

Meeting summary

Grid Code Development Forum – 1 November 2023

Date:	01/11/2023	Location:	MS Teams
Start:	09:00	End:	10:10

Participants

Attendee	Company	Attendee	Company
Terry Baldwin	National Grid ESO (Chair)	Matt Evans	Utility Results
David Halford	National Grid ESO (Tech Sec)	Nicola Barberis Negra	Orsted
Stuart Brace	National Grid ESO (Presenter)	Suzanne Law	SSE
Frank Kasibante	National Grid ESO (Presenter)	Isaac Gutierrez	Scottish Power
Tanmay Kadam	National Grid ESO (Presenter)	Harry Burns	EDF Renewables
Deborah Spencer	National Grid ESO	Ross Strachan	Scottish Power
Thomas Roe	National Grid ESO	Julie Richmond	Scottish Power
Graeme Vincent	SP Energy Networks	Stephen McKellar	Scottish Power Renewables
Garth Graham	SSE	Monica Crosa	RES Group
Andrew McKinlay	SSE	Lisa Waters	Waters Wye
Jacqueline Wilkie	SSE	Alice Chapman	Adaptogen Capital
Mzamoyabo Sibanda	SSE	Cahir O'Neill	ESB
Paul Youngman	Drax	Steve Quinn	National Grid
Alan Creighton	Northern Powergrid	Leo Moraga	Neuville Group
Mike Kay	P2 Analysis	Kate Teubner	Low Carbon
Oluwabukola Daniel	EDF Renewables	Andrew Roscoe	Siemens Gamesa
Ruth Kemsley	EDF Renewables	Sean Gauton	Uniper Energy

Agenda and slides

A link to the Agenda and Presentations from the November GCDF can be found [here](#).

GCDF

Please note: These notes are produced as an accompaniment to the slide pack presented and provide highlights only of discussion themes and possible next steps.

Meeting Opening – Terry Baldwin (GCDF Chair) & David Halford (GCDF Tech Sec), NGENSO

The meeting was opened, with an overview of the agenda items that will be covered.

Presentation: EDT Data Submission – Contingency Trial with SSE – Stuart Brace, NGENSO

A presentation was shared which gives an overview of a trial that the ESO is currently undertaking with SSE to establish a contingency process for EDT data submission.

Discussion themes / Feedback

It was asked if some context could be provided in terms of the trial i.e., does this relate to SSE as a Transmission Operator using EDT or is it the Generators connect to SSE's Transmission System?

This trial relates to SSE as a Control Point where generators submit data to the Control Point which is then transmitted via EDT to the ESO.

It was agreed that having contingency arrangements in place is very sensible, but why has email been used for the alternative communications method here? Would messaging software such as 'WhatsApp' be more suitable as it offers encryption and a way of identifying that the message sender is legitimate?

It is something that could be considered, but the rationale behind using email was that this is a communications method that is already been used within the Control Room and we need to be mindful of the numbers of different systems that are being used in this area already.

It was noted that a similar exercise may have taken place already with National Gas and there might be some value in conversations with the Emergency Planning Teams in terms of possible lessons learnt?

This is something we will take away and investigate further.

If the trial is looking at a contingency for EDT, should we also be looking at EDL as well as this is the communications method between the ESO and the Generator Control Point, as the assumption would be that if the EDT facility was unavailable then EDL would also be out of service?

EDL already has a process in place if EDL is unavailable, the control room would revert to telephone EDL instructions under these circumstances, the EDL instructions are simpler and easier to communicate over the telephone than EDT.

It was asked whether instead of email, should there be a consideration for using the API facility that smaller Generating Units currently use, as the assumption would be that if email is still available then the API facility would also still be active?

API was discussed as part of this project but due to timescales with SSE we agreed to investigate the email process. To allow us to modify the API would take a considerable amount of time. This will be reviewed as a process for the future to see if utilising the API is viable.

Verbal Update: Digitalised Whole System Technical Code – ASR (Alignment, Simplification & Rationalisation) Workstream – Frank Kasibante, NGESO

An overview of the ASR (Alignment, Simplification and Rationalisation) workstream of the dWSTC (Digitalised Whole System Technical Code) Project was provided which included an update following the submission of the Grid Code Modification (GC0164), which proposes the simplification of Operating Code No.2, with discussions in relation to the possible next sections of the Grid Code that could benefit from simplification.

A survey in relation to possible future sections of the Grid Code which could benefit from simplification can be found [here](#) and we encourage Grid Code Users to complete.

Discussion themes / Feedback

It was noted that there was a huge amount of work that had gone into the proposal for the simplification of OC2 and the hope was that the Workgroup which is assembled as part of the GC0164 modification does not look to start this process from the beginning again, notwithstanding that the Workgroup will be able to assist with moving this forward. It was noted that it will be interesting to review whether the work that was done in advance of the raising of GC0164 has proved to be valuable.

It was suggested that the DRC (Data Registration Code) Schedules would benefit from a review and some thinking in terms of how they could be submitted in a more efficient way. There was a view that the layout of the schedules could be improved to make them easier to complete and digitisation of the schedules could make completing them even more straightforward.

The workstream that has been involved in this simplification work on OC2 are also very aware that the Glossary and Definitions section of the Grid Code could benefit from simplification, but this would be an enormous task.

It was suggested that it would be greatly beneficial if there was a way for different Users of the Grid Code to know exactly which parts of the code apply to them. This would particularly help new Users to navigate the code and establish the obligations that they would need to meet.

This is something that we also received feedback on from survey we published in 2022 and this will be taken back to the dWSTC project Steering Group and the ASR Workstream Team for further discussion.

In terms of the points made around making the code easier for Users to understand and which areas apply to them, the work that has taken place as part of the OC2 simplification modification has looked to make it clearer to Users in terms of the areas of OC2 that apply to them, and it will be interesting to see whether has been successful in that respect.

It was noted that while a review of the DRC would be welcomed, there is a risk that if changes are made now, it might need to be changed again if other parts of the code are simplified. As part of the GC0164 modification, the DRC will need to be reviewed in terms of whether the proposed changes to OC2 have an impact on the DRC. It was advised that this should be part of the Terms of Reference for GC0164.

Presentation: Proposed changes to the Grid Code in the treatment of Embedded Small Power Stations with a Bilateral Embedded Generation Agreement (BEGA) – Tanmay Kadam, NGESO

A presentation was shared detailing proposed changes to the Grid Code in respect of the compliance process for Embedded Small Power Stations with a Bilateral Embedded Generation Agreement (BEGA)

Discussion themes / Feedback

It was asked if Embedded Small Power Stations with a BEGA need to comply or provide simulation models?

The simulation models and studies would still need to be performed as part of the G99 requirements, but only provided to the relevant DNO rather than both the DNO and ESO.

It was noted by a GCDF attendee that the proposal should help to eliminate some of the confusion and complication that customers currently experience and show the responsibilities of the DNO and ESO and avoid duplication of effort.

It was asked if the ESO know how many customers will be helped by this proposed change?

It was noted by a GCDF attendee that in their experience, these types of issues are raised every couple of weeks in England and Wales and cause problems for customers.

The proposal to introduce the new definitions to replace Interim Operational Notification (ION), and Final Operational Notification (FON), for Embedded Small Power Stations with a BEGA is to reflect that the customer has applied for a BEGA to participate in the Balancing Mechanism (BM).

It was asked what the process would be for existing customers that are issued with a Limited Operational Notification (LON), as they would have previously been issued with a FON?

This is something that we will take away and discuss prior to raising any modification.

It was asked that when the modification is raised, it is clear to understand what the requirements and obligations for customers are currently, and what would change as part of the proposal. This could be represented as a table that clearly shows the current requirements and obligations, and then what these would be should the modification be approved.

It was asked if the ESO could look at the current BEGA as it doesn't seem fit for purpose for smaller generators? Could the ESO look at a different agreement for Small Generators that want to participate in the BM which is more specific in terms of the obligations that Small Generators need to meet rather than the complexity of the current BEGA which is confusing for these generators?

It was noted that any new agreements may need to be raised through a CUSC modification.

It was asked if there are any new Grid Code definitions that are being considered as part of this change, then could some thought be given in terms of whether new definitions are required in light of the dWSTC Project which is seeking to rationalise and simplify the code.

A question was raised in relation to Grid Code Modification – GC0148 (Implementation of EU Emergency and Restoration Code Phase II), in terms of compliance for small batteries with the BEGA. Does compliance evidence need to be provided to the DNO or ESO?

Currently, this will need to be provided to the ESO, but once the GC0148 requirements have been added to G99, then this will need to be provided to the relevant DNO.

AOB

Help shape our Interconnector Framework

Please respond to our request for information to play a part in the creation of an Interconnector Framework, one of our Business Plan 2 deliverables.

Submit your responses before 07 December* by completing and return the consultation form. (**Please note we have extended the deadline from that published within the RFI documentation*)

RFI: <https://www.nationalgrideso.com/document/289701/download>

Proforma: <https://www.nationalgrideso.com/document/289696/download>

The dates for the 2024 GCDF sessions are available on the [GCDF webpage](#)

Attendees were reminded that the GCDF can be used by any industry party to present potential Grid Code changes and future agenda items are welcomed.

The Chair thanked the attendees and presenters for their contributions and closed the meeting.

The next GCDF will be held on the 22nd November 2023 with the 15th November 2023 being the deadline for agenda items and presentations.

Action Item Log

Action items: In progress and completed since last meeting.

ID	Agenda Item	Description	Owner	Notes	Target Date	Status
2310	Scottish Oscillation Issues	When will ESO presenting the outcomes from the issues experienced in Scotland relating to oscillations?	David Halford /Terry Baldwin	Investigations still on-going with an update be presented at the Operational Transparency Forum on the 8 th November. Details of how to register for the OTF can be found here	November	Closed
