



Minutes

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Meeting name | Grid Code Review Panel |
| Meeting number | 70 |
| Date of meeting | 19 November 2014 |
| Time | 10:00am – 3:00pm |
| Location | National Grid House, Warwick. |

Attendees

| Name | Role | Initials | Company |
|-------------------|---|----------|--------------------|
| Ian Pashley | Chair | IP | National Grid |
| Emma Radley | Panel Secretary | ER | National Grid |
| Alex Thomason | Code Administrator | AT | National Grid |
| Robert Longden | Suppliers | RLo | Cornwall Energy |
| Guy Phillips | Large Generator (>3GW) Member | GP | E.ON |
| Campbell McDonald | Large Generator (>3GW) Member | CMD | SSE |
| Alan Creighton | Network Operator (E&W) Member | AC | Northern Powergrid |
| Mike Kay | Network Operator (E&W) Member | MK | ENW |
| Alan Barlow | Non Embedded Customers Member | AB | Magnox |
| Neil Sandison | Network Operator (Scot.) Member | NS | SSE |
| Robert Wilson | NGET Member | RW | National Grid |
| Graham Stein | NGET Member | GS | National Grid |
| Ivan Kileff | NGET Member | IK | National Grid |
| Julian Wayne | Authority Member | JW | Ofgem |
| Steve Brown | Authority Alternate | SB | Ofgem |
| Nick Rubin | BSC Panel Alternate | NR | ELEXON |
| Richard Lowe | Transmission Licensee (SHE Transmission) Member | RL | SHE Transmission |
| Andy Vaudin | Large Generator (>3GW) Alternate | AV | EDF Energy |
| John Norbury | Large Generator (>3GW) Alternate | JN | RWE |
| Sigrid Bolik | Generators with Novel Units Alternate | SBo | Senvion |
| Gordon Kelly | Network Operator (Scot.) Alternate | GK | Scottish Power |
| Richard Lavender | NGET Advisor | RLa | National Grid |
| Matthew Ball | Observer | MB | Ofgem |
| Mark Perry | NGET Presenter | MP | National Grid |
| Mike Edgar | NGET Advisor | MK | National Grid |

Apologies

| Name | Role | Initials | Company |
|---------------|--|----------|---------------------------|
| Jim Barrett | Large Generator (>3GW) Member | JB | Centrica |
| Alan Kelly | Transmission Licensee (SPT) Member | AK | SPT |
| Dave Draper | Large Generator (<3GW) Member | DD | Horizon Nuclear Power |
| Brian Punton | Transmission Licensee (SHE Transmission) Alternate | BP | SHE Transmission |
| Brendan Woods | Externally Interconnected System Operators Member | BW | SONI |
| Barbara Vest | Small / Medium Generator Member | BV | Energy UK |
| Lisa Waters | Small / Medium Generator Alternate | LW | Waters Wye |
| John Lucas | BSC Panel Member | JL | ELEXON |
| Alastair Frew | Large Generator (>3GW) Alternate | AF | Scottish Power Generation |
| Tom Davies | Non Embedded Customers Alternate | TD | Magnox |
| Guy Nicholson | Generators with Novel Units Member | GN | Element Power |

1 Introductions & Apologies

3858. IP welcomed attendees to the meeting and the apologies were noted. IP announced that today would be Steve Brown's final meeting after four years contributing to the GCRP.

2 Approval of Minutes

a) September 2014 GCRP Minutes

3859. The minutes were approved by the Panel.

ACTION: Upload minutes onto the National Grid website.

3 Review of Actions

a) Summary of Actions

GC0063: Power Available

3860. **Minute 3219: Produce Lessons Learned slides.** Lessons learned to be presented after an Authority Decision. **Action ongoing.**

GC0080: RES.

3861. **Minute 3631: Update RES guidance document after updated version agreed and publish on website.** To be discussed under Item 5. **Action complete.**

3862. **Minute 3792: NGET to prepare a revised proposal under the Electrical Standards procedure addressing the majority of comments received and provide further update at September Panel.** **Action complete.**

3863. **Minute 3829: Provide an explanation / matrix on the Electrical Standards Documents webpage to portray how the standards apply.** AT advised that a matrix has been drafted and she will discuss with CMD separately to check if his previous comments and concerns have been addressed. **Action ongoing.**

3864. **Minute 3829: Scottish TOs to confirm whether any updates to the Scottish Electrical Standards will be progressed.** RL agreed that the Standards need reviewing and the action should be reworded to consider whether they need to be aligned between the TOs in Scotland. **Action ongoing.**

Technical Appendices

3865. **Minute 3794: Note issues regarding transparency of internal meetings and discuss at September workshop to work out the best way to take forward.** A workshop was held on 16 October 2014. **Action complete.**

GC0086: Grid Code Open Governance

3866. **Minute 3828: Consider the timescales and options for GCRP elections against the progress of GC0086.** ER advised that the GC0086 Workgroup had discussed elections at their last meeting and it had been agreed that the elections for 2015⁵⁴ would progress as normal. Any changes brought in by GC0086 would likely not be fully implemented until late 2015 and so it is envisaged would be reflected in Panel Membership for 2016. ER advised that the letter seeking

nominations for Panel membership had been drafted and would be sent out shortly to industry, in readiness for the outcome of the elections to be finalised in time for the January 2015 meeting. The Panel had a discussion on the content of the renewal letter and JN felt that the letter should reference the discussions held under GC0074 (GCRP Membership) in order to give parties comfort that work is being undertaken to review membership and that they are not disenfranchised from the process. Other Panel members agreed with this view and it was agreed to include a paragraph in the renewal letter to reflect this. The Panel agreed that a 3 week period for requesting nominations was sufficient.

ACTION: Revise election letter to include reference to work carried out under GC0074 regarding generator representation. [Post-meeting note – letter updated and circulated 20/11/14.

European Network Codes

3867. **Minute 3845: Ask ENTSO-E for an update on the work being carried out to produce a set of common definitions.** RW advised that he had sought an update and the response is that this is not something that is likely to be resolved in the near future. There has previously been some trilateral working on this between the Commission, ENTSO-E and ACER but so far there have not been any positive results from this. RW noted that all parties are aware that definitions are key to the working of the Codes and that is an issue that needs to be resolved; a further update will be provided when there is more information. **Action ongoing.**

4 New Grid Code Development Issues

a) GC0088: Voltage Unbalance

3868. MP presented on GC0088. GC0088 seeks to revise the Grid Code criteria applied to Voltage Unbalance within CC6.1.5 (b). MP ran through the key points of the proposal and advised that extensive analysis had been carried out and that a number of recommendations have been made in the paper. These recommendations align with the IEC Standards and unify the England/Wales and Scotland standards to 1.5% at EHV level (voltages above 150kV) and 2% for lower voltages. MP advised that there are a number of reasons for changing the NPS levels, including avoiding unnecessary investment in transmission systems and resolving inconsistency across England & Wales and Scotland. MP asked the Panel for their views on the work carried out so far and whether they believe a Workgroup is required to develop further, or if the work is sufficient enough to go out to Code Administrator Consultation. SB advised that she had been working on this and felt that the starting point needs to be clearly defined and also that harmonics need to be considered as this is impacted by voltage unbalance. MP responded that they have tried to keep harmonics separate and no change is proposed in this paper as he does not believe that there is significant interaction between the two. MP added that they have tried to include a clearer definition on the measurement and calculation of the level of unbalance in the paper.
3869. CMD felt that there had not been sufficient time to review this subject and questioned the formula in the paper. He had a concern about the priority of this in relation to the number of other Workgroups that are currently on hold and also about any unintended consequences and who would benefit from this. MP responded that the benefits are ultimately for the consumer as there are lower costs in transmission and added that this has been raised because we may be building more than we need to because of the tight limits. CMD was concerned about the resources, particularly with RfG coming up. IP advised that an internal view has been taken on how this ranks amongst other subjects and it was decided to bring this forward at this current time. There are cost implications for design choices which affect consumers so that is the main driver for raising now. RL suggested that it would be useful to understand what the additional costs and delays would be if this issue was not raised now. GP echoed this suggestion and added that it would be useful to break up the costs for the consumer in the paper / report. AV voiced his concerns about this progressing without a Workgroup as the implications for existing generators needs to be looked at. JN advised that sufficient time would be required by

[Generators](#) to study this [proposal](#) for implications and so that [any the](#) issues are [all](#)-identified. SB^o advised that 2% is a standard limit but that dependencies need to be examined particularly in relation to harmonics.

3870. AT asked how the GCRP deal with ranking of issues, taking into account limited resources, in relation to CMD's point on priorities. AT advised that the Progress Tracker currently has six issues on hold and thirteen Workgroups in progress including one on hold. AT queried whether GC0088 would get sufficient Workgroup membership. RL felt that if it is deemed a priority then resources would likely be re-assigned to deal with it. RW advised that the items on hold on the progress tracker are mainly due to external issues such as waiting for RfG, and also due to waiting for National Grid internal work to be carried out. JN felt that the Panel should be able to progress standalone issues that [may have a lower priority but](#) do not interact with other codes/work. IP noted that there is an element of self-regulation. AT asked if there anything on the tracker that could be progressed now. Some members of the Panel felt that there is not enough information on this issue yet to know whether it needs to be prioritised or not. MK advised that he is not aware of issues for DNOs but that this needs to be resolved bearing in mind the amount of activity coming up over the next 10 years. GS asked if this issue (work list) had been discussed under Open Governance. AT advised that the GC0086 Workgroup has discussed workload and resources and there is a potential Advisory Group which is being developed by National Grid, which would mean that issues get developed and potentially prioritised prior to being taken to the Panel.

3871. IP suggested having one Workgroup meeting on GC0088 to form a view on where we are in terms of level of comfort with the proposal or whether further thought is required across the industry. GP agreed with JN and CMD, in that it is good that the paper is worked up but that it also means that there is more for the Panel to digest and review, and therefore it is appropriate for a Workgroup to discuss further. NS advised that the Scottish transmission networks are not as strong as England and Wales and there is a need to reflect on the position during outages. He added that consideration needs to be given to construction work and that the Scottish TOs should be included on the 'impact' list within the paper.

3872. GS suggested having a workshop to discuss the subject further. AC agreed that this would give National Grid an opportunity to walk [Users](#) through the paper and have the appropriate industry experts to agree on [whether a](#) Workgroup may be required for. IP agreed that this is sensible and that a meeting could be arranged for January next year. The Panel agreed to comment on the draft Terms of Reference.

3873. NR asked about consequential impacts on the BSC. IP suggested putting this in the Terms of Reference.

ACTION – Arrange a workshop for January to discuss GC0088. Send out draft Terms of Reference for 3 week review.

b) GC0087: Development of Grid Code Frequency Response Provisions

3874. GS advised that GC0087 has been raised as a result of GC0022 (Frequency Response). The meetings held under GC0022 did not crystallise the issues or achieve a consensus despite extensive discussions over a long period of time. The GC0022 Workgroup commissioned further work from a technical sub-group and the proposals were presented in a Workgroup Consultation in 2012. The proposals included the development of mandatory responses for "5 second response from non-synchronous plant" and also the development of clearer requirements with respect to the delivery of frequency response in terms of minimum delay and ramping parameters. A number of additional issues remain outstanding including the suppression of the initial effect of synchronous generators, the provisions of frequency response by generators at low loads and the provisions of frequency response from onsite sources other than generators. GS advised that it is now proposed to close GC0022 and bring forward a new modification proposal, GC0087, listing explicitly the outstanding issues that need addressing via the formation of a new Grid Code Workgroup. GS advised that he would like to be clear on what the defects are and what the pros and cons are and have some structure

about the work required in order to reach a consensus in preparation for sending a final report to the Authority. GS asked the Panel for their views on the issues and noted that a Workgroup would be proposed to begin in April 2015.

3875. JN noted that there is no mention of inertia in the paper and asked if there ~~had been is~~ any consideration ~~for work~~ to developing inertia as a service. JN added that 5 second response is being put forward and the provision of inertia might be ~~another an~~ alternative solution. IP asked whether this is something that needs to go in the Grid Code or whether it is more of a commercial service. IK observed that there is a preference to keep system operator actions as light touch as possible, and having to procure additional machines to procure inertia incurs a lot of expense. IK advised that they want to look at having a solution that fits around what the market is providing. JN suggested that, if a technical specification for inertia was agreed and the market tested, procuring inertia may provide an economic solution. JW asked if it was intentional to be silent on demand side. GS advised that the development demand side services would be considered as part of any cost benefits analysis work deemed necessary and he would not envisage putting something into the Grid Code to define demand-side service. GS added that point c on the list is about facilitating provision of inertia. SBo voiced a concern about 5 second response, in that it is moving too fast, particularly for the wind industry. CMD observed that he had a concern about the issues in GC0022 and that 5 second response from wind could be beyond RfG. He added that Cost Benefit Analysis needs to be carried out and asked whether new synchronous generators could provide 5 second response, as well as non-synchronous. AV commented that he understood that RfG have provisions for this so any overlap needs to be considered.
3876. GP suggested that it may be easier to split out the issues to enable a quicker response, rather than one group / report looking at everything. IP responded that a number of points have been raised and there may be the potential to hold a workshop to look at scope of issues. GS advised that ultimately the system requirement is that we need faster frequency response and that it would be useful to split out the issues. GP noted that some of the analysis undertaken as part of GC0022 needs to be updated and it would be better to treat each issue individually and be clear on the defects. GS asked for views on what to tackle first and suggested that a workshop could be planned for February 2015 with the aim to report back to the March GCRP with the next steps.
3877. AT observed that we need to be clear on the defect for each item so is it worth holding a one-off session to discuss what the defect is and what should be developed first. SBo requested to present at the workshop. GS agreed that this would be useful and that the group would also discuss CMD's point about tying 5 second response to synchronous generators as well. JN added he is ~~not never~~ clear on what technical aspects relating to demand should be in the Grid Code but there ~~would seem to be is~~ no reason why a specification for demand side response should not be in the Grid Code in a similar form to generating unit response, there should be a defined service in the Grid Code. IP noted that, in the past, services procured on the demand side were on the basis of equivalence with services provided from the generation side of the market. ME commented that historically National Grid also procure other services not defined in the Grid Code.

ACTION: Arrange GC0087 workshop for February (avoid half-term and Customer Seminars) and report back to March GCRP.

5 Existing Grid Code Development Issues

a) GC0038: Electricity Balancing System Group

3878. The EBSG has not met since March 2014. RW advised that the work of this group has been concluded with the exception of the multi-shaft modelling subgroup. It is proposed to close GC0038 and set up a new issue to help progress multi-shaft modelling (MSM) and to bring this paper to the Panel in January 2015. RW advised that those involved in the MSM sub-group

previously had been contacted and had agreed to reconvene the MSM group and that this way forward is in line with the Panel's previous wishes.

3879. CMD commented that he does not agree with closing down EBSG as the topics that the group were looking at have not been concluded. CMD asked if there is any update on the EBS, particularly whether it is going live and if so, when. JN felt that, as a User, he does not have confidence in leaving EBS solely to IT resources to provide satisfactory results and that, in any event, the work envisaged by EBSG cannot be completed until EBS has gone live. IP felt that keeping the Workgroup open may not be the best way to provide updates on the status of the projects but acknowledged that there is a consensus to have a route open to industry for more information to be provided on EBS progress. JN advised that as a member of the EBSG he mirrors CMD's comments and added that the EBSG also provided a view from a business perspective on what the IT group are doing and the work will not be completed until the EBS is fully functional. and Therefore it is difficult to understand the rationale for closing the EBSG group down. IP felt that there may be a misunderstanding of what the group is doing and it may be an option to provide an IS update to the Panel, perhaps as a standing item, instead of keeping the Workgroup open to deliver this. GP suggested that there needs to be more of an avenue for keeping up on progress and updates on the EBS, whether that be through the Workgroup or through another means (such as the Operational Forum).
3880. CMD advised that the MSM group should be separate. RW asked the Panel for their views on what should be done with GC0038. JN commented that it is about understanding how that process works and a the principle function of the group was to have this oversight. JN mentioned the MODIS system as an example of IS issues currently impacting on Users and noted that the Panel needs to be informed of IS changes. IP suggested coming back to the next Panel with a summary of next steps, in addition to Terms of Reference for the MSM group. The Panel agreed with this approach and GP encouraged National Grid to provide general updates on the latest status of the project.

ACTION: Provide update on the latest status of the EBS project and circulate to the Panel. Return to January 2015 Panel with issue paper and any further update.

b) GC0086: Grid Code Open Governance.

3881. ER advised that the Workgroup had held four meetings in total, with the last one being held on 6 November 2014. A further two meetings had been scheduled but the Workgroup have progressed well and have completed the items listed on the Terms of Reference. ER advised that a Workgroup Consultation has been drafted and is currently out for comment with the Workgroup. It is planned to circulate this at the end of November, after conclusion of which the Workgroup will reconvene to discuss responses and finalise the proposals. The industry consultation will then be drafted and the current plan is for the Final Report to be sent to the Authority in April 2014.

c) GC0080: RES

3882. GS advised that a revised suite of proposals had been circulated with Panel Papers along with the comments that had been received. GS advised that comments had been taken into account and follow up discussions had been held with the parties that responded in order to address the comments. CMD asked for clarity on the formal approval process. GS advised that there is a twenty day window from the day of the Panel Meeting (19 November) for objections to be raised by Panel Members. If an objection is raised then the process is halted whilst the objection is dealt with. JN had some queries on the format of the documents and GS confirmed that 3, 4 and 9 are still in draft. It was agreed that these should they be taken out for now and it made clear that the previous RES document applies for these sections.
3883. CMD noted that there was recently a modification offer in Scotland with synchronising and interlocking NGTS referenced, and that these are two of those under review. CMD advised that there is a need for coordination with the Scottish TOs and questioned why the RES is

referenced in the offer, if it is not applicable in Scotland. CMD was concerned about potential risk for plant under construction with regard to the connection offer. GS responded that it is not the intention to make retrospective changes.

3884. CMD highlighted numbers 20 and 21 and felt that they should be applicable across GB. GS agreed that the listing needs to be changed as drafted to remove 20 and 21, or find a way of making it clearer about what applies where. IP noted that this does not affect the 20 day window as it is more of a presentation issue. The Panel agreed that they are happy to accept and begin the 20 day objection window.

ACTION: Remove 3, 4 and 9 and reference original documents until they are finalised and change listing to remove 20 and 21 or provide clarity on what is applicable.

d) Technical Appendices

3885. GS provided an update on outcomes of the Generic Templates Workshop which was held on 16 October 2014. A number of themes came out including simplification, consistent references to RES, transparency, visibility of governance and repetition of Grid Code requirements. GS advised that the next steps are to complete the RES process and update the templates on the website with the new RES references included (December 2014), simplify templates (February 2015) and address consistency and transparency issues (March 2015) as well as discussing governance of the template process (May 2015). CMD thanked National Grid for the work carried out and addressing the issues he had raised and added that he had been unable to attend the workshop in October but had received positive feedback on it. JN echoed CMD's comments.

6 Workgroups in Progress

a) GC0048: Electricity Network Codes – Requirements for Generators (RfG)

3886. RW advised that there is a Workgroup meeting for RfG on 20 November and a further meeting on 17 December. RW added that the Commission has not shared publicly a further version of the code since 14 Jan 2014 but that a draft is believed to be going through interservice consultation within the Commission and may be released shortly. The Commission's goal to meet Quarter 1 of 2015 for Entry into Force is still a target. MK asked what the expectations are when it is released. RW advised that once it is released publically, then it can go into comitology. MK asked whether there is a process to make sure that there is still an opportunity to lobby DECC. JW advised that there is work ongoing between Ofgem and DECC regarding stakeholder engagement and that a GB stakeholder workshop would be held once the code was released. It was noted that the time is restricted but that the Workgroup has had more time because of the delay from the commission to consider issues such as implementation, banding thresholds and project planning including how the work may be split up into proposals. With regard to the banding thresholds CMD noted that there are no regional specificities. RW advised that they apply to the whole GB synchronous area and added that the existing Grid Code requirements apply to small, medium and large generators which are specific to GB TO areas whereas RfG has cumulative requirements in four bands a, b, c and d.

b) GC0063: Power Available

3887. RW presented slides in order to provide an update to the GCRP on the latest developments with Power Available and informed the Panel of the progression of the Power Available Workgroup. RW advised that there had previously been a general lack of consensus in the Workgroup on the options proposed and this became even more apparent when a draft of the final report was presented to the Panel in May 2014. After this, more information on the defect that Power Available sought to address and further engagement with stakeholders were progressed. A special session of the Generator Services Group to engage with stakeholders was held on 16 September and a further Workgroup meeting was held on 8 October 2014. A number of

additional points were considered and further options proposed. RW advised that the final report has been re-written to define the defect, improve the narrative, summarise options, set out conclusions and address the points made in the May GCRP meeting. This revised draft was circulated to the Workgroup for comment and on 13 November to the Panel. RW confirmed that Option 3 (provision of a power available signal plus redefinition of MEL for Power Park Modules to be installed capacity) is still the preferred way forward. AV asked why it was not proposed to apply this retrospectively, although he advised that he did support it not being retrospective. RW responded that it is not retrospective due to the costs that could be incurred by some existing parties but that this does not preclude mutual agreement to establish the necessary information flows with any existing parties. With regard to costs, RW advised that a consultation question was asked but there was not any clarity on figures so therefore it was very difficult to do a CBA. CMD commented that he provided some figures in his response. RW added that most people expressed costs as being relative, in that the cost of option 3 could potentially be fairly insignificant if applied to new plant during the design phase. GP asked if power available data could be made available to the market. ME agreed that there was potential for this although clarity on what the market would do with this, given the volume of data involved, would be useful before committing to this expense. ME advised that there is no intention to submit a BSC mod to assess BOAs using power available signals. He added that there are sufficient incentives on parties to optimise their forecasting ability and you would expect the PNs to be associated with that, plus it is in everyone's interests to optimise their forecasted positions. JN noted that ~~a significant number the majority~~ of respondents favoured a parallel BSC modification in response to a question in the consultation. IP responded that it is not possible to progress a BSC change for settlement of bid-offer acceptances unless the requirement for a power available signal is a mandatory requirement on all. GP suggested that one possible BSC related change may be the requirement for some form of Power Available information to be made available through the BMRS.

3888. RW advised on the next steps. The Workgroup felt that there was not a need to re-consult again and that the final report would be finalised in preparation to send to the Authority. GP made a general observation that the 'least-worst' option is being presented to the Authority and it is a limit in the current arrangements that all the options are not being presented, notwithstanding the fact that all the discussions are captured in the final report. It is something that GC0086 (Open Governance) may improve on with regard to alternative options. IP noted that there is a lot that we can learn from this process.

b) GC0035 & GC0079 Frequency Changes during Large Disturbances and their impact on the Total System.

3889. GS advised that an updated set of Terms of Reference had been drafted to account for a change in the membership list and the new reference (GC0079) and removal of GC0035. Regarding membership, GS advised that if there are lapsed members, they can request to re-join. MK pointed out that lapsed members are still on the distribution list. GS noted that interested parties are welcome to join in the discussions. CMD suggested that there might be a requirement for a separate Workgroup for existing generators and withstand issues. MK added that this also needs to be addressed via RfG in the next few months.
3890. The Panel agreed Terms of Reference. CMD asked how new members are encouraged to join. MK advised that on paper, representation is adequate but there has not necessarily been the physical input. MK commented that consideration needs to be given to making sure that large generators are represented. AT suggested that the large generators representatives on the Panel could try and encourage support. AT also suggested that the Code Administrator could send an email with the updated Terms of Reference and also requesting new members, particularly from that category.

ACTION – Publish GC0079 updated Terms of Reference and email Grid Code distribution list to draw attention to group and advise that it is still open for members to join.

3891. None

8 Industry Consultations

3892. None.

9 Reports to the Authority

3893. None.

10 Progress Tracker

3894. ER noted that pp14/62 was circulated with Panel Papers.

3895. MK noted GC0034 (LEEMPS Compliance Assessment) on the tracker and felt that this could be removed from the list as there is not a LEEMPs issue once the European Network Codes are in force. It was agreed to minute this and see if any objections are received, then make a decision at the next Panel as to whether remove from the list.

3896. GP highlighted GC0022 (Frequency Response) and it was agreed to remove this now that GC0087 has been raised.

ACTION: Update Progress Tracker.

11 Pending Authority Decisions

3897. None.

12 Standing Items

a) European Network Codes

3898. IP advised that pp14/63 has been circulated.

b) Joint European Standing Group

3899. IP noted that pp14/64, the JESG Headline Report, was circulated to the Panel.

c) ECCAF

3900. It was noted that no headline report had been circulated as there has not been a meeting recently.

13 Impact of Other Code Modification or Developments

3901. A codes summary, pp14/65, was circulated to the Panel. AT asked the Panel if they found this document useful and the Panel agreed that they find it beneficial.

3902. NR advised that for the BSC, the review of BSC Panel Governance was considered further at their meeting in November and progression of Stage 1 of the work was approved by the Panel. NR also highlighted ELEXON's IS transformation programme and welcomed any questions or comments on this.

14 Any Other Business

a) Outage Change Management

3903. IK advised that a group has been formed under the STC Modification Panel¹ on outage change management which had reported to the October STC Modification Panel². A round table meeting had been held with Scottish TOs, generators with non-standard connections and Ofgem yesterday to cover the work done and establish whether there were any outstanding issues. No changes in the codes had been identified, but a number of improvements in working practice had been identified and implemented.

- a. The Scottish TO's have improved their short term and long term planning in accordance with their Network Access Policies
- b. Improved visibility in work involved for the transmission circuit outage
- c. Giving Scottish non standard User connections visibility of current year TO outage requests on a trial basis for a year
- d. More communication on impact of outage on generators
- e. Where there are issues NGET will co-ordinate tri party calls between SO, TO and Users to improve communication
- f. Encourage new generators to register in TOGA as soon as possible so they can receive relevant reports notifying them of planned outages
- g. NGET will offer a training session for generators to give an overview on how to extract information efficiently from TOGA reports

3904. IK advised that a number of new actions had been identified at the meeting yesterday, including:

- a. Whether there can be transparency on hours of access lost
- b. Whether an annual forum can be arranged to go over the transmission circuit outage plan for the coming year
- c. Whether the clarity of circuit definitions can be improved
- d. Whether there can be a red flag on certain major outages where a User has had to put in place major mitigating arrangements
- e. A number of actions on connection and network diagrams

3905. CMD noted that the meeting held on 18 November 2014 with generators was useful and well attended. CMD also advised that it may have been useful to hold the meeting with generators earlier as the issue had been raised a year ago. Having the meeting before the report had gone to the STC Modification Panel would have been useful in helping to understand some of the content of the report.

3906. JN queried whether this was part of a highlighted a wider issue with regard to OC2 and that he had previously received notification that there would be an imminent review of OC2. IK responded that he has not been planning a review of OC2. JN suggested ~~for~~ that OC2 may ~~would~~ be the place to capture this issue. CMD said that ~~the codes were okay, OC2 was satisfactory and the identified~~ improvements in TO/SO working practice were necessary. IK agreed and gave an example that there is an obligation in the code on NGET to coordinate outages, and the tri-party calls are an improved way of meeting this obligation.

Comment [NG1]: Campbell's comment

¹ <http://www2.nationalgrid.com/UK/Industry-information/Electricity-codes/STC/Modifications/PM077/>

² <http://www2.nationalgrid.com/UK/Industry-information/Electricity-codes/STC/Panel-information/Meetings/2013/29-October-2014/>

3907. AV said that an EDF representative had not been able to attend the meeting yesterday, that gaps had been identified in the process and that separate discussions were planned to address this, so there may be overlaps. IK advised that the National Grid representative on the Outage Change Management group was also involved in the meetings with EDF, ensuring consistency.

b) GCRP Meeting Dates 2015.

3908. ER showed the Panel a slide of the 2015 Panel meeting dates. The Panel agreed that they are happy with these dates. MK observed that we may need to convene some extraordinary Panel meetings to deal with RfG.

c) 2015 Elections

3909. ER referred to her update under the Review of Actions and confirmed that a letter would be circulated shortly seeking nominations for the 2015 Panel election.

d) Ofgem Publishing Moratorium and KPI impact.

3910. JW advised that the publishing moratorium this year will begin on Friday 19 December 2014 and run up to (but not including) Monday 5 January 2015. This will affect Ofgem's target of issuing 90% of code modification decisions within 25 working days of receiving Final Modification Reports – the 25 day KPI will be frozen for the duration of the moratorium period for any and may therefore extend the decision timetable for some code modification decisions that fall within this period. It was noted the GC0063 (Power Available) would be affected by this as it will be submitted to the Authority shortly.

Comment [NG2]: Julian Wayne's changes

e) System Operability Framework (SOF)³

3911. ER noted that the Consultation on the SOF had closed on 10 October and responses are being considered. JW advised that it is a useful document which sets out National Grid's views of the current and future challenges affecting the GB electricity system. JW considered that it was well worth reading, and contains good summaries and interesting forecast data-contains key summaries and sets out National Grid's thinking on current issues and also includes forecasts. RW noted that there is no governance around this and it has been provided for information only and that it is a transparent document which allows industry to have visibility of the issues that National Grid are considering and their general thinking. MK asked if it is now a living document and if it will be kept updated. GS advised that the intention is to update it annually. It was suggested that the Panel have a look at the document before the next Panel meeting and a further explanation could then be provided on the subject. CMD advised that the consultation documents could be structured better and that the regional references differed – it seemed that there had been input from different parts of the business which resulted in a lack of consistencies.

Comment [NG3]: Julian Wayne's changes

3912. CMD raised a concern regarding the document containing recommendations from a Workgroup that has not yet concluded or presented their findings to the Panel. GS acknowledged CMDs point and advised that care needs to be taken in the wording. IP advised that the choice of language needs to be considered. CMD highlighted the SOF did not mention Voltage Unbalance at all and asked if there was a link between the SOF and the priority issues for the GCRP

Comment [NG4]: Campbells' comment

ACTION: Include GCRP on distribution list for SOF and arrange for a presentation on SOF at next Panel meeting

3913. CMD asked for an update on Market Operation Data Interface System (MODIS). IP pointed out that there are fortnightly updates that are circulated. NR advised that from a BSC point of view, the BMRS changes are due to be implemented on 16 December 2014 and noted that there have been issues in relation to acceptance testing. NR advised that due to the amount of change and issues that have been encountered, National Grid and ELEXON have committed to producing a

³ <http://www2.nationalgrid.com/UK/Industry-information/Future-of-Energy/System-Operability-Framework/>

suite of communications to the industry through ELEXON'S channels to update the industry on the latest developments and it may be that MODIS is covered within these communications. It was noted that European Transparency Regulation is due to be implemented in January 2015. CMD had a concern about duplication and IP noted that the requirement for MODIS is due to ETR being implemented ahead of the Electricity Balancing System.

ACTION: Consider how best to provide updates to the Panel on MODIS (linked to EBS).

13 Next Meeting

3914. The next meeting is planned for 21 January 2015 at National Grid House, Warwick.