

Gents

Below is my DAR from the Grid Code Review Panel meeting. Key points to note include:

- There was a further debate on the Relevant Electrical Standards (RES) and whether there should be common standards not just in terms of connection to the Transmission System (i.e. the 275kV NG system in England & Wales and the 132kV system in Scotland) but also for connections to the Distribution System (especially at 132kV) as this would be easier for developers of larger generation installations. The focus so far has been on connections to the TO systems, but there was mention of the 12 DNOs also coming up with common set of plant standards. This would be a DCRP issue. This will be discussed further at the GCode Design Forum (4 Feb) so it might be worth attending to try and maintain the focus on TO systems.
- DNOs need to review the representation non GC0087 Frequency Response Provisions given that RoCoF withstand is included in their updated ToR.
- The Report to the Authority re Open Governance is in the final stages of drafting. NG's recommendation is to implement the original Open Governance proposal tweaked a bit re WG Timescales, WG Consultation Reports, Self-governance (possibly) and the timescale for appointing an Independent Chair. Seems likely to be approved by Ofgem. There will be some short term implications for ITCG (appointing reps) and potentially some longer term issues re DCRP governance.

Other interesting snippets highlighted in yellow

Regards Alan

**Attendees:**

Alan Creighton	Northern Powergrid
Campbell McDonald	SSE Generation
Graham Stein	NG
Richard Lavender	Customer Connections
Richard Lowe	SHETL
Guy Phillips	Eon
Guy Nicholson	Element Power
Rob Longdon	Cornwall Energy
Alastair Frew	SP
Andy Voden	EdF
Richard Woodward	NG
Tom McCartney	SONI
Gareth Evans	Ofgem

Ryan Place	NG
Phil Jenner	Horizon
Ian Pashley	NG Chair
Nick Ruben	Elexon
Richard Lowe	SHETL
Jim Barbour	SHETL
Lisa Waters	Waters Wyse
Tony Johnson	NG
Graham Stein	NG
Tim	NG Operation
Gordon Kelly	SP Energy Networks
Graeme Vincent	SPT
John Norbury	RWE
Alex Thomason	NG
Plus others	

**Apologies:**

Rob Wilson	NG
Steve Cox	ENW
Sigrid Bolik	Senergy Econnect

Issue	Paper No:	Summary	Proposed Next Steps		
			What	Who	When
<b>1 Welcomes</b>		Martha is leaving EUK and joining NGET			
<b>2 Minutes</b>	Pp16-01 Pp16-02	Some comments had been received and accepted.			
<b>3 Actions</b>	Pp16-06	4180 - Minutes published. 4181 - Continue wider review of end to end modification process. Ongoing. 4182 - Update Issues Paper and Workgroup Terms of Reference templates and publish both on the NGET website. Ongoing. 4142 - RP to circulate link to new templates on NGET website, once published. Ongoing.			

Issue	Paper No:	Summary	Proposed Next Steps		
			What	Who	When
		<p>4191 - SHE Transmission documents have been published. One comment has been received. On agenda. SPT documents submitted for the 20 day process. On agenda.</p> <p>4191 - Liaison to develop a single suite of documents is ongoing. There was a further debate on the Relevant Electrical Standards (RES) and whether there should be common standards not just in terms of connection to the Transmission System (i.e. the 275kV NG system in England &amp; Wales and the 132kV system in Scotland) but also for connections to the Distribution System (especially at 132kV) as this would be easier for developers of larger generation installations. The focus so far has been on connections to the TO systems, but there was mention of the 12 DNOs also coming up with common set of plant standards. Gareth Evans was surprised that there were different standards and though that there would be benefits associated with a common standard at interface between Generators and Transmission systems. This would be a DCRP issue. This will be discussed further at the GCode Design Forum (4 Feb) so it might be worth attending to try and maintain the focus on TO systems. There was concern that the GCode Development Forum isn't really working, and that there needs to be a concerted effort to make sure it does work as envisaged.</p> <p>the current requirements then the discussion re harmonisation should be addressed later.</p> <p>4196 - NG to finalise the remaining 3 or 4 RES documents. March GCRP</p> <p>4196 -Ofgem to confirm which standards would be applicable to third parties connecting at the interface point. Clarification email from Ofgem circulated. CMcD has some concerns about the clarification and raised a concern that there would be different interface standards for 132kV generator connections between E&amp;W and Scotland.</p> <p>4202 - NG to provide a report to the Panel in January on next steps and work planning following code mapping for implementation of the ENC's. On Agenda</p> <p>4225 - NG to provide an update on the System Operator Guideline and Cross-Code collaboration opportunities. On Agenda</p> <p>4202 - RJW to circulate GC0048 ToR following review in line with GC0087 ToR. On Agenda</p> <p>4202 - NG to amend ToR for GC0087 to add context to point 5. Completed.</p> <p>4218 - NG to review colour scheme of the Progress Tracker. March GCRP.</p> <p>4223 - Circulate GCDF 2016 dates to Panel. Done</p>			

Issue	Paper No:	Summary	Proposed Next Steps		
			What	Who	When
		4231 - NG to provide a final version of the System Disturbance Report. On Agenda 4321 - NG to provide Panel paper on ROCOF withstand at Jan Panel. On Agenda			
<b>4 New GC developments SHE Transmission Electrical Standards</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SHE broadly adopted NGET TO RES standards except where there is a justifiable reason to deviate. The SHE document lists the NG RES and sets out variation to the RES in an open and transparent way. One minor comment has been received.</li> <li>SPT documents have been circulated as part of the 20 day consultation process. CMcD had quite a few comments – so these standards are unlikely to pass through the process.</li> <li>The two recent RES consultations should really have included some accompanying legal text to change the GGC General Conditions. There are some presentational differences that need to be resolved to make the set of documents easier to use.</li> <li>See discussion on the Actions as there may be implications for DNOs and DCRP if there is a desire to harmonise the plant specification standards.</li> <li>The outstanding NGET RES documents that were only presented in Draft form at the last review are still being developed and there will be an update at the Mar 2016 GCRP.</li> </ul>			
<b>5 Existing Gcode Development Issues</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>			
<b>6 Workgroups in progress</b>  <b>GC0079 Frequency Changes during large disturbances</b>	Pp16-04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phase 1 changes for generators &gt;5MW ongoing</li> <li>LoM protection setting work nearly complete.</li> <li>Agreed within GC0079 and interested parties that RoCoF withstand (for new RfG compliant generators) discussions would be best placed in GC0087 as the right folk were already involved. A concern is that by the nature RoCoF withstand requirements would be retrospective, and that there could be confusion between existing and new (RfG) plant requirements. The revised GC0087 ToR will be presented at the March GCRP although they will start work beforehand.</li> </ul>			
<b>6 Workgroups in progress</b>  <b>GC0087 RfG Frequency</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This issue relates to the reduction in the inertia on the system potentially requiring generators to provide 'faster frequency response'.</li> <li>There needs to be additional clarity from GC0048 to make sure that GC0087 does deliver the requirements of GC0048. Hence the ToR may need to be updated. The Code Mapping</li> </ul>			

Issue	Paper No:	Summary	Proposed Next Steps		
			What	Who	When
<b>Response Provisions</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Template should be used to add this clarity. (e.g. parameter setting)</li> <li>The ToR now includes RoCoF Withstand</li> <li>DNOs need to look at the updated ToR to make sure that we're properly represented as there could be some DCode implications.</li> </ul>			
<b>6 Workgroups in progress</b>  <b>GC0077 &amp; NETS SQSS</b> <b>GSR018 Subsynchronous Resonance</b>	Pp16-05 Pp16-06 Pp16-07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Combined SQSS and GCRP workgroup</li> <li>Changes to SQSS will include a requirement to study for SSO as part of the design process.</li> <li>Changes to GCode will relate to the Connection Conditions.</li> <li>WG report has been approved by SQSS RP and is with the GCRP today for approval to proceed to industry consultation. The combined consultation document which includes the proposed changes to SQSS and GCode is due to be issued by the end of February. GCRP agreed to approve the WG report, so the industry consultation can proceed.</li> <li>Not an issue for DNOs.</li> </ul>			
<b>7 Workgroup Reports</b>  <b>GC0062 Fault Ride Through</b>	Pp16-08 Pp16-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The WG focussed on FRT for larger generators and doesn't make any proposals to support RfG implementation. RfG has been considered in the WG and there is helpful collateral captured in the WG report. The WG concludes that there is still a lot of work to do to develop the RfG implementation which will be done by GC0048.</li> <li>The WG report has been completed and tabled for agreement. The GCRP agreed to proceed to industry consultation.</li> <li>There shouldn't have any implications for DNOs from this change.</li> </ul>			
<b>7 Workgroup Reports</b>  <b>GC0048 RfG Implementation</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same slide pack as those presented at the GC0048 and GC0091 WGs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GC0048 G – Co-ordination, definitions etc</li> <li>GC0048 T - Technical (FRT, Voltage &amp; Reactive Power)</li> <li>GC0048 System Management – Possibly include in the GC0048 T group</li> <li>GC0090 HVDC</li> <li>GC0091 DCC</li> <li>GC0087 Frequency Response (RoCoF)</li> </ul> </li> <li>GCRP generally agreed that this proposed structure is OK</li> <li>The Code Mapping Template will be used to make sure all the EU Articles are being</li> </ul>			

Issue	Paper No:	Summary	Proposed Next Steps		
			What	Who	When
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addressed properly</li> <li>These ToR will all need to be agreed by the DCRP as well. AMC to email RW asking for complete set for the next DCRP in 11 Feb.</li> </ul>			
<b>8 Industry Consultation</b>  <b>GC0075: Hybrid Static Compensators</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relates to the interpretation of 'continuous fast acting' in the design / testing of this type of plant</li> <li>Sets out the expectation in terms of the operating range and the number of events per day when the defined performance is required. This is the type of issue that DNOs may need to think about if this type of equipment is installed on DNO networks.</li> <li>GCRP Agreed to go to industry consultation at the last meeting which was published today with a closing date of 7 February</li> <li>Not an issue for DNOs</li> </ul>			
<b>9 Report to the Authority</b>  <b>GC0086: Grid Code Open Governance</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft Report to Ofgem has been circulated in two volumes.</li> <li>Industry Consultation closed 6 November. 17 responses with split views on whether to proceed. 8 original -yes, 6 alternative- yes, 2 neither, 1 no preference. There was majority or unanimous agreement on most issues, but with some exceptions. The draft report summarises the consultation responses.</li> <li>NG recommendation is that the Original Proposal on balance is best overall although the following items in the Original proposal are to be amended in response to the consultation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WG duration should be fixed initially at 6 months (time for the WG to report to the GCRP) but with flexibility to extend even at the first meeting.</li> <li>WG Consultation not to be mandated where it doesn't really add value – there would be an Industry Consultation in any event.</li> <li>Self-Governance. Proposal to remove Ofgem's ability to direct the self-governance process. This differs from industry self-governance, so will be easier said than done.</li> <li>NG to defer the appointment of an Independent Chair until issues re their appointment and payment are resolved.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The proposed legal text have been updated to reflect these changes</li> <li>Implementation grouped into three stages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes that require a licence change (fast track / self-governance issues). This</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			

Issue	Paper No:	Summary	Proposed Next Steps		
			What	Who	When
		<p>would need to co-ordinate the Ofgem Code Governance Phase 3 – this might be later this summer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Changes that require a new election process, voting process. Poss 4 - 6months to implement</li> <li>○ Changes than can be implemented 10 days after an Ofgem decision (timescales for WG, WG consultation, Urgency process, GC Advisory Forum, Proposer ownership)</li> <li>• Issues to address in the Report to the Authority <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Explanation of the self-governance change. The issue is whether Ofgem should be able to force the GCRP to make a decision even if the GCRP feels that it didn't want t and that Ofgem should decide. Ofgem have suggested that as self-governance is the industry norm if there is a proposal to do something different then it will need to be justified. If there is insufficient justification then Ofgem may send back the entire change proposal (rather than just the self-governance part) creating delays.</li> <li>○ Change to the Independent Chair. The problem seems to be the method of actually finding someone appropriately independent and paying for the process / the chair. NG to think more about this.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Next Steps to finalise the Report to the Authority</li> </ul>			
<b>10 Progress tracker</b>	Pp15/136	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ok</li> </ul>			
<b>11 Pending Authority Decisions</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision letter expected in the next few days</li> </ul>			
<b>GC0028: Constant Terminal Voltage</b>					
<b>11 Pending Authority Decisions</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved</li> </ul>			
<b>GC0028: Constant Terminal Voltage</b>					
<b>11 Pending Authority</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved</li> </ul>			

Issue	Paper No:	Summary	Proposed Next Steps		
			What	Who	When
<b>Decisions</b>					
<b>GC0088 Voltage Unbalance</b>					
<b>12 Standing items</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OK</li> </ul>			
<b>EU Network Codes</b>					
<b>12 Standing items</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OK</li> </ul>			
<b>JESG</b>					
<b>12 Standing items</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See above re next meeting</li> </ul>			
<b>GCode Development Forum</b>					
<b>13 Impact of Other Code Modifications or Developments</b>	Pp16-18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ellexon have published a response to the consultation to the EU proposal to change the settlement period to other than 30 minutes.</li> </ul>			
<b>14 AOB System Disturbance Report</b>	Pp16-19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NG operations actively manage (by taking balancing actions) the risk of high levels RoCoF incurring post an incident so that a repeat of the 2008 incident doesn't occur – so the RoCoF values reported generally won't show an increasing trend. This does raise the question whether it is efficient for NG Ops to manage potential RoCoF rather than take the risk – what are the costs of NG managing the risks.</li> </ul>			
<b>14 AOB EU Network Codes</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RfG and DCC groups mobilised</li> <li>RfG expected to come into EU Law in March / April</li> <li>National implementation is aiming to be in 1 year</li> <li>Banding levels proposed to be the RfG as the 'maximum' values. SP and SHE may be concerned by these levels and need to share their concerns with NG. The WG report will be available by the end Jan.</li> </ul>			

Issue	Paper No:	Summary	Proposed Next Steps		
			What	Who	When
14 AOB EU SO Guidelines and Cross Code collaboration		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Latest draft expected to be issued on 22 Jan.</li> <li>Another Stakeholder meeting may be held on the 4 Feb – the same day as the GCDF</li> </ul>			
14 AOB CAP Report	Pp16-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>KPI annual report</li> </ul>			
14 AOB Power Available		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Power Available signal is required to be available by April. CMcD asked whether NG are actually using the signal?</li> </ul>			
14 AOB EBS Go Live		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Now expected to be September 2016</li> </ul>			
15 Next Meeting		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wednesday 16 March</li> <li>Wednesday 18 May</li> <li>Wednesday 20 July</li> <li>Wednesday 21 September</li> <li>Wednesday 16 November</li> </ul>			