

Minutes

Meeting name Grid Code Review Panel
Meeting number 82
Date of meeting 16 November 2016
Time 10:00am – 3:00pm
Location National Grid House, Warwick.

Deleted: 16th

Attendees

Name	Role	Initials	Company
John Martin	Chair	JM	CodeCode Administrator
Ellen Bishop	Technical Secretary	EB	CodeCode Administrator
Gurpal Singh	Authority Representative Member	GSH	Ofgem
Andy Vaudin	Large Generator (>3GW) Member	AV	EDF Energy
Campbell McDonald	Large Generator (>3GW) Member	CMD	SSE
Alan Creighton	Network Operator (E&W) Member	AC	Northern Powergrid
Roddy Wilson	Transmission Licensee (SHE Transmission) Alternate	RoW	SHE Transmission
Graeme Vincent	Transmission Licensee (SP Transmission) Member	GV	Scottish Power
Ryan Place	Code Administrator Representative	RP	Code Code Administrator
Xiaoyao Zhou	NGET Member	XZ	National Grid
Tim Truscott	NGET Member	TKT	National Grid
Antonio Del Castillo	NGET Presenter – Joined meeting for EBS Update	ADC	National Grid
Alastair Frew	Large Generator (>3GW) Alternate	AF	Scottish Power
Gordon Kelly	Network Operator (Scotland) Alternate	GK	Scottish Power
Sigrid Bolik	Generators with Novel Units Alternate	SB	Repower
Robert Longden	Suppliers Representative	RLo	Cornwall Energy
Guy Nicholson	Generators with Novel Units Member	GN	Element Power
John Lucas	BSCBSC Panel Alternate	JL	ELEXON
David Spillett	Network Operator (E&W) Alternate Alternate DS		ENA
Tim Ellingham	Large Generator (<3GW) Member (Interim)	TE	RWE
Honor Hynes	NGET Member	HH	National Grid
Bieshoj Awad	NGET Presenter – Joined meeting for GC0077	BA	National Grid
Joaquin Jimenez	NGET Presenter – Joined meeting for AOB Week 24 Submissions	JJ	National Grid
Geoff Ray	NGET Presenter – Joined meeting for AOB Week 24 Submissions	GR	National Grid
Philip Jenner	Large Generator (<3GW)	PJ	Horizon Nuclear
Tim Ellingham			
Honor Hynes	Rob Wilson	HH	National Grid

Deleted: National Grid

Deleted: National Grid

Deleted: CMD

Deleted: National Grid

Deleted: ¶
Need to add in John Norbury replacement¶
Alternates

Deleted: Nick Rubin

Deleted:

Deleted: Element PowerELEXONElement Power

Deleted: Steve Cox

Deleted: Steve Cox

Deleted: DS

Deleted: NGET Member

Deleted: NGET Member

Deleted: NGET Member

Deleted: Guy Ni

Deleted: Generators with Novel Units

Deleted: Member

Deleted: GN

Deleted: Element

Deleted: Power

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Left, Tab stops: 0.45 cm, Left

Formatted: Left

Deleted: ¶

Comment [RP1]: Attended

Deleted: Philip Jenner

Need to add HH as Alternate for Rob,

Apologies

Name	Role	Initials	Company
Tom McCartan	Externally Interconnected System Operators Member	TM	SONI
Jim Barber	Network Operator (Scotland) Member	JB	SSE
Richard Lowe	Transmission Licensee (SHE	RL	SHE Transmission

	Transmission) Member		
Craig McTaggart	Transmission Licensee (SP Transmission) Alternate	CMDt	Scottish Power
Guy Phillips	Large Generator (>3GW) Member	GP	Uniper
Rob Wilson	NGET Member	RW	National Grid
Nick Rubin	BSC Panel Member	NR	ELEXON
Lisa Water	Generator (Small and/or Medium) Alternate	LW	Waters Wye
Le Fu	NGET	LF	National Grid
Steve Cox	Network Operator (E&W) Member	SC	ENW

1. Introductions & Apologies

4531. Apologies were received from: [LF](#), [NR](#), [RW](#), (alternate [HH](#)) and [JN](#) retired welcome [TE](#).

a) September 2016 GCRP Minutes

4532. Comments were received from [JN](#), [CMD](#), [JN](#), [TT](#), [RW](#) and [GP](#).

4533. The minutes were approved by the Panel once the following amendments have been made to [removing missed typographical errors noted in the formatting](#).

ACTION – [EB](#) to update the website with approved September minutes.

2 Review of Actions

a) Summary of Actions

4534. **Action Log Minute Number: 4196, 4312 and 4315:** RES Review and Actions. An update was provided by [HH](#) that National Grid is working on finalising of the remaining outstanding documents [but has been prioritised so work on this is slower than expected. Action on Hold.; however this action has been placed on hold due to a need to priorities work in accordance with resourcing capabilities](#).

4535. **Action Log: Modification Templates:** During the last Panel meeting [CMD](#) raised the point that alternative templates [should be generated and used, giving an example of a discussion paper. This action has not been progressed as RP noted that Code Governance would need to discuss offline due to the move for consistency of documentation across Code Administrators and codes it is preferred that standard templates are retained. The discussion surrounding the idea of a further type of paper template to use as Discussion paper' is to be taken offline with RP and JM.](#)

4536. **Action Log Frequency Response:** Discussion around the need to feedback views on the table of information [RJW](#) presented at September Panel. [CMD](#) highlighted that there had been no formal request on the Panel.

ACTION:

[EB](#) Panel Tech Sec to circulate the Frequency Response Table for Panel members comment.

ACTION: All Panel members to formally to feedback by 23rd December 2016 on the Frequency Response table presented by [RJW](#) at September Panel.

4 New Grid Code Development Issues

a) Project TERRE Implementation Paper

4537. [HH](#) presented the Project Terre issue paper. noting [HH](#) flagged that there are, and that the purpose of the presentation was to gain Panel approval. Ideally the workgroup would benefit from one or two representatives for Large, Medium and Small (representing the "Non-BM"

- Deleted: Nick Rubin
- Deleted: Member
- Comment [RP2]: Not a member
- Deleted: Le Fu
- Deleted:
- Deleted: ,
- Deleted:),...JN retired welcome TE
- Deleted: , RJW
- Deleted: , NR
- Formatted
- Formatted
- Comment [RP3]: TKT?
- Formatted
- Deleted: CMDD and
- Deleted: and
- Formatted
- Deleted: RW ...P.
- Formatted
- Comment [RP4]: Indents need to match
- Deleted: Minutes to be re-checked ahe
- Formatted
- Formatted
- Comment [RP5]: Aren't we missing
- Formatted
- Comment [RP6]: What is this referri
- Deleted: ¶
- Formatted
- Deleted: <#>Discussion
- Formatted
- Deleted: <#>paper paper
- Deleted: <#>paper' is
- Deleted: <#> to be taken offline with
- Formatted
- Deleted: <#>
- Deleted: <#>.
- Deleted: <#>¶
- Formatted
- Deleted: .
- Deleted: <#>GC0086 Update: Upd
- Formatted
- Deleted: discussed...eeting CMD
- Formatted
- Deleted: panel. CMDD...anel. CMD
- Formatted
- Comment [RP7]: Not sure this was
- Deleted: <#>Emergency
- Comment [RP8]: I thought we agree
- Formatted
- Deleted: Research and develop
- Moved down [3]: ¶
- Formatted
- Formatted
- Deleted: Ask the panel
- Formatted
- Deleted: panel
- Formatted
- Formatted

scale) generators - preferably with BM experience, a DSR provider; TSO rep; DNO rep; a BSCCo Rep; and a Regulator rep.the issue to progress to Workgroup.

4538. A coordination group or other forum could also be considered for those wishing to observe and comment on workgroup progress.It is proposed that the Workgroup is a relatively smaller group ideally having one or two representatives for Large, Medium and Small (representing the issue to "Non-BM" scale) generators - preferably with BM experience, a DSR provider; TSO rep; DNO rep; a BSC Co Rep; and a Regulator rep. Due to the interest in this project it is also proposed that a coordination group or other similar forum could be formed for those wishing to observe and comment on Workgroup progress whilst not being a direct Workgroup member.

Deleted: Question being asked of panel is the approval to set up a workgroup. Note that there is a move to making a selection of representatives to maintain a considered group, focused technical workgroup with a coordination group above that, or hold stakeholder options

Deleted: .. Aim to begin workgroup in January. ¶

4531 JL raised concerns about the timescales being put forward in the paper, and the potential impact this on the on the work that is already ongoing in the Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC) LEXON have Workgroup. ELEXON have been holding bi-weekly meetings working towards delivering a Consultation in mid-February. the timescales that are suggested in the Grid Code paper, considering the level of inter-dependencies that are now apparent between BSC and Grid Code. The has been the Code have the risk of slowing down and impacting this ongoing and interlinked work.

The original intention has been that BSC would complete its work and then the Grid Code would deliver its part. CMD noted that Grid Code is an enabler of the solution and that clarity around the general principles of what we are trying to achieve is crucial. It is important that the BSC should not be driven by what Grid Code can deliver; the BSC should provide its own solutions. It was highlighted that if the work is carried out in silo between codes this could have a negative impact on the feasibility of the solution proposed by the Workgroups. JL agreed that it was an option that the BSC can take the lead on delivering the initial solution. CMD added that the Grid Code does not dictate what the market should be, it facilitates the technical capabilities of the system.

4539. TT noted TT noted there reflected that the BSC and Grid Code do need to work together. They cannot be isolated.

4540. CMD raised the issue of run up rates not being accounted for in TERRE and TT confirmed added that run rates and ramp times times are a BSC issue, but ; however both agreed that the practical limitations on the system are dictated by the Grid Code. As a result of the change the industry should not be put at a competitive disadvantage due to a technical limitation in the Grid Code.

4532 RLo felt that agreed the BSC and Grid Code Workgroups need to progress in tandem. confirmed that.

Deleted: 'leisurely' ...

Comment [RP9]: Not sure this is true? ...

Deleted: are too slow...considering ...

Comment [RP10]: Who said this? ...

Deleted: *riginal*Original intention ...

Deleted: JL highlighted repeatedly the level of inter-dependencies that are now apparent between BSC and Grid Code. ¶

Formatted: Font color: Red

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 1.94 cm

Deleted: do and... deliver; ...

Deleted: as

Deleted: ...on delivering the initial ...

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Deleted: ...it facilitates the technica ...

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Bold, Italic, Font color: Auto

Comment [AMC11]: Didn't quite follow this.

Deleted: RLo if

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 4531 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0 cm + Indent at: 0.63 cm, Keep with next, Tab stops: 1.25 cm, Left + Not at 1.94 cm

Deleted: the lead identifies

Deleted: an issue ahead of consultation then that is a concern to be considered and discussed. ¶ ...

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Deleted: R...un on...prun up rates ¶ ...

Comment [TKT12]: I am not sure what this is referring to. I stated that ramp rates are limited by the technical limitations of the GB system as stipulate din the Grid Code. CMD raised the issue that GB players mustn't be at a competitive disadvantage relative to European players.

Deleted: CMD noted that as TT... ...

Deleted: that

Deleted: as TT commented ...he ...

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Deleted: workgroups...workgroups. ...

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Red

4541. AV asked whether there should be a joint BSC/Grid Code Working Group. As the risks being by other Panel members there should be BSC/Grid Code be mitigated if representatives from both the Grid Code working group and the BSC working group were on the same team feeding information and views across Workgroups.

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 4531 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0 cm + Indent at: 0.63 cm, Keep with next, Tab stops: 1.25 cm, Left + Not at 1.94 cm

4542. JL noted the limit of capacity for more meetings and time constraints already on Workgroup members to attend. The BSC Workgroup has a full agenda of work. RLo in agreement with AV suggested that one or two people on both Workgroups could resolve this issue by retaining an informed link. HH noted that Richard Woodward has been attending some of the TERRE BSC groups, and BSC members have attended GCDF. There is a consensus from the Panel to establish further collaboration.

Deleted: raised the discussion point ...
Formatted: Font color: Auto
Deleted: JL responded with a note about...L noted about ...he limit of ...

4543. AF moved on the discussion to highlight that the definition of the modification is not yet defined in the paper. JL noted that National Grid has raised the BSC modification to meet legal requirements, and that National Grid has already released an impact assessment. HH also noted similarities with the EU modifications; it is the Workgroups job to define what the problem is and what the solution should be.

Deleted: fully
Deleted: fully ...n the paper. JL not...
Comment [TKT13]: This is an EU mod
Deleted: workgroups
Deleted: yesyes...greed a ...

4544. CMD agreed a Workgroup is required, but raised the question as to why the paper does not reference D Code. TT noted that TERRE is concerned with operation of the market therefore the (Balancing Mechanism) BM does not apply to D Code. JL supported this by noting that the BSC is not aware of any impact to D Code. DS questioned whether a TERRE participant would need to be a part of the BM. DS agreed with requirement for Workgroup. CMD wanted to know how capacity market settlements are impacted. JL noted that Capacity Market queries would be more of a BSC issue, but that the TERRE paper does not mention BSC at all. JL responded that this is because there is the separate group for BSC.

Comment [TKT14]: I commented that the operation of the current market (BM) is stated in the Grid Code and not in the Distribution code. Therefore I expected operation RR to also be stated in GC and there would be no impact on D code
Deleted: anything impacted in
Deleted: continued
Deleted: withwith
Deleted: to query...questioned as t...
Deleted: ?... DS agreed with ...
Deleted: edconfirmed...onfirmation ...
Deleted: Is it...f scheduling was ...
Deleted: wants...anted to populate ...

4545. HH moved for confirmation that National Grid would send out an invitation for a Workgroup. Simultaneously National Grid will draft the Terms of Reference in order to address the questions asked by the Panel. The Panel agreed.

Deleted: to query...questioned as t...
Deleted: ?... DS agreed with ...
Deleted: edconfirmed...onfirmation ...
Deleted: Is it...f scheduling was ...
Deleted: wants...anted to populate ...

4546. AV raised the issues on timing and wanted to gain consensus. If scheduling was possible the first Workgroup should be planned for December instead of January. HH noted that there may be practical limitations to this.

Deleted: wants...anted to populate ...

4547. GN wanted to populate the timetable before the paper is released for approval by the Panel, on the basis that there are tight timescales that need to be achieved. JL concerned that the BSC process will be put at risk due to the timescales proposed in the paper and that there is a risk that the BSC is going to be wasting time, money and resources.

Comment [TKT15]: Typo?
Deleted: the

4548. JM summarised on behalf of the Panel that the Panel approved and agreed that a Workgroup was needed. He also noted that the Panel would prefer that the first Workgroup was scheduled for December, however if this is not possible then the first Workgroup should be held no later than January 2017. Time is of the essence to ensure coordination with BSC.

Deleted: noted that yes a workgroup is needed...ummarised on behalf of the ...

4549. Given that the BSC are still drafting their proposals, they should not be in a position where they are driving all of the outputs. The impact assessment needs to be all in hand across BSC and Grid Code to achieve the mid-2018 deadline to the Authority. JL noted that to meet the timescales the impact assessment will need to be confirmed by July 2017. GN noted that January to July timescales for this working group is a tight timescale and there needs to be a focused attention to outcomes and clear responsibilities. Therefore this TERRE paper timetable should link in with the BSC Workgroup timetable to ensure collaboration and consistency.

Deleted: Impact...mpact assessme...

4550. TE commented that planning the TERRE implementation around the BM system was already assumed as it did not appear there was another route, and consequently it seemed that decisions are being made in the BSC Workgroup that may/will impact the Grid Code Workgroup. JL highlighted that BSC is taking the lead from the impact assessment provided by National Grid. TT noted that the markets are very different and therefore will need separate systems. The BSC group working on P344 noted three alternative solutions.

Deleted: . Decisions...and ...
Comment [AMC16]: It's not too clear what the markets are different from...
Deleted: .
Comment [TKT17]: I think that this referred to data. The markets are different and will require submission of different data. P344 gave three options for deriving the required data.

4551. JL pointed out that the 14 August 2917 2017 is the deadline date to get a BSC report to Ofgem and CMD highlighted that this would mean implementation a year later. This is a tight timescale to achieve. CMD commented that there was a need for a preparatory view of the report prior it being sent to the Authority to ensure there was no send back and consequent delay to the timescales. JL noted that the BSC have based their Workgroup around based on two consultation phases. The February 2017 consultation will have a good high level of detail, but there will be no legal text in this consultation.

4552. AV noted that the Grid Code consultation in May 2017 should align with the BSC consultation so that the industry and Ofgem has joint consultations and a full view of the proposed solution and inter-dependencies. The Panel agrees with this point although JL pointed out that this would cause a risk in delaying the implementation.

4553. RP asked HH how long it would be until National Grid could circulate the Terms of Reference (ToR) along with the proposed timetable for the Workgroup and delivery of the Report. ed HH noted that National Grid were cautiously optimistic that they could circulate the ToR in the week commencing 21st November 2016, but was unable to guarantee made no guaranteethis circulation date.

ACTION: HH/RJW to draft Terms of Reference, draft timetable, updated papers and then recirculates to the Panel. (It was noted that the TOR should include information from the BSC Workgroup progress).

ACTION: Workgroup requirement agreed therefore invites to join the Workgroup will be sent out.

6 Existing Grid Code Development Issues

None

7 Workgroups in Progress

- a) GC0079: Frequency Changes during large disturbances and their effect on the total system (RoCoF).

Comment [TKT18]: Plenty of time then

Deleted: 14th

Deleted: .

Deleted: CMD

Deleted: . Report will go

Deleted: Ofgem, however

Deleted: from Ofgem ahead of this

Deleted: sandbank

Deleted: workgroup

Deleted: , which should enable

Deleted: aa

Deleted: an informed steer from Ofgem.

Deleted: CMD pointed out that the initial consideration for the Grid Code workgroup should be held in January / February.

Deleted: panel

Deleted: .

Deleted: a delay to

Deleted: and the proposed timescale with HH notingnot

Deleted: ing

Formatted: Not Superscript/ Subscript

Deleted: no

Deleted: .

Formatted: Font: Arial

Deleted: recirculate. Yes

Deleted: workgroup is required. Therefore yes send out with

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Deleted: invite to join the workgroup.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Deleted: workgroup

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Moved (insertion) [3]

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: ROCOF).

4554. XZ provided an update, Vector Shift discussed a potential setting change from 6-12 degrees and there is a view from the Workgroup that further research needs to be carried out to assess if this offers sufficient protection for embedded generations. The Workgroup want to do further research and together with RoCoF information produce a report covering both issues for the D Code and Grid Code Panels.

4555. JM noted that the realistic timescales for this work will result in at least another six months of work for the Workgroup. DS noted that DCRP and Ofgem will be looking for a robust implementation plan that will be adhered to and to be included in the report; particularly having missed the 1 August 2016 date.

4556. CMD highlighted the importance of efficiency in combining these two pieces of work; one visit one change. AV was in agreement with DS that we need a robust delivery plan and also the need to have a clear commercial plan. There is a concern over the commercial considerations and the lack of movement in this area.

4557. Panel members agreed with this point and are keen to see the report as soon as possible inclusive of commercial considerations. DS wants to see a focus on devising a strong plan combined with a mind-set of delivering on time. CMD keen to know if commercial considerations can be sorted before or in parallel with the research; small generators are not the cause of the issue; therefore asking them to pay is difficult and likely to be met with resistance, thus slowing the process down even more.

4558. Not specifically about GC0079 but related to it: GN requested that the report for significant incidents to be presented at the Panel in January. This is a useful tool for the Panel given that the new issue of Vector Shift is apparent. GN queried whether National Grid and the wider industry are tracking these events on the system. If we are trying to understand the significance of these issues we need to be given understanding and data. XZ responded that yes this is being considered and is a part of the work that is ongoing.

4559. XZ was asked to ascertain when the next publication of the next System Incident Report was planned for. GN noted that the last report was circulated to Panel in January 2016 and would like a copy of the next report to be issued to the Panel. TT commented that the number of RoCoF incidents seems to have reduced over time because TT noted that National Grid is managing the system to ensure there are fewer RoCoF incidents. Vector Shift losses were to do with a transmission fault and therefore a separate issue.

ACTION: GC0079 commercial considerations query to be fed back to National Grid representative on GC0079. Action owned by XZ.

ACTION: Significant Incident Report is required for the January meeting (or the nearest Panel to its publication) should be automatically included as a paper on its release. Action owned by XZ.

b) GC0048: Requirements for Generators (HH provided an update)

Formatted

Deleted: 12degrees

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 4531 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0 cm + Indent at: 0.63 cm, Tab stops: 1.25 cm, Left + Not at 1.94 cm

Deleted: movement

Deleted: workgroup

Deleted: is

Deleted: ?... The workgroup

Deleted: joint

Deleted: are realistically looking ...

Deleted: need to be combined to make it as efficient as possible... one

Deleted: highlight that there is

Deleted: to...research; as

Deleted: ,

Deleted: panel

Deleted: U

Deleted: panel...anel given that the

Deleted: XY

Deleted: XY

Deleted: Y

Deleted: XY

Deleted: . Last...was planned for. G

Comment [TKT19]: TKT titled

Deleted: are...s managing the syste

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Font: Arial

Deleted: GC079.

Deleted: Y

Deleted: XY

Deleted: incident report ...ncident

Deleted: Y

Deleted: XY

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Header + Black, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1.25 cm + Indent at: 1.89 cm, Tab stops: Not at 1.23 cm

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Font: Bold

4560. **HH Banding:** Richard Woodward is updating the workgroup report to include a proposal to uncouple the bandings from any consideration of BM participation.

4561. **HH Voltage and Reactive:** are in the process of putting the consultation together and the aim is the send this out via circulation before the year end.

4562. **HH Compliance for RfG:** The first meeting was held in November 2016 kicking off initial discussions around equipment certificates for Type A and generation B. AV questioned whether National Grid was going to produce a cost benefit analysis on what was going to be produced. His understanding was that Ofgem are requesting this information, therefore it was important this was carried out.

4563. **DS noted** that the next step for the Compliance group was the step was a meeting with UKAS on December 9th to explore some queries raised by the Compliance subgroup. The outcome would be fed back to GC0048 and a further compliance subgroup meeting would follow.

ACTION: Confirmations on actions from last RfG workshop and circulate to the members. Action owned by HH.

c) GC0095: TSOG

4564. Entry into Force (EIF) dates are staggered. Some requirements commence at EIF others come into effect between 12-18 months from the EIF date. Therefore the Workgroup is focusing attention on the EIF requirements to ensure all can be met on time.

4565. HH highlighted that there is a risk that EIF date may slip back, however, this has not been confirmed officially and therefore the Workgroup was continuing to work on the basis that EIF remains scheduled for January 2017. DS noted that minor D Code modification proposals were being presented to DCRP and would be progressed via self-governance.

4566. HH noted that the Emergency and Restoration EIF date is expected in June 2017. HH also stated that National Grid is working internally on the code mapping, to identify if another Workgroup is required or whether the current GC0095 Workgroup could work on System Defence Planning and Restoration Plan: the view is that this would take a year to design and then a year to implement.

8 Workgroup Reports

None

9 Industry Consultations

a) GC0048: RfG Implementation.

4567. HH noted that the aim was to issue RfG voltage issue the Voltage and reactive consultation by end of the year.

b) GC0087: Requirements for Generators Frequency Provisions

4568. HH said that the consultation will be circulated. There was discussion around ing and whether the latest Terms of Reference reflect this. ed if is, by the end of the year.

4569. There was discussion around GC0087 falling and whether the latest reflect this. DS queried whether there is a need for a D Code modification. GS responded that he sees no reason why would not be able to consider them together as part of. asked the Panel and the Authority Representative if to confirm

- Deleted: :
- Formatted
- Deleted: RJW
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 4531 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0 cm + Indent at: 0.63 cm, Tab stops: 1.25 cm, Left + Not at 1.94 cm
- Deleted: the workgroup ...ncludewh...
- Formatted: Font: Bold
- Deleted: will hopefully go ...ut before...
- Formatted: Font: Bold
- Deleted: Held...he first meeting was...
- Deleted:
- Deleted: offer upoffer up...roduce a...
- Deleted: CMD raised the consideration of LEMPs; with a note
- Deleted:
- Formatted
- Deleted: that cost for access to
- Formatted: Not Superscript/ Subscript
- Deleted: Fed...ed back to
- Formatted
- Deleted: ¶
- Formatted
- Deleted: depending on specific items
- Deleted: 18months
- Formatted: Font color: Auto
- Deleted: noted...ighlighted that ther...
- Formatted: Font color: Auto
- Deleted: also ...oted that the
- Formatted
- Deleted: ¶
- Formatted
- Formatted
- Formatted: Font color: Auto
- Formatted
- Deleted: a...m was ...o issueget ..
- Formatted: Font color: Auto
- Deleted: Consultation
- Formatted
- Deleted: , ...here was discussion
- Deleted:
- Formatted: Font: 14 pt
- Formatted
- Deleted: under GC0048 as another
- Deleted:
- Deleted: ¶
- Formatted

whether it is ~~the~~ workstream work stream if the Panel are ~~are~~ the modification. This would mean that the reports ~~noted~~asked the Authority Representative if they had a

4533 RP asked the Authority Representative their view on how GC0087 should consult on frequency changes following the requirement to implement RfG EU Network Code. GS confirmed he sees no reason why GC0087 needs to be consulted on as part of GC0048. RP confirmed that the Terms of Reference for GC0087 makes special mention to considering the requirements of RfG when consulting. The Terms of Reference also give direct mention to the requirement for GC0087 to report back to the GC0048 co-ordination group. CMD raised the risk that if we do not follow due process the modification may get sent back or rejected so he would prefer to ensure that there is a strong governance structure.

4534 RP asked the Authority Representative their view on how GC0087 should consult on frequency changes following the requirement to implement RfG EU Network Code. ~~was~~ GS confirmed he sees no reason why GC0087 needs to be consulted on as part of GC0048. RP confirmed that the Terms of Reference for GC0087 makes special mention to considering the requirements of RfG when consulting. The Terms of Reference also give direct mention to the requirement for GC0087 to report back to the GC0048 co-ordination group. CMD raised the risk that if we do not follow due process the modification may get sent back or rejected so he would prefer to ensure that there is a strong governance structure.

4534 confirmed he ~~GC0087 need to be consulted on~~ confirmed that the ToR for GC0087 makes special mention to considering the requirements of RfG when consulting. The ToR also gives direct mention to the requirement for GC0087 to report back to the GC0048 co-ordination group that if ~~do~~ the modification may get sent back or rejected so to ensure have a strong governance structure. The Panel agreed that GC0087 does not need to be consulted on under GC0048 as the ToR Terms of Reference for GC0087 captures the requirement to consider RfG EU Network Code. It was concluded that the consultation needs to be sent via the GC0048 co-ordination group before it is submitted to the Authority.

ACTION: Governance around GC0087 needs to feedback into the GC0048 coordination group, before the Report is submitted to the Authority. Action owned by HH.

10 Reports to the Authority

a) GC0077 Subsynchronous Resonance:

4571 Awad's ~~ABA updated the Panel~~ following the send back from the Authority. A teleconference has been held with the Workgroup and Ofgem, with the next steps defined as being: a face to face meeting in early December, providing more material on potential impacts and risks, further information on some indicative costs and also providing a schedule of how frequently events could take place on the system if mitigations are not put in place. ~~R, why the modification was raised, and a cost~~ RP confirmed that the Workgroup felt that it was and potentially time consuming to carry out the work, so further work and engagement will be carried out at the next Workgroup meeting on the 5 December 2016. ~~Another will,~~ The meeting is planned for the 5 December 2016. Following this meeting there will be an indicative timeline given.

4572 RP noted that Ofgem require a lot more detail in the Report including; safety implications, background / context why the modification was raised and a cost benefit analysis. RP confirmed that the Workgroup felt that it was difficult and potentially time consuming to carry out the work, so further engagement will be carried out at the next Workgroup meeting on how to achieve the requirements. Another update will be given at the January Panel.

4573 GN noted that there was no Workgroup meeting or minutes / agenda etc. on the SQSS web site and that there was a need to link back to the SQSS web site with these updates.

ACTION: SSR Update on website SQSS modification update. Action owned by EB.

~~Deleted:~~ would this be

~~Deleted:~~ easier if GC0087 was captured under ...he GC0048

~~Deleted:~~ happy for this ...he to be a

~~Formatted:~~ Font: Arial

~~Formatted:~~ Font: Arial

~~Deleted:~~ or are we

~~Formatted:~~ Font: Arial

~~Deleted:~~ we

~~Formatted:~~ Font: Arial

~~Formatted:~~ Font: Arial

~~Deleted:~~ report? Reports

~~Formatted:~~ Font: Arial

~~Deleted:~~ will be submitted separately, as well as having separate consultations.

~~Formatted:~~ Font: Bold, Italic

~~Deleted:~~ RP

~~Formatted:~~ Indent: Hanging: 1.27 cm

~~Deleted:~~ GC0087 meetings Frequency,...as originally a Grid Cod

~~Formatted:~~ Font: Arial

~~Deleted:~~ ACTION: GS to discuss with Stephen Perry on Ofgem position regarding whether GC0087 needs to be brought in under the banner of GC0048.

~~Deleted:~~ ¶

~~Comment [NG20]:~~ I'm not sure what Bieshoy's surname is -

~~Comment [NG21]:~~ I'm not sure what Bieshoy's surname is - **Awad**

~~Deleted:~~ Bieshoy

~~Formatted:~~ Indent: Hanging: 1.27 cm, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 4571 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1.27 cm + Indent at: 1.9 cm

~~Deleted:~~ update B...ieshoy update

~~Deleted:~~ ...from the Authority. A

~~Formatted:~~ Superscript

~~Deleted:~~ .

~~Formatted:~~ Font color: Auto

~~Formatted:~~

~~Formatted:~~ Font color: Auto

~~Formatted:~~

~~Deleted:~~ -...oted that there was no

~~Deleted:~~ GSR

~~Deleted:~~ the

~~Deleted:~~ ACTION: GSR Update on

11 Pending Authority Decisions

12 **GC0086: open Governance**

4574 Update provided in AOB

12 Progress Tracker

4575 No comments from the Panel on the revised format.

13 Standing Items

a) European Network and (b) Joint European Codes update

Deleted: Moved to

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 1.27 cm, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 4571 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1.27 cm + Indent at: 1.9 cm

Deleted:

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 1.27 cm, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 4571 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1.27 cm + Indent at: 1.9 cm

Moved (insertion) [1]

Formatted: English (U.K.)

Formatted: English (U.K.)

- 4576 RP gave a presentation as the Code Administrator Governance representative on a European Implementation Approach (EIA) document generated by National Grid for the Joint European Stakeholder Group (JESG) in October. It was confirmed that the JESG is a joint BEIS/Ofgem owned forum where stakeholders meet to discuss the implementation of the EU Network Codes. However JESG is not a decision making forum
- 4577 RP confirmed that there are several options put forward in how best to implement the EU Network Codes has been developed and are as follows: including; Full EID, EID light which consists of 4 different implementation approaches and finally continue with the current implementation approach. Along with presenting the different options RP also flagged the pro's positive and con's negatives developed by National Grid along with JESG stakeholders. Comments were invited from Panel members to be fed back to the JESG forum.
- 4578 Some Panel members asked were keen to understand how the decision will be determined. RP responded that JESG is using a scoring mechanism to determine the preferred industry response to the options. RP highlighted that all are welcome to voice opinions or attend the meeting on 23 November meeting to decide which option JESG prefer. RP confirmed it is not clear at this time that who will be making the final decision about which option should be implemented. AF suggested that it must be Ofgem in their role as the Authority, JM noted that the JESG is not a decision making body – Ofgem is represented at JESG.
- 4579 RP asked the Panel if they would like to provide feedback verbally, as a collective Panel or individually, in writing. The Panel agreed that they would create wording to be submitted to the meeting representative of the Panel view. Code Administrators would then be responsible for submitting the response.
- 4759 Panel Grid Code Workgroups are already codes codes
- 4580 was unclear as to the need for this approach. DS added he wanted to step back and gain more context on why changes to the present implementation arrangements were being proposed. The distribution proposed; as he was of the understanding that the D Code is being amended to include the RfG, so it is not clear why these EID proposals are being put forward. concurred stating that he the approach to the EU codes. The Panel also voiced that they were now were at this time. JM noted that the benefits to these options are that there is a single document that would then be easier to unpick in future if required/decided.
- 4581 AF flagged he was concerned that a current approach has already been developed and work is currently being done to implement some EU Network Codes (e.g RfG) and so this would potential leave create a risk that these changes in would be put into a state of uncertainty.
- 4582 AV questioned who is pushing these approaches forward. JM responded that at JESG there is recognition of the complexities and volume of changes caused by the EU codes. RP added that part of the concern is that there are significant cross-code impacts coming for future codes, and delivering these changes may prove difficult under the current structure. RP felt that the essence is to make it easier for stakeholders to see that the requirements, captures them, are captured. From a consistency point of view if each code implements the changes differently or interprets the meaning differently then it will make things compliance and understanding harder for stakeholders, and participants across all codes.
- 4583 TT concurred and noted that there is a risk that if there is not a coherent approach such as a single EU document that the EU mandate could be implemented differently by different codes due to differing interpretations. RLo questioned whether once the initial push of EU codes has been implemented, if there was a future workload issue that would utilise this piece of work. If not then RLo queried the necessity of this additional work given the amount of work the industry already has. TT noted that there is a risk of splitting

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 1.27 cm, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 4571 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1.27 cm + Indent at: 1.9 cm

Deleted: ENC Implementation...

Moved down [4]: Presentation update from RP.

Deleted: The...Joint European

Moved (insertion) [4]

Deleted: T...he Joint European

Deleted: ion

Deleted: are being held on how best to implement the European changes required to GB codes. The current approach highlights the complexity of interfacing and delivery of coordinating changes across the codes. Significant impacts to Grid code and BSC have been identified...owever JESG is not

Deleted: One option suggested is; a single European Interface Document (EID) paper that houses the EU codes and is referenced across to the GB codes. Alternative options are available, but pros include being able to make future changes easier, implementation easier, governance can be supported and centralisation would ensure collaboration across Code Administrators. Cons include timescales, license changes, new bo

Deleted: <#>AF concerned that the

Deleted: is recommended

Deleted: <#>Full EID option is one

Formatted

Deleted: questioned ...he

Deleted: AF noted that his

Deleted: ,

Deleted: we are

Deleted: is

Deleted: working on current

Formatted

Deleted: wants...dded he

Deleted: s

Deleted: s. ...he

Deleted: as to

Deleted: AF ...onccurred stating that

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Deleted: this...hese approaches

Deleted: that

Deleted: particularly if each code is

Deleted: is...onccurred and noted th

requirements, and AC noted that it is difficult to envisage what these options look like in practice. TT commented that something that simple to implement now may run the risk of making things more complex later on, therefore there was a view point that by putting EU requirements in to individual codes now may actually help in the longer term.

4584 JM indicated National Grid can provide an to feedback to JESG, if members write to Grid Code. Box with their views and National Grid will ensure that these get passed on to JESG ahead of 23 November. RLo noted that the EID approach would not eliminate the risk but would assist with cross-code coordination. Whilst DS stated that he was really unhappy about these suggestions noting the risk that this could mean 18 months' worth of work could be wasted, GN agreed that there should be a response from the Panel and representation at the JESG meeting. GN and RLo agreed to lead on this activity on behalf of the Panel.

4585 Draft text and sent to Panel members, GN and RLo to draft via Panel chair and work offline. EB

4586 ACTION: Circulate the EID presentation to Panel members to enable response to EID JESG presentation. Action owned by EB.

c) Code Summary; SQSS

4587 Commented that there was an error on the SQSS log; Code Governance to check.

d) Grid Code Development Forum

4588 8 December 2016 is the next meeting; it was suggested that this is rescheduled or cancelled due to lack of agenda items.

ACTION: Include the GCDF papers in the GCRP Panel papers and amend the error within the SQSS paper for the January Panel. Action owned by EB.

Progress Tracker

4589 GN Annual report on modifications tracker would be helpful and highlighted on the tracker would also be a useful addition.

ACTION: EB to present new modifications tracker to January Panel. Action owned by EB.

EBS Update

4590 ADC provided an update on EBS. The system is progressing well on the commissioning of EBS into the control room. For the Scheduling element of the system the go live is planned for the 29th November 2016. This will be used by a particular team in December and will be running in parallel to current systems. Due to this there will be no change to what is seen externally. EDL and EDT will still be connected to the same boxes.

4591 ADC noted that in terms of training there have been challenges to this and it is taking longer than anticipated to get the control room users upskilled with the new procedures. A re-plan is now being phased until the end of 2016. Looking at following phases with regards to the Dispatch phase (this phase will impact market participants) it is currently anticipated to have a go live during Q2 2017. A transition plan is being developed internally to National Grid and this will be shared in early 2017.

4592 It is expected that within these plans there will be a need to trial with market participants over a short timespan to test and check specific instructions are being carried through. It is expected that these will be carried out during Q1 2017. In terms of what we call the full EBS go live there are as yet no specific dates given for 2017.

- Deleted: ...AC...nd AC noted that i...
- Deleted: RP responses from panel
- Deleted: we
- Deleted: option would need a new
- Deleted: we will
- Deleted: .
- Deleted: you can
- Deleted: . All can
- Deleted: box
- Deleted: your ...ith their views and
- Deleted: 23rd...3 November. Membe
- Deleted: is
- Deleted: this
- Deleted:
- Deleted: would...ould mean
- Deleted: panel...anel members...
- Formatted
- Moved up [1]: <#>Joint European
- Formatted
- Deleted: <#>¶
- Deleted: ¶
- Deleted: ¶
- Formatted
- Deleted: No updates. ¶
- Comment [AMC22]: I can't recall w
- Deleted: <#>No comments from the
- Formatted
- Formatted
- Deleted: ¶
- Formatted
- Deleted: 8th
- Formatted
- Deleted: .
- Deleted: ¶
- Deleted: s
- Deleted: .
- Deleted: ¶
- Formatted
- Formatted
- Deleted: panel.
- Deleted: ¶
- Formatted
- Formatted
- Deleted:
- Formatted
- Deleted: Progressing...he system is
- Formatted
- Deleted: NoNo
- Formatted
- Deleted: In...DC noted that in terms
- Deleted: There are ...t is expected ¶
- Comment [NG23]: HH I don't

- 4593 An ADC also updated on the action request to have an EBS Forum with members of Grid Code Panel and the BSC is being formed. A member of [s team will] Panel; this is being formed. A member of the National Grid System Operator's leadership team will chair the forum and the first of these will be held in February 2017.
- 4594 ADC was keen to request input and guidance from the Panel on the governance and reporting structure to ensure that discussions and decision from the forum are fed out to the necessary Panels and vice versa. CMD enquired as to how activities will be reflected in the forum as to prioritisation etc. ADC suggested that activities would be prioritised by timescale / impact or interfaces. CMD highlighting that TERRE needs to be captured as it could set the priorities for late 2017 – 2018 and impact on the EBS go live.
- 4595 JM suggested suggested that the forum feeds back to the Panel when they feel there is a material impact to Grid Code being highlighted. JL feels it should be a two way conversation out from Panels to the forum as well as vice versa. JT also highlighted that there are some changes will be purely internal to National Grid and therefore the scope needs to be defined carefully. ADC concurred noting that the main feeders into discussion will be regulatory changes and internal National Grid changes. ADC stated that it is expected that the forum will be run every two – three months.
- 4596 Action log: ADC still needs to action the update, due to fluidity of the timeline as to when these changes will come into effect they are not yet considered actions that can be carried out. JM suggested that there should be a direct link back to the RES documents.

- Deleted:
- Deleted: Actions Actions
- Deleted:
- Deleted: this panel
- Comment [RP24]: Will need to anonymise this – job title?
- Deleted: potentially
- Deleted: panel
- Deleted: this is progressing well.
- Deleted: Cathy McClay
- Deleted: McClay has agreed to
- Deleted:
- Formatted: Font color: Auto
- Deleted: Asking for
- Deleted: panel on reporting bringing g conclusions and discussion back to GCRP – what
- Deleted: could we have with BSC
- Deleted: GCRP; suggestions welcome around governance.
- Deleted: How will these
- Deleted: ? ADCADC
- Deleted: ,
- Deleted: ingsuggesting
- Deleted: panel
- Deleted: panels
- Deleted: TTTT
- Deleted: .
- Deleted: ADC
- Deleted: the
- Deleted: AV how often will
- Deleted: held? ADC
- Deleted: – quarterly currently planned
- Formatted: Font color: Auto
- Deleted: . Not
- Deleted: .
- Formatted: Font color: Auto

4597 CMD raised the concern about training and authorisation of adding in new participants, however, ADC responded that the programme team are not envisioning that any changes to process will need to be made so stakeholder should not experience any differences.

4598 TT stated that with all transformation programmes there will be a handover from the programme team to running as business as usual. CMD continued his point that he does not want to be told that the industry can't add new participants due to the new system and people not being trained properly. TT there are phased handovers of systems like this not a single end point and therefor this was a risk that was being mitigated and any disruption was very unlikely.

14 Impact of other Code Modifications or Developments

4599 No comments from Panel

15 Any other Business

a) Week 24 Submissions Presentation

4600 A presentation was given by Joaquin Jimenez and Geoff Ray from National Grid regarding the Week 24 Submission process. There are 14 different types of schedules and the role of the DNO Data Liaison & Management team within National Grid is to act as a single point of contact for DNOs.

4601 National Grid reported that timeliness of the Week 24 submission is an issue due to the internal review processes involved. GN queried how many schedules are there currently. JJ replied that there are approximately 200-250 documents although this varies year on year.

4602 There are currently differences between the National Grid and the DNOs view of the generation connected to the distribution networks. JJ noted that they would like consistency between the list of embedded generators from DNOs and the information that National Grid has compiled from their own sources. In recent times JJ and GR noted that there has been a decline in the level of analysis carried out on the data received. Panel members queried the accuracy of the current data.

4603 AV noted that the data capture should relate to embedded generators of one megawatt or more and questioned whether it includes uses Storage Plant. CMD contributed that unless Storage is a part of the schedule the information will not be supplied. AC commented that the difference between the embedded generation information provided from DNO should align more closely with that from National Grid sources over time as the quality of DNO and National Grid data improved. DS noted that he was interested in whether there was a trend of improved or worsening data quality and therefore was keen to see data from the last five years to make an assessment. DS continued that he was unclear if National Grid was making a specific proposal to change or improving the data gathered and analysis.

4604 CMD queried as to whether there was a defect for the Panel to consider and was interested as to why this presentation had not first been taken to the Grid Code Development Forum (GCDF). RLo continued that if the DNOs have submitted this data then there should be an assumption that the view of the DNOs. Jeff can't disagree data given is correct and valid; JJ agreed with this point.

4605 CMD noted that GC0095 TSOG was not mentioned on the slides. HH commented that there is flexibility with this however, did agree that there would need to be information from this presentation fed into the TSOG modification.

4606 JJ commented that National Grid is restricted by the increased data submissions from DNOs due to the constraints in the Grid Code to share data via excel sheets. GN noted

- Deleted: ...ADC...however, ADC ...
- Formatted
- Deleted: TTTT...T stated that with a ...
- Formatted
- Deleted: ¶
- Formatted
- Deleted: panel
- Deleted: ¶
- Formatted
- Formatted
- Deleted: Other
- Formatted
- Comment [NG25]: HH Would be go ...
- Deleted: ¶
- Formatted
- Deleted: ¶
- Formatted
- Formatted
- Deleted: (view slides) ...nd the role ...
- Formatted
- Deleted: For the production of ...
- Deleted: Produce the schedules.
- Deleted: Timeliness is an issue.
- Deleted: queries
- Deleted: .
- Deleted: with ...J replied that there ...
- Deleted: - ... although this varies ...
- Deleted: Differences
- Deleted: s...of the generation ...
- Deleted: ;
- Deleted: with regards to difference...
- Deleted: Need a consolidated list ..
- Deleted: re
- Deleted: there
- Deleted: needs to be a consolidate ...
- Deleted: . Level
- Deleted: to ensure a more accurate ...
- Deleted: has been in decline. Quer...
- Deleted: .
- Formatted
- Deleted: go down to 1megawatt. ...
- Deleted: be reduced to
- Deleted: 1megawatt
- Deleted: use
- Deleted: is...uses Storage Plant.? ...
- Deleted: If it's not ...ontributed that ...
- Deleted: there should be an
- Deleted: with time. We have not yet ...
- Deleted: over time with changes to ...
- Deleted: atat
- Deleted: to see
- Deleted: ? BeBe
- Deleted: trends were being set
- Deleted: what the trend is... is there ...
- Deleted: what is the SO is doing about
- Deleted: it? Embedded generation ...

that we should be careful not to duplicate the submission of data e.g. with the DNOs Long Term Development Statement.

4607 It was agreed that any issues raised would be considered in conjunction with the Data Exchange workstream under TSOG. It was agreed that any issues raised would be considered in conjunction with the Data Exchange work stream under TSOG.

4608 DS requested for the information to be presented to DCRP by Graham Stein.

ACTION: Graham Stein to be asked to present at DCRP. Action owned by XZ.

ACTION: Are IDNO's listed – do they give information / data. National Grid to answer and update. Action owned by HH.

ACTION: DS wants to see trend data for 5 years and for the slide pack to be circulated. Action owned by XZ.

4609 Code Governance Update GC0086 Open Governance

4610 RP updated the Panel on the progress of GC0086. It was confirmed that work is still being undertaken on drafting the legal text for CGR3 liaison and that liaison between Ofgem and the National Grid legal team teams is taking longer than expected so there is an aim to complete the work by the end of November 2016 and to share with Ofgem ahead of the 7th December 2016. If we achieve this then the hope is to start to implement by the end of Q1 2017.

4611 RPRP then asked if they are asked if the Code Administrator Panel agreed to stay in place for additional one or two Panel meetings thus postponing the election for consistency 1 or 2 meeting Panel members until a decision is reached on GC0086.

4612 TT asked if the constitution is different under Open Open Governance with RP confirmed confirming that there will be fewer representatives on the Panel and with a switch to a focus on accountability and decision making. JL raised a risk that by RP not showing the legal text to Panel ahead of it being implemented problems could be caused with any decision the Authority makes. RP asked the Panel if they wished to see the legal text or For 1 final Report before submission. The Panel agreed that they did not think it was necessary to review the document again before submission.

4613 RPRP then discussed the current recruitment process of a new Independent man Chairperson for GCRP. The aim is now to appoint an. There is a Chairperson for the beginning of 2017. There is a being to the Proposal is being considered to have a new joint chair towards end of 2017 for Grid Code and CUSC. RP confirmed the Code Administrator will be writing an open letter to Ofgem to discuss the Code Administrator's minded too position on the recruitment of an Independent Chairman Chairperson, but wanted to stress that we do not have any clear candidates as yet.

4614 GGS flagged to the Panel that the Ofgem CMA Remedies on Code Governance Consultation has now been published. The deadline to respond to Ofgem proposal is the 11st February 2017. GS also confirmed that on the 12th January Ofgem will be hosting a stakeholder seminar on their view of the remedies. RP confirmed that the Code Administrator areis planning on putting in a response to the Consultation consultation. RP confirmed that in January the Code Administrator will present on the Consultation consultation.

ACTION: RP to write out to the entire Grid Code distribution list that the election process is being put on hold until GC0086. Action owned by RP.

ACTION: RP to circulate offline the legal text with Panel / distribution list. Action owned by RP.

ACTION: Circulate link to the Ofgem Code Administrators consultation. Action owned by RP.

- Deleted: of the duplication of data
- Deleted: ,
- Deleted: and work being carried out
- Deleted: AC noted that week 24 da ...
- Deleted: so ok. GN IDNO data how ...
- Deleted: .
- Deleted: CMD this should go to TS ...
- Formatted
- Deleted: ¶
- Formatted
- Deleted: would like this
- Formatted
- Deleted:
- Deleted: XY
- Deleted: .
- Deleted: open door to attend
- Deleted: is comfortable with
- Deleted: ¶
- Formatted
- Deleted: ¶
- Deleted: ¶
- Deleted: is still
- Deleted: being carried out...s still
- Formatted
- Deleted: we will start
- Deleted: Isl...PRP then asks... the ...
- Deleted: panel
- Deleted: a new panel...consistency ...
- Deleted: is ...he constitution is
- Deleted: agreed ...o see
- Deleted: .
- Deleted: for a...final Report before
- Deleted: I...PRP then discussed the
- Deleted: chairperson
- Deleted: proposal ...eing is to...o th ...
- Deleted: DS update panel...DS
- Formatted
- Deleted: .
- Formatted
- Deleted: .
- Deleted: responses
- Deleted: yes we are optioneering of ...
- Deleted: Consultation... RP confirm ...
- Deleted: panel will have a
- Deleted: Consultation with further
- Deleted: .
- Formatted
- Deleted: all of
- Comment [RP27]: Not sure who this ...
- Deleted: panel / DL. .

16 Next Meeting

The next meeting is planned for ~~18~~, January ~~2017~~, at National Grid House, Warwick. Papers day is the ~~4~~, January ~~2017~~.

- Deleted:** 18th
- Formatted:** No bullets or numbering
- Deleted:** 2016
- Deleted:** 4th
- Deleted:** ¶
¶
- Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0 cm, First line: 0 cm