Code Administrator Meeting Summary

**GC0117: Improving transparency and consistency of access arrangements across GB by the creation of a pan-GB commonality of PGM requirements**

### Date: 19th May 2021

# Contact Details

### Chair: Nisar Ahmed, National Grid ESO [Nisar.Ahmed@nationalgrideso.com](mailto:Nisar.Ahmed@nationalgrideso.com) / 0777 3043068

### Proposer: Garth Graham

# Key areas of discussion

The Workgroup discussions are summarised according to agenda item:

**REFRESHER PRESENTATION FOR THE PROPOSAL**

* Concern was raised over the title of the modification and if the documentation was to be transferred to the new templates. Also if there was to be any impact on the CUSC. These actions will be noted in the Action log.
* Garth shared a refresher presentation of the history to the modification and summarised the reason for harmonisation. There was discussion around the defect and if this was to be an enduring solution or just for those who are newly connected, or making significant modifications to equipment, discussion also linked to RfG requirements and the impact of 6.3 within the CUSC.
* A review of the types of connection agreements was presented, and how these agreements differ in each Transmission region.
* A discussion was held around the fact the Grid Code currently applies to all parties- consideration around retrospectivity may need to form an alternate proposal. The issue of retrospectivity was recognised as a area requiring some substantial discussion.

**SUMMARY OF ALL 5 OPTIONS (100MW, 50MW, 30MW & 10MW)- (A/B/C/D RfG THRESHOLDS)**

* The workgroup discussed the possible options that are available for harmonisation and the implications of this- such as the increased visibility of available generation. This promoted a discussion around the RFI in respect of the visibility of generation connected to the GB distribution networks and the workgroup view was to take this into account when assessing the best route for harmonisation.
* Operational metering was discussed together with the costs for those who could potentially be bound by these requirements through changes to the thresholds.
* Also of interest to the workgroup was ensuring that there was no duplication of data being shared either to the DNO or the ESO. It was noted that consideration of costs should factor in increased ongoing costs, alongside any changes as a result of this process.
* The work that the Open Networks is assessing is also key to developing the right solution for this modification and contact needs to be made for the latest thoughts.

**REVIEW OF INITIAL ASSESEMENT**

* The workgroup felt that this assessment was most likely still relevant, however it did not include Option 5 to consider if the RfG thresholds would be suitable for the harmonised approach. It was noted that adopting the RfG Thresholds (on a module basis rather than a Power Station basis) was not really an option but really another method of defining the same requirement.
* The workgroup did not feel that there was value in updating this assessment and representing to panel. The requirement was to support the understanding of the modification in the early stages. A decision was taken from the workgroup to review the minutes from the last meeting and then move forward.
* The option of Aggregation was also discussed though how this would work in practice would require further consideration.

**ACTION LOG AND TERMS OF REFERENCE REVIEW**

* The workgroup discussed the last Action log and a new Action log is to be created and circulated to the workgroup.
* The TOR document is to be updated with the latest template. The group updated the TOR for the modification and reviewed each reference point for clarity and expanded some points following the discussions through the meeting. Some of these discussions were expanded in the review of the TOR. Such points to note are CAP169 and cross code implications.
* Discussion to ensure the implementation process considers those who could be required to comply with the Grid Code for the first time so they fully understand their requirements.

**INFORMATION GATHERING**

* The ESO would like to formulate a Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) and seek the views of the potential BM participants (through a questionnaire) should the thresholds change. The current thinking is that this will encompass data from the Future Energy Scenarios (FES) as this is considered to be a suitable industry recognised benchmark. Ideally stakeholders would be to be able to provide costs incurred in the thresholds. For example these could include operational metering, control telephony and EDL/API.
* Within this, a review of data exchanges should also be considered and how the data is transferred from DNOs to the ESO. This also prompted a brief discussion around alignment of the Distribution Code the Grid Code and the possible use of Aggregators.

**NEXT STEPS**

The workgroup arranged provisional dates for subsequent workgroups.

**Actions Log**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number | Action | Owner | Status |
| 1 | Is the title of the modification correct? Power Generating Modules or Facilities? | Nisar and Garth | Open |
| 2 | Is there any impact on the CUSC or the BSC? | Workgroup | Open |
| 3 | Review the RFI for visibility of distributed generation connected to the GB DNO networks | Workgroup | Open |
| 4 | Discussions to be had with Open Networks around their strategy and thinking | Mike Kay | Open |
| 5 | Do you need to have a credit check when you are a CUSC party? | ESO | Open |
| 6 | Is there a connection condition in line with CUSC 651 and those who are exempt from generation licenses- what about the Grid Code? | Workgroup | Open |
| 7 | Check the minutes from the GCRP meeting that the Initial assessment was presented | Nisar | Open |
| 8 | To seek data for those who are in each threshold to assess how this impacts BM participation | ESO | Open |
| 9 | Create questionnaire Workgroup Members for supporting the CBA | Tony Johnson | Open |

## **Participants**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Attendees | Company | Position |
| Nisar Ahmed | Code Administrator National Grid ESO | Chair |
| Louise Trodden | National Grid ESO | Technical Secretary |
| Garth Graham | SSE Generation | Proposer |
| Alan Creighton | Northern Powergrid | Workgroup Member |
| Richard Wilson | UK Power Networks | Workgroup Member |
| Tony Johnson | National Grid ESO | Presenter |
| Mike Kay | P2 Analysis | Workgroup Member |
| Paul Youngman | Drax | Workgroup Member |
| Tim Ellingham | RWE | Workgroup Member |
| Calum Watt | SSEN Transmission | Workgroup Member |
| Graeme Vincent | SP Energy Networks | Workgroup Member |
| Jeremey Caplin | Elexon | Workgroup Member |
| Phil Smith | National Grid ESO | Presenter |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

For further information, please contact the Code Administrator.