

Attendees:

Name	Organisation	Initial
Mike Kay	ENA	MK
Sarah Carter	Ricardo EAE	SC
Greg Middleton	Deepsea Electronics	GM
Slavomir Seman	Siemens	SS
Anne Kensall	NGET (TO)	AK
Andy Vaudin	EDF	AV
John Norbury	RWE	JN
Guy Phillips	Uniper	GP
Yash Audichya	SSE	YA
Mick Barlow	S & C	MB
Richard Woodward	NGET (SO) [T/S-Chair]	RJW
Stephen Perry	Ofgem	SP
Alastair Frew	SP	AF
Campbell McDonald	SSE	CMD
Garth Graham	SSE	GG
Rob Wilson [AM]	NGET (SO) [Chair]	RW
Antony Johnson [PM]	NGET (SO) [Lead]	AJ
Franklin Rodrick [PM]	NGET (SO) [T/S]	FR

Project Management Update (AM)

Ofgem/DECC Update

Multiple TSOs

As discussed in February, SP confirmed Ofgem’s ‘minded to’ decision would follow in March for all x3 Connection Codes and CACM and be consulted on. Details would be provided to the workgroup.

Emerging Technologies

Draft guidance documentation for Emerging Technologies had recently been circulated and was out for comment.

Enforcement Powers

SP mentioned Ofgem discussions with DECC about bolstering their powers for ENC compliance enforcement for non-licenced generation. GG queried whether this could also apply for non-licenced demand providers also (DCC).

Actions/Plan/Risk Register review

Actions

Re. action 115 – RJW had issued the open letter on EU codes with a guidance note to Trade Association representatives to disseminate. So far no confirmation had come back that the circulation had taken place so RJW will double check

114 – The ACER stakeholder committee has been established and is due to meet on 18/03. There will be x4 meetings per year. GG confirmed he will represent Eurelectric and will report back at the next Coordination meeting.

116 – RJW confirmed that he would issue the G99 and the new G98 drafts to the workgroup as soon as received (estimated W/C 14/03). MK confirmed that if acceptable to

the workgroup, these would follow the standard modification process for the D-Code for approval.

There was lengthy discussion on the fit of the codes to the prospective RfG bandings, and how the hand-off from the D-Code to Grid Code will work. There was discussion to what extent the Grid Code would need to carry all the requirements from Type A upwards, rather than be focused on ‘Transmission’ users who could be Type C or D (maybe even B). The issues with the definition of ‘Transmission’ for EU purposes came up – RW and MK confirmed they were trying to resolve this **[ACTION]**.

The above will therefore be considered in a full codes scope session at next month’s GC0048-C meeting.

117 – RW confirmed that informal guidance from ENTSOE on technical definitions was that local interpretation was generally acceptable if there was significant concern or ambiguity. GM explained the concern some technical definitions have on equipment standards and testing which could lead to existing equipment failing certification tests en masse. RW agreed to pursue guidance on measurement standards – GG suggested this could perhaps be covered in ENTSOEs non-binding guidance for the Connection Codes re. compliance testing. RW agreed to query. **[ACTION]**

Risk Register

The new risk regarding Ofgem send-back of any prospective RfG banding decision report to the authority was flagged. The risk has ‘amber’ status as the mitigation is using the industry consultation to gather the necessary evidence to support the workgroup recommendation of the ‘high’ levels (as draft into the code). CMD and RJW agreed that the current proposed industry consultation questions are not pitched adequately to bring out the right view on costs. RJW agreed to address this when presenting the paper during GCRP.

Project Plan

RJW presented an updated version of the project plan following discussion in February. There were a few more aesthetic changes that were proposed to make it easier to read the plan. RJW will update for April **[ACTION]**.

The lack of clarity in the plan over the final implementation of text changes led to a discussion on how this might work. The key date is the one year after code entry into force, which is the target for completion of the workgroup activity and report to authority. However whether the associated modifications were grouped or issued individually was still up for discussion. SP, MK, SC and RW took an action to consider this and present back to the Coordination Group **[ACTION]**.

The link to the TSOG was also discussed, and whether implementation of that code should be linked closer to GC0048 given the code interactions.

With the code still pre-comitology and code mapping only being undertaken for the first time on the 11/03, it was agreed this needs to be monitored at GC0048-C. Eventually the JESG would need to consider the implementation approach, which may or may not involve incorporating in the connection code workgroup structure.

The group also considered the agenda for April, noting that the pause of GC0090 HVDC and GC0091 DCC meetings was due to end, leading to possible meeting clashes. It was agreed that GC0090 would continue to wait to meet again until GC0048-T had made a recommendation on the management of Fault Ride Through requirements. The third placeholder date in May was mooted (04/05). It was agreed that DCC would continue to pause until a date closer to Entry Into Force (est. June/July 2016).

April meetings

Wednesday 6th April – GC0048-T - RfG FRT
 Thursday 7th April – GC0048-C – Project Management Update (AM); Codes Scope (PM)
 (Friday 8th April – JESG – Glasgow – see link for JESG below)

May meetings

Wednesday 4th May – GC0090 - FRT

Definitions and Code Drafting Discussion (PM)

RJW outlined the purpose of the session which was to finalise the drafting approach of the definitions and the general approach to drafting the new EU requirements into the Grid Code.

AV initially sought to confirm whether the concept of a separate 'EU Grid Code' document (alongside an 'existing' Grid Code) was still on the table. RJW confirmed definitively that EU requirements will be incorporated into the existing Grid Code, in dedicated sections differentiated by drafting and/or section naming/numbering. It was explained that this best allowed existing and new requirements to sit side by side, and provide familiarity to users.

The concept of having two separate definitions sections (existing GB and EU) was challenged and discussed. It was felt that separating the definitions allowed better change management in future, and avoided doubt for users. It was therefore endorsed.

MK also suggested removing existing GB definitions where the EU definitions were comprehensive and accurate enough to replace them. It was felt this might be easier to check when dealing with the definitions in context of the technical requirements.

SP queried GG's proposal of using coloured text to differentiate EU requirements. He asked whether other industry codes have a colour coding for different sections and whether it was actually legally binding. AJ agreed that National Grid would check this with their internal Legal Team **[ACTION]**

MK suggested the naming convention for the revised Grid Code sections could have an "E" prefix to denote 'existing' and "N" for the new requirements or the sections in the code. This would better help users understand what they need to comply with by differentiation.

MK also highlighted that definitions in the D-Code are hyperlinked back to the Glossary and Definitions (when viewed electronically). He recommended the Code Admin for the Grid Code consider this for the EU Connection Codes. It was suggested that the definitions can also be linked to the ENTSOE metadata site. Alternative suggestions were made to include code name labels after each EU definition to show where they originate from, e.g. [RfG], [HVDC], [DCC]. These concepts were all agreed in principle.

The overall drafting approach was also agreed by the group, whereby separate 'EU' sections will be formed from existing Grid Code text. Superseded existing text will be removed, new EU text will be added and formatted differently (along with any local clarification text), and existing requirements not impacting cross-border trade will be maintained (with 'existing' Grid Code formatting).

The concept of existing requirements referring to existing definitions (despite being in new 'EU' sections) was discussed. It was felt that it could be considered 'gold plating' to apply new definitions to existing requirements and should be avoided.

Regarding the next Coordination Group meeting, it was agreed that fixing the scope of users from the x3 codes, plus the process/materiality for considering retrospective application of the requirements on 'substantially modified' existing users, should be on the agenda. Updates on the Multiple TSOs and Emerging Technologies work could also be presented by Ofgem if they have progressed.

Useful Links

GC0048 (C – Coordination Group; T – RfG Technical):

<http://www2.nationalgrid.com/UK/Industry-information/Electricity-codes/Grid-code/Modifications/GC0048/>

GC0090 (HVDC Technical):

<http://www2.nationalgrid.com/UK/Industry-information/Electricity-codes/Grid-code/Modifications/GC0090/>

GC0091 (DCC Technical):

<http://www2.nationalgrid.com/UK/Industry-information/Electricity-codes/Grid-code/Modifications/GC0091/>

Joint European Stakeholder Group:

<http://www2.nationalgrid.com/UK/Industry-information/Electricity-codes/European-network-code/Joint-European-Stakeholder-Group/>

***ENTSO-E Metadata site - Definitions Glossary:**

<https://emr.entsoe.eu/glossary/bin/view/GlossaryCode/GlossaryIndex>