&W) Member	MK	ENW
Richard Lowe	Transmission Licensee (SHE Transmission) Member	RL	SHE Transmission
Gordon Kelly	Network Operator (Scot.) Member	GK	Scottish Power
Robert Longden	Suppliers	RLo	Cornwall Energy
Graham Stein	NGET Member	GS	National Grid
Ivan Kileff	NGET Member	IK	National Grid
Rob Wilson	NGET Member	RW	National Grid
Jim Barrett	Large Generator (>3GW) Alternate	JB	Centrica
Campbell McDonald	Large Generator (>3GW) Alternate	CMD	SSE Generation
Guy Phillips	Large Generator (>3GW) Member	GP	E.ON
Tom McCartan	Externally Interconnected System Operators Member	TM	SONI
Nick Rubin	BSC Panel Member	NR	ELEXON
Richard Lavender	NGET Advisor	RLa	National Grid
Mark Perry	NGET Presenter	MP	National Grid
Franklin Rodrick	NGET Presenter	FR	National Grid
Richard Price	NGET Presenter	RP	National Grid
Antonio del Castillo Zas	NGET Presenter	ACS	National Grid
Richard Woodward	NGET Presenter	RJW	National Grid

Apologies

Name	Role	Initials	Company
Alan Barlow	Non Embedded Customers Alternate	AB	Magnox
Sigrid Bolik	Generators with Novel Units Alternate	SB	Repower
Alan Creighton	Network Operator (E&W) Member	AC	Northern Powergrid
Tom Davies	Non Embedded Customers Member	TD	Magnox

1 Introductions & Apologies

4018. Apologies were received from Alan Barlow, Sigrid Bolik, Alan Creighton and Tom Davies. IP confirmed that MK had tendered his resignation from the GCRP and that Steve Cox was attending the meeting as an Observer, with a view to replacing Mike on the GCRP.
4019. JW explained that he was leaving Ofgem to work for RES on energy storage in GB and Ireland. Ofgem is happy that there is no conflict of interest with JW continuing with GCRP work. However it is important that panel members are happy that the Ofgem GCRP representative is impartial and independent, so panel members were asked to raise any concerns with Gareth Evans (Ofgem).

2 Approval of Minutes

a) March 2015 GCRP Minutes

4020. Comments were received from JN, JW, RL and MK. The minutes were approved by the Panel, subject to a discussion on Minute 3973, Governance of Electrical Standards, during which it was agreed to retain the wording in the March minutes. MK summarised the discussions that, once agreed by the GCRP, the Electrical Standards applicable to connections in Scotland would be changed. In reference to minute 3973 of the March 2015 minutes, RL commented that it was not NGET that would require the Scottish TOs to do something; it would be the Authority representative at the GCRP. **Post-meeting note:** GS clarified that it would be NGET who would implement any changes, in line with the Electrical Standards governance process.

ACTION: AT to upload minutes onto the National Grid website

3 Review of Actions

a) Summary of Actions

GC0063: Power Available Lessons Learned

4021. **Minute 3994: Workgroup Best Practice.** RJW confirmed that he is currently considering best practice for Grid Code Workgroups and will report back to the July Panel meeting.

Scottish Electrical Standards

4022. **Minute 3829: SPT and SHE Transmission to update the GCRP on any plans and timescales for reviewing the electrical standards applicable in Scotland.** AT noted that she had circulated a paper from SHE Transmission on progress with the review of the Scottish Standards. RL summarised progress as set out in the paper from SHE Transmission. GK provided an update to the Panel that SPT had completed its review of electrical standards and copied its views to SHE Transmission on 19th May 2015. RL noted that there is a live dialogue between the two Scottish TOs and that an engagement session is proposed to inform the industry. RL confirmed that he intends to report back to the November 2015 GCRP. JN asked for clarification about what standards would be applied in new BCAs while the review work was ongoing. RL responded that there would be a dialogue between SHE Transmission and NGET as customers' connection contracts are with NGET, not SHE Transmission.
4023. JN noted that if only the existing GC Annex standards are being used in BCAs, that should not be an issue but there is a general lack of transparency with the process for Scottish TOs. IP asked for clarity on what action was required. GS noted that there are multiple strands of work ongoing for electrical standards: one is the review of electrical standards and the other is a review of templates for technical appendices for bilateral agreements, for which there is a further meeting planned on 4th June 2015. CMD asked whether JN was asking for the Scottish Standards to be part of the RES (Electrical Standards). JN responded that incorporating the SPT/SHETL standards within the E&W RES would be an ideal outcome – several Panel members confirmed that the suite of Electrical Standards includes the standards applicable in Scotland. The GCRP agreed that in the absence of any changes being formally proposed to Scottish Standards, the existing standards remain in force.

4024. RL agreed to produce a summary of differences between the current and proposed standards, but questioned whether it was best dealt with through the GCRP or through the engagement process set out by SHE Transmission in its note. GK noted that existing set of standards are covered by the RES and are part of the Grid Code. SPT has completed a review of the standards and has proposed some changes, GK was not aware that SPT was proposing to conduct a stakeholder engagement event. GP suggested that to get the most out of a stakeholder session, it would be good for the Scottish TOs to publish a track changed version of the documentation before the workshop. RL noted that detailed change version documentation was probably not efficient or practical, but that a good overview could be provided to advise proposed changes ahead of a workshop. MK suggested that NGET has a role in coordinating the review process and that governance of the standards should also be covered in the workshop.

Action: Scottish TOs to arrange a stakeholder workshop

4025. **Minute 3973: GS to update the Electrical Standards summary document with a process flow diagram.** AT noted that an updated summary note including a process flow diagram was circulated with Panel papers. Action closed.

4026. **Minute 3973: RW to arrange update of the process flow diagram in the Grid Code summary document to include the Electrical Standards.** RW to submit by the end of the week for publication.

4027. **Minute 3980: Circulate revised technical appendices templates to GCRP members.** GS confirmed that this had been done, however as GCRP members did not recall having seen it, AT will recirculate the documents.

ACTION: AT to recirculate the technical appendix templates to GCRP members

4 GC0038: Electricity Balancing System Group

a) Multi-Shaft Modelling (MSM)

4028. RJW presented the slides that were circulated to GCRP prior to the meeting. The slides contained a brief overview of the issues relating to MSM and were presented to the first GCDF meeting on 13th April 2015. At GCDF, a consensus was reached that inefficiencies existed, but that this was so intrinsically linked to implementation of the Electricity Balancing System that it could not be taken forward in isolation. The GCDF concluded not to pursue MSM further at this stage, but wait until the EBS was nearer to completion. RW noted that NGET would be happy to take something forward if generators wanted this, however it was not clear that that desire existed. JB asked what the defect is, RJW responded that there are limited options for the NETSO being able to model true MW availability and response from multi-shaft generator units, as they are treated as a single BMU.

4029. IK gave an example of a multi shaft unit (e.g. a CCGT) running overnight, where NGET might want to take off one of the units, but there is no clear way of transmitting that requirement through the existing systems, so a fax workaround is required and used. RW clarified that this would arise where a CCGT has multiple gas turbines supplying one or more heat recovery boilers and steam turbines and NGET wants to take off just one of the gas turbines. CMD expressed a view that flexibility is valuable during a summer minimum crisis. IP clarified that NGET is not prevented from doing this, but that the systems prevent it happening in a slick manner and this also affects generator pricing for Bids/Offers. IK noted that the information transmitted in the faxes is published. IP asked whether the GCRP were comfortable with this approach, no further comments were received, so it was agreed that the MSM subgroup would close until further notice.

b) EBS Sub-Groups

4030. RJW introduced ACZ to talk through consideration of existing EBS subgroups. ACZ explained that the EBS group was created under GC0038 to address changes required to the Grid Code resulting from the EBS. The EBS changes have been delivered, therefore the EBS Group currently has no activity. However, the EBS IT Subgroup is still operational, talking about test schedules for EDL and EDT, EDL* and EDT*. The group meets every 3 months, which may change to a higher frequency nearer to EBS go-live. There is also an

EBS MSM Subgroup which was agreed to be put on hold in line with the previous agenda item. ACZ noted that the GCRP was previously reluctant to close GC0038 for EBS as industry participants felt it provided a route to information on EBS progress and that the GCRP felt they were blind to proceedings in the EBS IT subgroup. ACZ therefore proposed to extend the scope of the EBS IT Subgroup to become an EBS stakeholder liaison group. ACZ also asked the GCRP to close the EBS Group until it may be required for further Grid Code changes and the EBS MSM group until EBS is commissioned. ACZ noted that the EBS IT Subgroup is currently under the governance of the EBS Group, however, ACZ is proposing to close the EBS Group so the EBS IT Subgroup would no longer be under GCRP governance through this route.

4031. JN noted that the IT Subgroup was originally convened for the IT experts to discuss what was required to deliver the service. JN considered that the business process issues needed to be taken out of the IT subgroup and considered separately. CMD supported this approach. ACZ responded that in principle he agrees, although he is not an IT person but chairs the meeting. The IT subgroup meetings usually include an overall update on the project; a review of the project plan and discuss scheduling of the connectivity tests. There may be specific IT questions, but there are also questions on business impacts. ACZ is trying to combine the external communications in one meeting to be more effective, rather than smaller meetings on just one topic. IP asked the GCRP whether they agreed that the time was right to move the focus to the remaining IS and business process implementation issues and that this sits outside GCRP. JN responded that he was concerned that the purpose of the IT subgroup was being diluted and that the IT experts attending that meeting from users would not necessarily be in a position to engage in a meaningful dialogue with NGET on business processes. In response to the question on applicability, JN felt that it was relevant business for the GCRP as the Grid Code BC1 makes users effectively liable for any failure of communications facilities. IP suggested that one forum could be dealt with in two parts – one for IT and one for business processes. CMD raised a concern that the IT subgroup would not be best placed to do everything that needs to be done.
4032. IK noted that EBS is the National Grid system for despatching the system and that EDL and EDT were the interfaces from EBS to Generators. Consequently Generators would not directly see EBS, so there should be minimal change to their business processes. IP asked again whether the GCRP is the best place for discussions on the EBS IT Subgroup. JN responded that he did not feel that the GCRP could wash its hands of the EBS implementation due to the Grid Code requirements. JN suggested a forum be established via an email distribution list for Users' business process representatives. The GCRP agreed to close the EBS Group and the EBS MSM group, to continue the EBS IT Subgroup and to establish a general EBS stakeholder group, via an email distribution list.
ACTION: ACZ to establish a distribution list for an EBS stakeholder group
ACTION: AT to recirculate the invitation to the next EBS IT meeting
4033. NR noted that the EBS pages of the NGET website do not appear to have been updated since December 2014. ACZ responded that an update was published in March 2015.
4034. GN asked NGET to look at the terms "EDL" and "EDT" as they do not appear to be defined in the Grid Code. IK agreed to look at the use of those terms and the acronyms within the Grid Code.
ACTION: IK to review use of EDL/EDT in the Grid Code

5 MODIS Lessons Learned

4035. RP provided background to NGET's European Transparency Regulation (ETR) project which included the European REMIT regulations and the Market Operation Data Interface System (MODIS). RP noted that the delivery timescales for the regulation were very challenging and affected NGET's ability to choose when to deliver MODIS.
4036. RP explained that ELEXON's role was to publish the data on the BMRS reporting system which was then forwarded to the EMFIP system (the European Transparency platform). CMD asked whether the data provided was new information or information already provided by participants through OC2 of the Grid Code. RP confirmed that it was existing information but that you would have to look quite hard to identify the subset published. IK noted that the OC2 regulations did not satisfy the timing requirement of the ETR and so

could not be used, due to limitations of the TOGA system. RP noted that NGET did comply with the Regulation at go live on 5th January 2015 and that Day 1 outage information for the next 3 years was loaded ahead of 5th January. The new EBSCR project will use MODIS as a platform, it will not be exclusively for transparency information. NGET set up a new GB Local Issuing Office (LIO) for administering the Energy Identification Coding (EIC) Scheme for electricity and gas. In the future, it is proposed that this role may be taken by ELEXON.

4037. RP explained that an external workshop was held by NGET to review the project. Only 5 or 6 parties attended, however a lot of feedback was received which was useful. There were also a number of internal NGET workshops held to cover every aspect of the project. RP noted that he has drafted a detailed 20 page report which will be available to anyone who is interested, within the next few weeks at the following link on NGET's website: <http://www2.nationalgrid.com/UK/Industry-information/Europe/ETR-E-Industry-Workshops/>
4038. The key themes for the review were: Engagement & Involvement; Roles & Responsibilities; Communication; and Planning & Contingency. RP provided a summary of the feedback received for each of the key themes.
4039. Engagement & Involvement: Parties wanted to be able to influence ENTSO-e at the earliest possible stage. RP noted that other forums existed that allowed parties to be able to feed their views to ENTSO-e directly. Comments were received about duplication, asking why outage information had to be submitted via the OC2 and for MODIS. IP noted that the JESG is the right forum to coordinate stakeholders' input into Europe.
4040. Roles & Responsibilities: Parties felt that links between code processes and project start-up activities were not clear and it was not clear to NGET whether all parties were talking to each other and were informed. NGET is proposing to form an NGET/ELEXON Steering Group to coordinate activities more closely.
4041. Communication: NGET needs to make sure it reaches all participants in all organisations, RP noted that this was challenging at times, due to email addresses not working or representatives moving on and not providing contact details for a replacement. RP concluded that in the future a dedicated communications person would be allocated to each relevant project who would be responsible for ensuring regular prompt and structured communications.
4042. Planning & Contingency: RP noted that NGET's first workshop was held in 2013, but feedback suggested this should have been earlier on in the project. NGET took the decision to stop preparatory work after 2010 and restart in 2013 once the Transparency Regulation entered into force. With the benefit of hindsight, as long as the requirements of the regulation were considered to be reasonably stable, NGET could have continued some of the earlier work as this may have not proven entirely wasted.
4043. JN thanked RP for his presentation and noted that there would be many lessons learned that could be applied to the EBS project and hoped that these would be shared. JN asked whether RP anticipated further Grid Code changes being needed to fully fulfil MODIS functionality, e.g. interface standards required for MODIS for users that do not already have it. RP responded that there had been two Grid Code modifications in the area of clarifying how the requirements for GB should be interpreted. In terms of communications, RP did not consider there would be any changes required to the Grid Code, as there are four different options for communicating outage information. If users do not have an existing FTP link, NGET will be happy to set one up for them.
4044. JN also noted that he was not sure that MODIS process was working as it should be. JN explained that he recently changed a value of registered capacity and had notified NGET's data manager, compliance manager and account manager, but the figure had not changed within MODIS. RP responded that he was not aware of any files going missing in NGET's systems. He acknowledged that previously over the past 6 months, files had gone missing somewhere in either NGET's systems or between NGET and ELEXON, however he believed that these issues were now resolved. RP noted that the registered capacity figures are not held by NGET in a central database and agreed with JN's comment that those figures are sent to NGET by letter by the customer. The capacity stored by NGET for transparency purposes is not necessarily the same as the Grid Code Registered

Capacities. RP explained that there is a form on NGET's website for changing the capacity in MODIS. JN suggested that Users should not have to make any further submissions to get the registered capacity data onto MODIS and, for example, this data should be sourced in a similar way that data he had previously submitted had made its way into the Ten Year Statement, without him having explicitly asked for it to be published there.

ACTION: RP to review process for submitting data to MODIS and to put the draft MODIS report on the website

4045. JB congratulated NGET on ensuring compliance with the European Regulation and asked how GB compares to the rest of Europe in terms of compliance. He also asked whether there is any data to show that the industry is performing better as a result of implementation of the transparency regulation. RP responded that there are over 40 TSOs and that GB is at the top with France and Germany in terms of compliance. RP was not able to say whether the industry is operating better as a result of the information being provided.
4046. CMD asked whether MODIS would remain as a separate stand-alone system or be amalgamated with or used to replace TOGA. RP responded that it would stay stand-alone for now, but acknowledged that at some point in the future TOGA will need to be replaced. CMD asked about costs associated with MODIS, noting that there are approximately 50 parties with log-ins currently and that significant costs had been incurred by parties to implement MODIS. CMD commented that a new system may have been preferable rather than duplication of existing systems. RP responded that this point had already been fed back to ENTSO-e by multiple parties, including other TSOs.

6 Code Administration Code of Practice – Principle 13

4047. AT presented an updated draft of Principle 13 of the CACOP regarding Cross Code Coordination and asked whether the GCRP had any comments. None were received. AT noted that the next step in the process would be for ELEXON, as this year's CACOP review process coordinator, to issue an industry consultation on the draft Principle 13.

7 New Grid Code Development Issues

4048. There were no new development issues this month.

8 Existing Grid Code Development Issues

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

4049. FR gave an update on progress with GC0023, noting that he had circulated draft legal text to a number of Panel Members who had been involved in the issue dating back to 2008. A suggestion was made to convene a workshop to discuss the changes to the Grid Code as NGET had received feedback that the text remains unclear. IP sought clarification that the purpose of the workshop would be to review and agree the legal text that would be consulted on. RW responded that this was the aim and that at present, it did not appear that a full Workgroup would be required, but that if it were, it could be established.
4050. IP asked GCRP members for views on the proposed approach. JN responded that a workshop of specialists was required to review and clarify the legal text. MK asked whether it would cover both generation and network requirements, FR confirmed that it would. JB asked that the invitation be sufficiently clear on what the Workshop is hoping to achieve and what the defect is.

ACTION: FR to arrange a Workshop for GC0023

b) GC0087: Development of Grid Code Frequency Response Provisions

4051. GS presented the Issues Paper (pp15/88) that was circulated to the panel, noting that GC0087 arises from a workshop held on 23rd March 2015 which discussed how to progress Frequency Response. GS noted that the draft Terms of Reference circulated intend to

keep the Workgroup focussed and, to this end, contain a non-exhaustive list of items that are excluded from the scope. MK asked whether there is a read across to the Requirements for Generators European Network Code. GS explained that the Code defines the parameters “t1” and “t2” in Article 15, and that the GC0087 Workgroup will be required to recommend values for these to be applied in Great Britain.

4052. CMD provided a comment on the draft TOR, noting that bullet point 3 to “consider issues in line with GC0048” could be very wide. CMD considered the scope should be tightened and asked whether GC0087 would be reporting back to the GC0048 Workgroup as it was unclear.

ACTION: RW to review TOR of GC0087 with TOR of GC0048 group to ensure they align.

4053. NR noted from the draft TOR that the GC0087 Workgroup is due to report back to the GCRP in January 2016 and asked whether any updates would be provided to the GCRP prior to that date. GS responded that a progress update for ongoing Workgroups is usually given at every GCRP meeting. PJ asked to add to the TOR an item on inherent technology characteristics to ensure that whatever is designed would be achievable across the board. AV asked whether the workgroup is looking at both primary and secondary response. GS responded that it is primarily focussed on primary and high frequency response.

ACTION: GS to update GC0087 TOR to reflect the points of clarification raised

4054. The GCRP agreed to establish a Workgroup.

ACTION: GS to circulate invitations to join the GC0087 Workgroup

9 Workgroups in Progress

a) GC0028: Constant Terminal Voltage

4055. GS gave an update on progress with GC0028, noting that a draft Workgroup Report had been circulated with panel papers (pp15/89). GS asked the GCRP’s approval to progress the Workgroup Report to Industry Consultation to bring back to the July 2015 Panel meeting, including making sure the legal text is appropriate. GS noted that the issues being discussed are quite complicated and that the changes required to the Grid Code are far reaching. JN thanked GS for an excellent report, noting his support for option 2b), and asked whether the panel would agree that the final report could be agreed by the Workgroup and then be sent straight to industry consultation without further reference to the GCRP. GCRP members agreed that this approach was appropriate and agreed that a lack of response from Panel members would be considered as assent to issue the consultation document.

b) GC0048: European Network Codes – RfG Implementation

4056. RW provided an update on the GC0048 Workgroup meeting held on 19th May. The expectation is that the RfG Code will be voted on at the Cross Border Committee in June 2015 and that a code mapping exercise will be undertaken following this for the Grid Code and Distribution Code. The other main item of work is determining the banding thresholds for GB. RW noted that a consultation has to be carried out regardless of whether any changes are proposed and that NGET needs to get a better view from generators of what the cost of compliance will be for types A, B, C and D generators as defined in the code. CMD asked when the various appointments of TSOs would take place in terms of responsibilities under the RfG. IP responded that GB’s position is unique in that we have multiple parties designated as TSOs, including onshore and offshore TOs, and that this process would be led by Ofgem. JW clarified that the allocation of TSO responsibilities would be led by DECC as Member State. CMD asked whether there was a role for the GCRP in that process. IP responded that it would not have a role in dividing up TSO responsibilities, but that it would have a role in progressing Modification Proposals.

c) GC0086: Grid Code Open Governance

4057. AT provided an update on progress of the GC0086 Workgroup, noting that two further meetings had been held in April and May 2015, to page turn the draft legal text. During those Workgroup meetings, one Workgroup member had indicated a wish to propose an alternative option to implement open governance that was less prescriptive than the one currently being considered by the Workgroup. A further Workgroup meeting would therefore be required before AT would be in a position to finalise the draft Industry Consultation document.
4058. JN asked whether the Workgroup were considering Ofgem's open letter of 15th May 2015 on "Further review of industry code governance". JW responded that Ofgem's letter was not intended to second guess the outcome of GC0086. MK asked how Ofgem's letter would interact with the CMA's theory of harm relating to code governance. JW noted that the CMA could make recommendations in relation to this, but that Ofgem was separately considering governance improvements.

10 Workgroup Reports

4059. There were no Workgroup Reports.

11 Industry Consultations

GC0088: Voltage Unbalance

4060. MP provided an update on GC0088, noting that a discussion was held at GCRP in November 2014 and that expert views from the industry were required. A workshop was held in February 2015, with general agreement on what was proposed, with some concerns raised. Following the workshop, NGET drafted a consultation document showing areas of consensus and where differing views remained, which was circulated to the workshop members and subsequently updated. Scottish TOs raised concerns that the proposals may lead to non-compliance; NGET's view is that this should not be the case, but NGET recognises that more work is needed to fully quantify this. NGET will work with SPT and SHET to address their concerns and have included a question in the consultation document on regional differences.
4061. MP noted that a further comment was received from WPD, regarding how limits apply to distribution companies, which had also been discussed under the P28 workgroup. WPD had questioned whether network companies have to ensure limits apply to their networks or just to their connections to the network. NP explained that NGET's view is that it applies to the whole network, but some DNOs disagree. MK felt that standards apply to networks and users, as differentiation drives costs onto users. MP noted that this comment has not been addressed in the Industry Consultation document and needs further consideration. AV noted that the RfG Code applies to generators and distribution and transmission systems and asked whether RfG has levels in it. JW responded that there are not any levels in the RfG. RW confirmed that the RfG is silent on it.
4062. IP asked whether the issue of distribution networks needs to be addressed prior to the consultation being issued. GS noted that it also came up under GC0076 and was answered there, in that the connection conditions in the Grid Code apply equally to users and licensees. MK responded that code changes are not applied retrospectively. RW concluded that the consultation has been updated to reflect feedback from workshop attendees, either in the text or through specific consultation questions. RW reminded GCRP that the aim of GC0088 was to avoid unnecessary investment. MP asked whether the GCRP was happy for GC0088 to go to industry consultation.
4063. CMD commented that he had struggled to find the proposal described clearly in the consultation document; IP referred CMD to paragraph 1.4 of the Executive Summary. CMD noted that the description was hard to find within the main body of the consultation document. MP acknowledged that this needed to be looked at and was being carried out in parallel with the Scottish TOs. RW asked whether this work needs to be concluded before the industry consultation is issued, MP said not. JB queried RW's reference to avoiding significant cost implications and asked where the cost benefit analysis is to support this assertion. RW noted that cost benefit information needs to come from both sides. MP confirmed that the cost benefit had been looked at by the GC0088 workgroup and that

information from CIGRE work had shown there would not be a detrimental impact on generators. JB suggested that a reference to this work should be included in the Industry Consultation document. JW noted that the Authority would be looking for cost information about who would be impacted by GC0088. IP suggested that a question be added to the consultation to this effect. JW noted that the Authority would also be looking for strong engagement from respondents.

4064. MK suggested that references in the document to “Scotland, England and Wales” be changed to “GB”. CMD questioned whether there would be an impact on Offshore; the GCRP felt that there would not be. CMD asked whether it was normal practice to include IEC references in the Grid Code legal text and whether this could be future proofed. PJ noted removal of the word “maximum” in the legal text and asked what the impact would be. MP responded that this corresponded to the way that NGET has always measured and there should not be any impacts. GN commented that the proposal is to deliver 1.5% and asked whether a single 2% option had been considered and, if so, what the decision had been. MP noted that this had been discussed by the Workgroup and could be explained in more detail in the Consultation document. GN asked how this would work in Scotland where there is already a 2% limit. MP responded that in practice the limit is not going over 1.5%. GN noted he had not seen any discussion about mitigation in the consultation document. GN asked how this would work with DNOs, noting that previously where a new standard has been applied, the DNO had expected the customer to pay for changes required.
4065. RL noted the discussion on bringing the limit in Scotland from 2% down to 1.5% and asked what the benefit would be, given that the assumption is that Scottish TOs are operating at below 2%. MP responded that this was included as a consultation question. CMD asked whether the reference to NGET in CC6.16 in the draft legal text was correct or should it be changed to “NETSO”. GS responded that the term used in the Grid Code is “NGET”, IP noted that this text has not changed from the existing text.
4066. RL asked what the correlation is between the 2% referenced in the draft legal text in paragraph CC6.1.6 and the reference to the 95th percentile at the top of the page in the legal text. MP noted that the first reference was to a 10 minute peak. The GCRP noted that these were detailed questions which would be better addressed through the Industry Consultation.
4067. The GCRP agreed for GC0088 to be sent to Industry Consultation, subject to being allowed to review the document. The document will be sent out by 5th June 2015, with comments due back by 19th June.
- ACTION: MP to update GC0088 Consultation document with comments and circulate by 5th June 2015**
ACTION: GCRP members to provide comments to MP by 19th June 2015

12 Reports to the Authority

GC0076: Limits on Rapid Voltage Changes

4068. GS noted that GC0076 had been subject to two industry consultations; the second had received 9 responses. The main issue that arose was an inconsistency between what NGET is proposing as Rapid Voltage Change category 2 and Engineering Recommendation P28. The report to the Authority contains legal text that is different from what was included in the consultation document; one of the equations is different. GS asked for GCRP members to review the formulae to check for errors and for approval to submit the report to the Authority, following a period of two weeks for Panel member consideration. MK noted that his comment on the report about writing switching restrictions into bilateral agreements being overly restrictive had not been taken into account. JW asked GS whether any other DNOs had responded supporting MK’s point. GS replied that no other DNO had responded in support of this point, but other parties had and the legal text had been softened slightly as a result of those comments. CMD asked whether P28 would still apply to Transmission in Scotland. GS replied that it would not in this context. CMD asked what the governance was around P28, MK responded that if it were cited in the Grid Code then it was under joint governance of GCRP and DCRP. CMD commented that

the structure did not appear to be very transparent. GS noted that the proposed text removes references to P28.

ACTION: Panel Members to provide comments on legal text by 4th June 2015

13 Progress Tracker

4069. IP noted that the Progress Tracker had been circulated with panel papers. PJ asked whether draft Workgroup reports were always sent to the Panel, noting that some of the boxes were left blank on the tracker. RW noted that flexibility currently exists in the Grid Code to produce a report or move straight to industry consultation.

14 Pending Authority Decisions

4070. There were no pending Authority decisions.

15 Standing Items

a) European Network Codes

4071. The Panel noted that pp15/81 was circulated with Panel papers. JW noted timescales for Grid Connection Codes: for the RfG code, voting will be on 25th June 2015; HVDC is expected to vote in July; DCC voting is in September 2015. RW noted that the JESG had discussed what would be appropriate to progress for HVDC and DCC now that they are progressing in Europe and that the JESG had asked NGET to draft TOR for implementation groups for these codes.

b) Joint European Stakeholder Group

4072. IP noted that the JESG Headline Report was circulated to the Panel.

c) Grid Code Development Forum

4073. FR provided an update on the first GCDF meeting, held on 13th April 2015. MK asked how many people attended, FR responded around 20. FR noted that the GCDF has been publicised through ELEXON's newscast and industry associations. The next meeting is planned for 8th June, and a request has been made from the industry to discuss reactive power and voltage control. AV asked what the issue was, GS responded that it was around how non-synchronous generators meet the voltage control requirements, but further information is needed. JN asked whether, under open governance, the GCDF would be dealing with issues currently dealt with by the GCRP and asked whether the GC0086 Workgroup had considered terms of reference for the GCDF. AT confirmed that the GC0086 workgroup had considered the role of the GCDF (which is referred to as the Grid Code Advisory Forum), but had not drafted a set of terms of reference for it. CMD asked whether consideration had been given to how the existing arrangements would transition to new arrangements under open governance.

ACTION: NGET to consider how to transition from current governance to GC0086 open governance in due course

16 Impact of other Code Modifications or Developments

4074. IP noted that the Codes Summary document was circulated to the Panel. No comments were received.

17 Any Other Business

a) Grid Code Panel Member Retirement

4075. IP noted that MK had tendered his resignation from the Panel, due to his impending retirement from ENW. IP thanked MK for his long service to the GCRP and noted that

Steve Cox of ENW was proposed by the DNOs as MK's replacement on the Panel. IP acknowledged that the Grid Code is silent on mid-term replacements, but asked GCRP members for their approval for SC to replace MK with immediate effect. GCRP members agreed to this approach and welcomed SC to the Panel.

b) November 2015 GCRP meeting

4076. IP explained that NGET is proposing to move the date of the November GCRP from 18th to 25th November 2015. IP asked for any objections to be fed back to NGET.

ACTION: GCRP members to send objections to November 2015 Panel meeting date change to Panel Secretary

18 Next Meeting

4077. The next meeting is planned for 15th July 2015 at National Grid House, Warwick.