

Grid Code Industry Consultation Response Proforma

GC0074 GCRP Membership

Industry parties are invited to respond to this consultation expressing their views and supplying the rationale for those views, particularly in respect of any specific questions detailed below.

Please send your responses by **1 August 2014** to Grid.Code@nationalgrid.com. Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration.

These responses will be included in the Report to the Authority which is drafted by National Grid and submitted to the Authority for a decision.

Respondent:	<i>Alan Creighton alan.creighton@northernpowergrid.com</i>
Company Name:	<i>Northern Powergrid</i>
1. What are your views on Interconnector users being given a seat on the GCRP as an occasional attendee when it is deemed appropriate by the GCRP and/or the Code Administrator based on the subject matter, rather than as a permanent member where an Interconnector Representative would be expected to attend all meetings.	<i>This seems a pragmatic solution as an alternative to requiring Interconnector to attend meeting when there may be no relevant agenda items. In addition to the GCRP and the Code Administrator deciding when it would be appropriate for an Interconnector Rep to attend, the Interconnector Rep should be free to decide themselves.</i>
2. Do you agree with the group that (i) the Scottish TOs should continue to have a seat on the Panel (ii) that the DNOs should continue to be represented by three seats on the Panel (2 for England & Wales and 1 for Scotland) and (iii) that manufacturers should not be represented on the Panel.	<p><i>Northern Powergrid agrees with the Workgroup that Scottish TOs should continue to be represented on the GCRP.</i></p> <p><i>Northern Powergrid also agrees with the Workgroup that Distribution Network Operations should be represented by two England and Wales Representative and a Scottish Representative.</i></p> <p><i>Northern Powergrid also agrees with the Workgroup that it would be inappropriate for there to be a Manufacturer Representative at the GCRP. Manufacturers can be and often are invited to join workgroups to provide expertise on specific issues.</i></p>
3. Do you believe that each NGET Representative should hold 1 vote each, as for other representatives, or that this should be reduced to, for example, 2 votes between the proposed 4 NGET Representatives.	<i>Northern Powergrid are of the view that retaining the present arrangements of a vote for each of the four NGET representatives is reasonable and balanced with the voting rights of the other distribution and transmission licensees. If NGET only had 2 votes, the Generator community would have more voting rights than all the other parties combined; this would be inappropriate as it could be seen to create a dominant</i>

	<i>stakeholder group.</i>
4. How do you think a tied vote should be dealt with in an election?	<i>The least contentious way to address a tied result would be for the affected candidates to come to an agreement between themselves as to who should be sit on the panel. If this proved not possible, it would be reasonable for the Chair to have a casting vote.</i>
Do you believe that GC0074 better facilitates the appropriate Grid Code objectives?	<p><i>Northern Powergrid agrees that the proposal would better facilitate Grid Code Objective ii) as it would facilitate competition by allowing a more equitable distribution of representation on the GCRP across the electricity industry and thus help ensure Grid Code issues are properly addressed.</i></p> <p><i>For reference the applicable Grid Code objectives are:</i></p> <p><i>(i) to permit the development, maintenance and operation of an efficient, coordinated and economical system for the transmission of electricity;</i></p> <p><i>(ii) to facilitate competition in the generation and supply of electricity (and without limiting the foregoing, to facilitate the national electricity transmission system being made available to persons authorised to supply or generate electricity on terms which neither prevent nor restrict competition in the supply or generation of electricity);</i></p> <p><i>(iii) subject to sub-paragraphs (i) and (ii), to promote the security and efficiency of the electricity generation, transmission and distribution systems in the national electricity transmission system operator area taken as a whole; and</i></p> <p><i>(iv) to efficiently discharge the obligations imposed upon the licensee by this license and to comply with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decisions of the European Commission and/or the Agency.</i></p>
Please provide any other comments you feel are relevant to the proposed change.	<i>The Summary in the consultation paper implies that Candidates would need to be nominated by Generator parties listed in CUSC Schedule 1 whilst voting would be by any party on the TEC Register, Embedded MW Register or CUSC Schedule 1. It's not clear why all the parties eligible to vote are not able to nominate a</i>

	<p><i>candidate.</i></p> <p><i>The Summary makes the observation that it may be possible for the Chair may be able to appoint an additional member to the GCRP in the event that a particular group of generators is not properly represented. It would be good to clarify if this is a specific proposal being made.</i></p>
--	---