

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.

Attendees

Name	Role	Initials	Company
John Martin	Chair	JM	Code Administrator
Ellen Bishop	Technical Secretary	EB	Code 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	National Grid Code Administrator
Xiaoyao Zhou	NGET Member	XZ	National Grid
Tim Truscott	NGET Member	TKT	National Grid
Antonio Del Castillo	NGET Presenter	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	BSC Panel Alternate	JL	ELEXON
David Spillett	Network Operator (E&W) Alternate DS		ENA
Tim Ellingham	Large Generator (<3GW) Member (Interim)	TE	RWE
Honor Hynes	NGET Member	HH	National Grid
Bieshoy Awad	NGET Member	BA	National Grid
Joaquin Jimenez	NGET Member	JJ	National Grid
Geoff Ray	NGET Member	GR	National Grid
Philip Jenner	Large Generator (<3GW) Member	PJ	Horizon Nuclear Power

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 Transmission) Member	RL	SHE Transmission
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

4781. Apologies were received from: RW, (alternate HH), JN retired welcome TE, LF, NR

a) September 2016 GCRP Minutes

4782. Comments were received from JN, CMD, JN, TT, RW and GP.

4783. 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

4784. Action Log: 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.

4785. **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; however this action has been placed on hold due to a need to priorities work in accordance with resourcing capabilities.

4786. **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.

4787. **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 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

4531 HH presented the Project Terre issue paper. The purpose of the presentation was to gain Panel approval to set up a Workgroup.

4532 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.

4533 JL raised concerns about the timescales being put forward in the paper and the potential impact this has on the on the work that is already ongoing in the Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC) 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 have the risk of slowing down and impacting this ongoing and interlinked work. JL highlighted repeatedly the level of inter-dependencies that are now apparent between BSC and Grid Code. 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 as 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.

- 4534 TT noted the lead identifies an issue ahead of consultation then that is a concern to be considered and discussed. TT reflected that the BSC and Grid Code do need to work together. They cannot be isolated.
- 4535 CMD raised the issue of run up rates not being accounted for in TERRE and TT added that run rates and ramp times are a BSC issue; 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
- 4536 RLo felt that agreed the BSC and Grid Code Workgroups need to progress in tandem. JL confirmed that the BSC consultation is planned and on schedule for mid-February.
- 4537 AV asked whether there should be a joint BSC/Grid Code Working Group. As the risks being raised by other Panel members could 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.
- 4538 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.
- 4539 AF moved on the discussion to highlight that the definition of the modification is not yet fully 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.
- 4540 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 continued to query as to 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.
- 4541 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.
- 4542 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.

- 4543 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.
- 4544 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.
- 4545 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.
- 4546 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.
- 4547 JL pointed out that the 14 August 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, which should enable an informed steer from Ofgem.
- 4548 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.
- 4549 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. 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 this 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).

- 4550 XZ provided an update. Vector Shift discussed 6-12 degrees movement and there is a view from the Workgroup that further research needs to be carried out to assess if this is sufficient protection for embedded generations. The Workgroup want to do further research and together with RoCoF information produce a joint report for the D Code and Grid Code.
- 4551 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 plan that will be adhered to and to be included in the report; particularly having missed the 1 August 2016 date.
- 4552 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 need to highlight that there is a clear commercial plan. There is a concern over the commercial considerations and the lack of movement in this area.
- 4553 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 to research as 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.
- 4554 Not specifically about GC0079 but related to it: GN requested that the report for significant incidents to be presented at the Panel in January. 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. XY responded that yes this is being considered and is a part of the work that is ongoing.
- 4555 XY 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 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 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 XY.

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 XY.

b) GC0048: Requirements for Generators

- 4556 HH provided an update: HH **Banding**: RJW is updating the Workgroup report to include a proposal to uncouple the bandings from any consideration of BM participation.
- 4557 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.
- 4558 HH **Compliance for RfG**: The first meeting was held in November 2016 kicking off initial discussions around equipment certificates for Type A and B generation. 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.
- 4559 DS noted that the next step for the Compliance group 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

- 4560 Entry into Force (EIF) dates are staggered depending on specific items 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.
- 4561 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.
- 4562 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

- 4563 None

9 Industry Consultations

a) GC0048: RfG Implementation.

- 4564 HH noted the aim was to issue the Voltage and Reactive consultation by end of the year.

b) GC0087: Requirements for Generators Frequency Provisions

- 4565 HH said that the consultation will be circulated by the end of the year.
- 4566 There was discussion around GC0087 falling under GC0048 and whether the latest Terms of Reference reflect this. DS queried whether there is a need for a D Code modification. GS responded that he sees no reason why they would not be able to consider them together as part of GC0048.
- 4567 RP asked the Panel and the Authority Representative to confirm whether it would be easier if GC0087 was captured under the GC0048 work stream or if the Panel are happy for

this to be a standalone modification. This would mean that the reports will be submitted separately, as well as having separate consultations.

4568 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.

4569 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.

4570 The Panel agreed that GC0087 does not need to be consulted on under GC0048 as the 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 BA 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. 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 site and that there was a need to link back to the SQSS site with these updates.

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

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 Codes

- 4576 RP gave a presentation as the Code Governance representative on a European Implementation Approach (EID) 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, 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 positive and negatives developed by National Grid along with JESG stakeholders. Comments were invited from Panel members to be fed back to the JESG forum.
- 4578 Panel members 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 is recommended. RP confirmed it is not clear at this time 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.
- 4579 RP asked the Panel if they would like to provide feedback verbally or 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.
- 4580 AF noted that his understanding, concurred with by other Panel members was that, Grid Code is already working on current connection codes therefore was unclear as to the need for this approach. DS added he wanted to step back and gain more contexts on why changes were being proposed; as he was of the understanding that the D Code is being amended to include the RfG so it is not clear as to why these EID proposals are being put forward. AF concurred stating that he understood that the approach to the EU codes had all been agreed previously. The Panel also voiced that they were unclear on why these options were being put forward at this time.
- 4581 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.
- 4582 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 create a risk that these changes would be put into a state of uncertainty.
- 4583 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 the requirements that are captured. From a consistency point of view if each code implements the changes differently or interprets the meaning differently then it will make compliance and understanding harder for stakeholders and participants across all codes.
- 4584 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 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.

4585 JM we will feedback to JESG. All can write to Grid Code. Box views and we will ensure that these get passed on to JESG ahead of 23 November. RLo noted that EID would not eliminate the risk but would assist with cross-code coordination. Whilst DS stated that he was really unhappy about this 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.

4586 Draft text and sent to Panel members; GN and RLo to draft via Panel chair and work offline.

4587 **ACTION: Circulate the EID presentation to Panel members to enable response to EID JESG presentation. Action owned by EB.**

b) Joint European

No updates.

c) Code Summary; SQSS

4588 Commented that there was an error on the SQSS log; Code Governance to check.

d) Grid Code Development Forum

4589 8th December is the next meeting; suggested that this is rescheduled or cancelled.

ACTION: Include the GCDF papers in the GCRP Panel papers.

Progress Tracker

4590 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.

e) EBS Update

4591 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.

4592 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.

4593 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.

- 4594 ADC also updated on the action request to have an EBS Forum with members of Grid Code Panel and the BSC 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.
- 4595 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.
- 4596 JM 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. TT 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.
- 4597 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.
- 4598 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.
- 4599 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

- 4600 No comments from Panel

15. Any other Business

a) Week 24 Submissions Presentation

- 4601 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.
- 4602 For the production of schedules timeliness is an issue due to the processes involved. Produce the schedules. GN queries how many schedules are there currently with JJ referring to approximately 200-250 documents, although this varies year on year.
- 4603 There are currently differences between National Grid and the DNOs views of the world with regards to differences in levels anticipated of embedded generation. JJ noted that there needs to be a consolidated list gathered between the DNOs and National Grid to ensure a more accurate way of gathering data. In recent times JJ and GR noted that there has been a decline in the level of analysis carried out. Panel members queried the accuracy of the current data.
- 4604 AV noted that the data capture should be reduced to 1 megawatt and questioned whether it uses Storage? CMD contributed that unless Storage is a part of the schedule the information will not be supplied. AC commented that there should be an expectation that the differences would reduce over time with changes to the system. DS noted that he was interested in looking to see whether trends were being set and therefore was keen to see data from the last five years to make an assessment. DS continued that he was unclear what the SO is doing about improving the data gathering and analysis.
- 4605 CMD voiced his query 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 data given is correct and valid; JJ agreed with this point.
- 4606 CMD noted that GC0095: TSOG was not included 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 TSOG.
- 4607 JJ commented that National Grid is restricted by the increased data requests from DNOs due to the constraints in the Grid Code to share data via excel sheets. GN noted that we should be careful of the duplication of data and work being carried out. AC noted that week 24 data is a higher level.
- 4608 It was agreed that any issues raised would be considered in conjunction with the Data Exchange work stream under TSOG.
- 4609 DS would like this information to be presented to DCRP by Graham Stein.

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

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 is comfortable with attendance at the D Code meetings. Action owned by XY.

b) Code Governance Update

4610 **GC0086 Open Governance**

- 4611 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 and that liaison between Ofgem and the National Grid legal teams is taking longer than expected. 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.
- 4612 RP then asked if the Panel agreed to stay in place for additional one or two panel meetings thus postponing the election for Panel members until a decision is reached on GC0086.
- 4613 TT asked if the constitution is different under Open Governance with RP confirming that there will be fewer representatives on the Panel and there is 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 agreed to circulate legal text once internal reviews are complete for a final review before publication.
- 4614 RP then discussed the current recruitment process of a new Independent Chairperson for GCRP. The aim is now to appoint an interim chairperson for the beginning of 2017. There is a proposal 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 Chairperson, but wanted to stress that we do not have any clear candidates as yet.
- 4615 GS 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 1st 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 is planning on putting in a responses to the Consultation. RP confirmed that in January the Code Administrator will do a presentation on the Consultation with further details to follow in due course.

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.

16 Next Meeting

- 15 The next meeting is planned for 18th January 2016 at National Grid House, Warwick. Papers day is the 4th January.