

Digitalised Whole System Technical Code (WSTC) Meeting Minutes

Consultation 1 Stakeholder Engagement Session 6

Date: 10/11/2021 **Location:** MS Teams
Start: 14:00 **End:** 15:00

Participants

Attendee	Attend/Regrets	Attendee	Attend/Regrets
Daniel De Wijze (DDW) - Renewable UK	Attend	Jonathon Bell (JB) - Scottish Power	Attend
Kirsten Shilling (KS) - NGESO	Attend	Laetitia Wamala (LW) - NGESO	Attend
Vicky Allen (VA) - NGESO	Attend	Frank Kasibante (FK) - NGESO	Attend

Minutes Recipients

Industry - Published on the WSTC website

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Presentation of Slides & Discussion
3. Closing Remarks

Discussion

The discussions held during the meeting are summarised below:

1. **Introductions**

Introductions were done as recorded above.

2. **Presentation of Slides & Discussion**

During the presentation of the WSTC slides (Oct/Nov), the discussions summarised below were held. The full slidepack can be viewed [here](#).

DDW: The Renewable UK (RUK) does not heavily interact with the technical codes. Being a small RUK policy team, we don't cover every aspect of the codes but generally help our members on individual modifications.

2.1. **Introduction (Section 2)**

DDW: Members of RUK have received the consultation material sent via email. Thus, I have a few comments from members, but not answers to every question.

DDW: Members like the open governance model and the fact that they can contribute to the workgroups. However, there are concerns around the speed of open governance and the fact that only the companies that have the time and resources are involved in code modifications.

DDW: Simplifying and shortening the codes would be beneficial. Although I also appreciate that the electricity system is complex and hence simplifying and shortening might not always be realistic.

DDW: I'd be interested to hear how far you could go with the consolidation aspect of this project. The idea of aligning the Grid Code (GC) and Distribution Code (DC) so that they are at least the same format, would definitely be welcome.

2.2. Potential Solutions (Section 3.1 Whole System Consolidation or Alignment)

DDW: One of the comments from our members is that there is a risk that we create a very large document by consolidating the GC and DC into a single WSTC. Is this something that's under consideration? How would it be workable given the large number of asset and connection types it would cover?

LW: Some technical requirements are the same for both transmission and distribution. Given that there is a certain degree of overlap across the two documents, bringing them together will not necessarily be a case of 100 pages + 100 pages is 200 pages. In case of an overlap, hypothetically we could go with either GC or DC version, or maybe we go with one modified version.

DDW: That is helpful, thank you. If it's possible to combine the GC and DC without creating an excessively large single code, then it makes sense to me.

DDW: I'm not sure about developing an overarching WSTC and then keeping the existing codes because it just feels like you're just adding another code to the existing long list of codes. I think we would favour either #2 (*align on key issues*) or #4 (*single WSTC*) on that timeline.

JB: Number 2 (*align on key issues*) would make more sense. I think if you're trying to develop into one code, it's just going to deliver more problems than it would actually solve.

2.3. Potential Solutions (3.2 Digitalisation)

DDW: Could you explain what you mean by whether it should be legally binding or for guidance? Surely it would still be the same codes, but the proposal is to change the way people can access them.

VA: A number of stakeholders have highlighted that should there be a mistake in the artificial intelligence, and a section of code was omitted resulting in non-compliance at a later stage, the liable party between the User & Grid Code Administrator needs to be clear.

DDW: We like the idea of enabling self-service. However, you would still expect whoever is connecting to the grid, to have read the whole code carefully, to identify their obligations. The only worry would be if they use this service as you say, and then later discover that some relevant information was omitted.

Given that the codes are online, the intention of this project is to make them more accessible. With this kind of AI platform, you probably require a disclaimer indicating that it is 'For Guidance', and thorough checks need to be undertaken prior to commissioning. I think the idea of more digitalization is a positive one.

JB: Digitalisation is going to be a better idea than the current process. No further comment.

2.4. Potential Solutions (3.4 Work that can progress independently of the ECR outcome)

No questions

2.5. Potential Solutions (3.5 Delivery of Solutions)

DDW: Given that one of the objectives is to have alignment between the existing codes, then it would make sense to digitalise the Grid Code and the Distribution Code together. Ideally, if

you're looking for areas where there's duplication, I don't think it makes sense to go through them separately.

In terms of postponing until the ECR outcome, surely if you're doing all this work now, it would make sense to develop the recommendations and then progress them if possible, rather than delaying your work until the ECR outcome whose timescales are unknown.

JB: For 'Code consolidation/alignment'; I propose point B; 'Postpone until ECR outcome'. For 'digitalisation', there's no point in stalling the movement of this.

2.6. Key Benefits (Section 4)

DDW: I broadly agree with these.

I'm not 100% sure about encouraging innovation in the market. There is not much that the codes can do to reduce the complexity of a connection to the electricity network if the process and charges remain the same.

The streamlining and user friendliness are really good, and I agree they may increase market participation.

I think you've covered the key benefits well.

We always make the case that this needs to go along with reform of legislation.

2.7. Project Governance (Section 5.1 Decision Making)

DDW: Are you still looking for stakeholders to join the steering group? If yes, this is something I can pass on to our members.

FK: Yes. The consultation has a question specifically eliciting for representatives.

DDW: Noted. I will talk to the rest of the policy team and my manager and get back to you.

2.8. Project Governance (Section 5.2 Proposed Terms of Reference – Steering Group)

DDW: Question 20 regarding the steering group making decisions, particularly if there isn't consensus is tricky. With CUSC modifications (an area that I've come across the most in my role), Ofgem has the final say. Do you see something similar applying to the Steering Group? Or is it something for the ESO to decide seeing as you are leading the project?

FK: When the steering group is formed, decision making will be discussed as part of their terms of reference with guidance from Consultation 1 responses.

2.9. Project Governance (Section 5.3 Stakeholder Engagement)

DDW: You're doing an excellent job in terms of engagement e.g., this webinar and reaching out to trade bodies like RUK. We definitely appreciate that you are allowing us to be the link between you and our members.

Once a month seems like good frequency beyond which will be too much in terms of commitment from industry.

I don't have any complaints in terms of the engagement.

LW: In one of our webinars, a stakeholder raised the fact that RUK's Grid Strategy forum would be a good one to present this project. Can you tell us more about the Grid Strategy forum?

DDW: No. I can ask about it and get back to you.

LW: We've been to your Networks and Charging forum to present. Is there an opportunity to come and present there on a regular basis?

DDW: We would definitely be keen to have you present to our members at relevant points when there's been progress on the project. However, let us discuss the regularity and timing via email.

2.10. Project Governance (Section 5.4 Schedule)

DDW: It is too late for me to suggest changes. It looks fine to me. I'm eager to hear the results of the first steering group meeting.

3. Closing Remarks

LW: Just a final call to express our gratitude for your attendance of this webinar and to urge you to submit a consultation response.
