

	Subject:	Grid Code Review Panel
Day After Report	Author:	Alan Creighton
	Date:	21 June 2017

All

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

- Most of the meeting was focussed on the new governance process and the transition of the workgroups to the new process.
- The now does seem to be agreement between the DCode Code Administrator and the GCode Code Administrator that have been developed since the last panel meeting, which is very helpful.

Other interesting snippets highlighted in yellow

Regards Alan

Alternates

Attendees:		Apologies:	
Panel Members		Panel Members	
John Martin	NGET Code Admin Chair	Steve Cox	DNO / ENW
Alan Creighton	DNO / Northern Powergrid	TBC	Offshore TO / TBC
Kate Dooley	Generator EUK	Rob Longdon	Supplier Cornwall Energy
Alastair Frew	Generator / SP		
Damian Jackman	Generator / SSE Generation		
Gurpal Singh	Ofgem		
Guy Nicholson	Generator Element Power		
Chrissie Brown	NGET Code Admin Rep & Tech Secretary		
Nick Ruben	BSC Rep / Elexon		
Kyla Berry	NGET rep		
Graeme Vincent	Onshore TO / SPT		
Presenters			
Franklin Roderick			

	Subject:	Grid Code Review Panel
Day After Report	Author:	Alan Creighton
	Date:	21 June 2017

Observer Rob Wilson Rachel (new Honor)	
---	--

Panel Alternates

John Lucas – BSC Representative
Gordon Kelly SP (2017) and Jim Barber (2018) – DNO Representative
Fergus Healy – NGET Representative
Le Fu – Onshore Transmission Operator
TBC*further information required – Offshore Transmission Operator
Lisa Waters – Generator
Sigrid Bolik – Generator
Martin Queen- Ofgem

Issue	Paper No:	Summary
1 Welcomes		•
2 Minutes if last meeting	Paper 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting notes OK 1004 Guidance re Materiality. NGET circulated a link and are looking to develop thinking further at the next panel GCode summary document on website needs to be updated Need to ensure that consistent terminology is used across GCode related documents e.g. Modification Template, ToR etc. Actions from previous meeting under the old governance arrangements will be discussed at the next meeting. 1033 minute to be clarified. NGET confirmed that when the SO / TO split is formalised, there will be a series of changes to industry codes. The intention is that there would be a word version of the minutes circulated for comment before papers day.
3 Action log	Paper 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Update Grid Code Panel on Consumer and OFTO Representative seats. On-going Outlook calendar invites issued Code administrator to present on their survey and action plan. On agenda

		Subject:	Grid Code Review Panel
Day After Report		Author:	Alan Creighton
		Date:	21 June 2017

Issue	Paper No:	Summary
		<p>4. Rob Selbie to present GC0098 to July Panel</p> <p>5. Forward Work Plan to be added as standing agenda item to GC Panel agenda. On agenda.</p>
4a New Modifications GC102 EU Connection Code implementation Mod 3	Paper 4 Paper 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focusses on the System Management and Compliance issues in RfG, DCC, HVDC under GC0048, 90, 91 • Included in the table is a list of RfG Articles to be addressed by the WG. It was agreed to delete this as it wasn't the most recent table and didn't include an equivalent table for DCC or HVDC. Instead it was agreed to refer to the Code Mapping Spread sheet. This spread sheet was to be reviewed and the GC100, 101, 102 reference added, so that it's clear what Articles each WG need to consider. • Clarified that this will be presented to the DCRP as a joint WG as per GC100 & 101. • ToR are to be drafted and circulated later • 6 July is the next meeting date. FR to draft a timeline for completing this work. • GCRP approved the Mod proposal to proceed to a WG and Ofgem decision pathway.
5 Current Modifications GC0036 G5/4 GC0079 RoCoF		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recast as a DCRP WG retaining the present membership and scope. ENA would manage the consultation process and submit any final report to authority. This work is included on the DCode work programme. • Once G5/5 is agreed then GCRP will consider if it wants to adopt the new standard in the GCode – the presumption is that it would, and that this would just require a housekeeping change. • There was a discussion about the authorisation process of a revised G5/4 and how Users, who might be affected if it was to be adopted by GCode, could engage in the DCRP WG. AMC suggested that anyone who was interested in joining the WG should speak to David Spillett. • The expectation is that the WG will take 12-18 months to complete their work. • AMC to liaise with DS to clarify the process by which a revised G5/4 would be signed off by the industry. Post meeting note: • G5/4 is a DCode Annex 1 Qualifying Standard. The procedure for updating this document is set out in the DCode Constitution and Rules in Standard Procedure No 1 Parag 1 states that <p>ii) All Annex 1 Standards and Annex 2 Standards will be owned by the DNOs and will be developed by a transparent and inclusive process through the Panel with appropriate consultation and publicity as determined in accordance with this Standard Procedure and as otherwise determined by resolution of the Panel.</p>

		Subject:	Grid Code Review Panel
Day After Report		Author:	Alan Creighton
		Date:	21 June 2017

Issue	Paper No:	Summary
		<p>v) For Annex 1 Standards, or where unanimity is not reached regarding an Annex 2 Standard, the DNOs will report to the Authority who will take the final executive decision as to whether or not the proposed standard or modification should be implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hence following a DCRP Public Consultation on the revised standard and the Revised DCode to implement the revised document, a Report to the Authority would be prepared and sent to the authority for a decision. Similar approach for GC0079 although the changes recommended by the WG will only impact the DCode not the GCode.
5 Current Modifications GC0087 Generator Frequency requirements		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Withdrawn and 5 day email circulated – no request for the WG to be reopened had been received. The RoCoF withstand element of the GC0087 work required for EU code will be picked up by GC100/1/2 RW confirmed that the collateral from the WG and the WG consultation is available to the new GC100-102 WGs.
5 Current Modifications GC0048 RfG GC0090 HVDC	Paper 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Withdrawal of the GC0048 / 90 is being proposed as all the work has been included within the new GC100, 101, 102 Mod Proposals. Agreed – on the assumption that DCRP will also agree. FR to ask the DCRP for their agreement to withdraw GC0048 as it is a joint GCRP/DCRP. Once DCRP has agreed to withdraw GC0048, NGET will write to give parties 5 days to resurrect the GC0048 proposal
5 Current Modifications GC0094 RES		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSE have taken ownership of this Modification Proposal, but not had too much time to look at this Possibility that there may be implications re GC102, particularly in relation to information exchange, the need for and specification for Operational Metering There was some discussion of the role of the RES and the co-ordination of its requirements and other obligations. An example being where a fault recorder is required but can't be commissioned as there is no NGET comms infrastructure for it to connect to. DJ to discuss with FR to discuss the GC0094. DJ preference is for one set of RES documents applied across GB DJ to raise at the next GCRP
5 Current Modifications	Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update to be provided at the next GCRP

		Subject:	Grid Code Review Panel
Day After Report		Author:	Alan Creighton
		Date:	21 June 2017

Issue	Paper No:	Summary
GC0095 TSOG Membership	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIF 21 July 2017 • GCRP asked to approve the members as required by the GCode, although it wasn't really clear how the GCRP were actually supposed to do this. Much of the discussion was on making sure that there is a good representation across all the likely affected parties, rather than the proposed individual on the WG (i.e. the current ones). • Concern that there needs to be a representative from the TOs as well as SO. GV agreed to be a TO rep. • Though that other Reps may be required and that it would be worth GC0095 WG considering if all affected parties were appropriately represented. • General Agreement of the membership.
5 Current Modifications GC0096 Storage Membership	Presentation 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WG report has been drafted which will be circulated to WG members. WG members will consider if they think a WG consultation is required – I would have expected this to be the case. • Update to be provide at the July GCRP • Though that the WG members was a good cross section of the industry; there was lots of interest and potential Reps. • General Agreement of the membership
5 Current Modifications GC0097 Membership TERRE	Presentation 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next meeting soon followed by a joint meeting with the BSC • Though that other Reps may be required • General Agreement of the membership
5 Current Modifications GC0098 pan-EU Common Grid Model		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update at the July GCRP once Rob Selbie has had more time to incorporate the feedback from the last GCRP.
5 Current Modifications GC0099 Establishing a common approach to interconnector		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First WG was held on the July WG day • They recommended that a WG consultation should be required. There was a concern relating to updates of PNs. • GCRP agreed that there should be a WG consultation, which means an extension to the agreed timeline is required. • General Agreement of the membership

		Subject:	Grid Code Review Panel
Day After Report		Author:	Alan Creighton
		Date:	21 June 2017

Issue	Paper No:	Summary
scheduling consistent with the single intraday market coupling process		
5 Current Modifications GC0100 EU Code implementation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Agreement of the membership Those member not nominated by a User are to be nominated by NGET with the agreement of GCRP
5 Current Modifications GC0101 EU Code implementation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Agreement of the membership Those member not nominated by a User are to be nominated by NGET with the agreement of GCRP
6 Governance Code Administrators survey & Action plan		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Code Admin looking at 4 areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website, scheduled to go live Aug 2017 Transparency; better branding of the CA function Meeting facilities: new webex / conference call facilities which will be tested with users before going live Responsive: quicker response to emails
6 Governance ToR & WG voting		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was a discussion about whether the stakeholder discussion about difficult and complex issues should take place before raising a formal Mod Proposal - or whether this discussion should take place in a WG. NGET view is that such discussion should really take place before a formal MP is presented so that a MP proposes a well-defined change. Anyone can raise a Mod Proposal and arrange stakeholder discussions themselves or via the GCDF – although this would be easier for large players (e.g. NGET) than smaller ones who would need to call on the Code Administrators services as a critical friend. It was accepted that there are some 'big' issues (such as those associated with the GC0100,0101, 0102 Modification Proposal) where the solution and legal text isn't defined; although NGET view is that these would be the exception. It was clarified that a Modification Proposer can't change the defined defect, but can change the solution and legal text

	Subject:	Grid Code Review Panel
Day After Report	Author:	Alan Creighton
	Date:	21 June 2017

Issue	Paper No:	Summary
		<p>if they want. If during WG discussions it transpired that the defect wasn't quite correct then a new MP would need to be developed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a lengthy discussion on whether the WGs should be populated by industry experts (GC20.3) or whether there should be representatives of ideally all the stakeholders affected. It's not really clear whether the intention is for WGs to be populated with experts or stakeholder representatives. In practice this probably isn't material apart from when it comes to who can vote in a WG (not that a vote is necessarily required under the GC governance) and whether any particular company (stakeholder) can only have one vote. • The generic ToR are focussed on the case where there is a clear well defined defect / solution. AMC asked for at least including the option for the ToR to include development of the solution and legal text where it isn't included in the MP. NGET to consider this. • There were some additional requirements that had been include in the 'process' description that were over and above that required by the GCode; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Voting – general agreement that voting is helpful although it was unclear who in the WG would be eligible to vote. ◦ Voting – a WG member needed to attend 50% of the meetings to be eligible to vote ◦ Quorum of 5- GCRP agreed with this proposal • Agreed to use a standard ToR that takes into account the panel meetings for new WGs as an interim position following a wider piece of work to see if there is a standard form of ToR across the various Codes – i.e. good practice • Any comments on the draft ToR to be sent to NGET
6 WGs, GCode Development Forum		
6a GCDF		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AMC to ask DS as to whether we're looking to present an OC6 issue
6b July 2017 WG Meeting agenda		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed • NGET to fix the dates for these sessions for the rest of 2017
7 WG reports		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
8 Industry Consultations		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
9 Reports to the Authority		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
10 Standing items		

		Subject:	Grid Code Review Panel
Day After Report		Author:	Alan Creighton
		Date:	21 June 2017

Issue	Paper No:	Summary
10a Code summary		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OK
10b JESG		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next meeting 22 June TSOG is the main issue
10c Forward Plan		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
10d EBS update		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update at next meeting
11 Impact of other Code Mods		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
12 AOB		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NGET propose to finalise the RES documents then update the General Conditions and point properly to the most recent versions of the three TOs documents. Multiple Fault Ride Through. Survey carried out in March, these results will be circulated to the GCRP. NGET are looking to better understand the event in Australia. GCRP/CUSC chair recruitment process. Ongoing. Gender bias in the GC – he/she, should be reviewed. Future start time 10:15
13 Next Meeting		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wednesday 19 July 2017 Wednesday 16 August 2017 Wednesday 20 September 2017 Wednesday 18 October 2017 Wednesday 15 November 2017 Wednesday 20 December 2017