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

Responsibilities

1. The Workgroup is responsible for assisting the Grid Code Review Panel in the evaluation of Grid Code Modification Proposal GC0117 Improving transparency and consistency of access arrangements across GB by the creation of a pan-GB commonality of PGM requirements proposed by Garth Graham of SSE Generation Ltd in June 2018 and presented to the Grid Code Review Panel on 28 June 2018.

Applicable Grid Code Objectives

1. To permit the development, maintenance and operation of an efficient, coordinated and economical system for the transmission of electricity;
2. 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);
3. Subject to sub-paragraphs (i) and (ii), to promote the security and efficiency of the electricity generation, transmission and distribution systems in the national; and
4. 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. In conducting its business, the Workgroup will at all times endeavour to operate in a manner that is consistent with the Code Administration Code of Practice principles.
5. To promote efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Grid Code arrangements.

Scope of work

1. The Workgroup must consider the issues raised by the Modification Proposal and consider if the proposal identified better facilitates achievement of the Grid Code Objectives.
2. In addition, the Workgroup shall consider and report on the following specific issues:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Workgroup Term of Reference** | **Location in Workgroup Report** |
| * 1. Implementation and costs; | ‘Implementation information and additional ESO IT Costs’ within **Workgroup Considerations**  Plus Awaiting on FES information |
| * 1. Review draft legal text should it have been provided. If legal text is not submitted within the Grid Code Modification Proposal the Workgroup should be instructed to assist in the developing of the legal text; | **Annex 3** – Legal Text |
| * 1. Consider whether any further Industry experts or stakeholders should be invited to participate within the Workgroup to ensure that all potentially affected stakeholders have the opportunity to be represented in the Workgroup. Demonstrate what has been done to cover this clearly in the report | ‘Workgroup Consultation’ , ‘Questionnaire Feedback’ and ‘Interaction with the smaller Generators and Aggregators’ within **Workgroup Considerations** |
| * 1. Consider EBR implications | **Interactions Section** |
| * 1. The current transmission and generation characteristics in Scotland compared to those in England and Wales and whether the rationale for the thresholds being set at the current levels still applies given the current and projected generation composition and transmission infrastructure; | **Workgroup Considerations** and **Annex 21 -** SSEN Concerns email |
| * 1. Cross code impacts (BSC, CUSC and DCode) and impact on EBR; | ‘Interactions’ within **Workgroup Considerations** |
| * 1. Consider any emerging thinking from the Open Network project; | ‘ENA Open Network Project Update’ and ‘Connections Reform’ within **Workgroup Considerations** |
| * 1. Any interaction with generator licencing thresholds or requirements; | ‘Registered Capacity’ within **Workgroup Considerations** |
| * 1. The impacts for stakeholders including NGESO, iDNOs, TOs, DNOs and generators; | **Workgroup Considerations** and **Annex 13** – Threshold Matrix and **Annex 19** - ESO CBA results |
| * 1. Implications for new connectees in relation to data exchange, planning, market engagement and any other areas of change; | **Workgroup Considerations**, **Legal Text** and **Annex 20** - ESO Industry Impact Cost Assessment |
| * 1. The implications associated with implementing any changes retrospectively so that they apply to existing connectees rather than just for new connectees; and | ‘Retrospectivity discussion’ within **Workgroup Considerations** and **Annex 14** - Retrospective considerations |
| * 1. The implementation options together with the associated costs and benefits. | ‘Industry Analysis of GC0117 impacts’ within **Workgroup Considerations** and **Annex 11** – NGESO estimated delivery timeframes and costs for proposed solutions |

1. As per Grid Code GR20.8 (a) and (b) the Workgroup should seek clarification and guidance from the Grid Code Review Panel when appropriate and required.
2. The Workgroup is responsible for the formulation and evaluation of any Workgroup Alternative Grid Code Modifications arising from Group discussions which would, as compared with the Modification Proposal or the current version of the Grid Code, better facilitate achieving the Grid Code Objectives in relation to the issue or defect identified.
3. The Workgroup should become conversant with the definition of Workgroup Alternative Grid Code Modification which appears in the Governance Rules of the Grid Code. The definition entitles the Group and/or an individual member of the Workgroup to put forward a Workgroup Alternative Code Modification proposal if the member(s) genuinely believes the alternative proposal compared with the Modification Proposal or the current version of the Grid Code better facilitates the Grid Code objectives The extent of the support for the Modification Proposal or any Workgroup Alternative Modification (WAGCM) proposal WAGCM arising from the Workgroup’s discussions should be clearly described in the final Workgroup Report to the Grid Code Review Panel.
4. Workgroup members should be mindful of efficiency and propose the fewest number of WAGCM proposals as possible. All new alternative proposals need to be proposed using the Alternative Request Proposal form ensuring a reliable source of information for the Workgroup, Panel, Industry participants and the Authority.
5. All WAGCM proposals should include the Proposer(s)'s details within the final Workgroup report, for the avoidance of doubt this includes WAGCM proposals which are proposed by the entire Workgroup or subset of members.
6. There is an option for the Workgroup to undertake a period of Consultation in accordance with Grid Code GR. 20.11, if defined within the timetable agreed by the Grid Code Panel. Should the Workgroup determine that they see the benefit in a Workgroup Consultation being issued they can recommend this to the Grid Code Review Panel to consider.
7. Following the Consultation period the Workgroup is required to consider all responses including any Workgroup Consultation Alternative Requests. In undertaking an assessment of any Workgroup Consultation Alternative Request, the Workgroup should consider whether it better facilitates the Grid Code Objectives than the current version of the Grid Code.
8. As appropriate, the Workgroup will be required to undertake any further analysis and update the appropriate sections of the original Modification Proposal and/or WAGCM proposals (Workgroup members cannot amend the original text submitted by the Proposer of the modification). All responses including any Workgroup Consultation Alternative Requests shall be included within the final report including a summary of the Workgroup's deliberations and conclusions. The report should make it clear where and why the Workgroup chairperson has exercised their right under the Grid Code to progress a Workgroup Consultation Alternative Request or a WAGCM proposal against the majority views of Workgroup members. It should also be explicitly stated where, under these circumstances, the Workgroup chairperson is employed by the same organisation who submitted the Workgroup Consultation Alternative Request.
9. The Workgroup is to submit its final report to the Modifications Panel Secretary on **17 January 2024** for circulation to Panel Members. The final report conclusions will be presented to the Grid Code Review Panel meeting on  **25 January 2024**.

Membership

1. It is recommended that the Workgroup has the following members:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Role** | **Name** | **Representing** |
| Chair | Milly Lewis | Code Administrator |
| Technical Secretary | Lizzie Timmins | Code Administrator |
| National Grid Representative\* | Antony Johnson & David Hallford | NGESO |
| Workgroup Member\* | Alan Creighton | Northern Powergrid |
| Workgroup Member | Robby Wilson | SHE Transmission |
| Workgroup Member | Chris Marsland | AMPS |
| Workgroup Member\* | Richard Woodward | National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) |
| Proposer/ Workgroup Member\* | Garth Graham | SSE |
| Workgroup Member\* | Graeme Vincent | SP Energy Networks |
| Workgroup Member\* | Isaac Gutierrez | Scottish Power Renewables |
| Workgroup Member\* | John Lucas | Elexon |
| Workgroup Member\* | Mike Kay | Electricity North West |
| Workgroup Member\* | Paul Youngman | Drax |
| Workgroup Member | Andrew Akani | Western Power Distribution |
| Workgroup Member\* | Richard Wilson | UK Power Networks |
| Workgroup Member\* | Tim Ellingham | RWE |

14. A (\*) Workgroup must comprise at least 5 members (who may be Panel Members). The roles identified with an asterisk (\*) in the table above contribute toward the required quorum, determined in accordance with paragraph 15 below.

1. The Grid Code Review Panel must agree a number that will be quorum for each Workgroup meeting. The agreed figure for this modification is that at least 5 Workgroup members must participate in a meeting for quorum to be met.
2. A vote is to take place by all eligible Workgroup members on the Modification Proposal and each WAGCM. The vote shall be decided by simple majority of those present at the meeting at which the vote takes place (whether in person or by teleconference). The Workgroup chairperson shall not have a vote, casting or otherwise. There may be up to three rounds of voting, as follows:

**Vote 1:** whether each proposal better facilitates the Applicable Grid Code Objectives;

**Vote 2:** where one or more WAGCMs exist, whether each WAGCM better facilitates the Applicable Grid Code Objectives than the original Modification Proposal;

**Vote 3:** which option is considered to BEST facilitate achievement of the Applicable Grid Code Objectives. For the avoidance of doubt, this vote should include the existing Grid Code baseline as an option.

The results from the vote and the reasons for such voting shall be recorded in the Workgroup report in as much detail as practicable.

17. It is expected that Workgroup members would only abstain from voting under limited circumstances, for example where a member feels that a proposal has been insufficiently developed. Where a member has such concerns, they should raise these with the Workgroup chairperson at the earliest possible opportunity and certainly before the Workgroup vote takes place. Where abstention occurs, the reason should be recorded in the Workgroup report.

18. Workgroup members or their appointed alternate are required to attend a minimum of 50% of the Workgroup meetings to be eligible to participate in the Workgroup vote.

19. The Technical Secretary shall keep an Attendance Record for the Workgroup meetings and circulate the Attendance Record with the Action Notes after each meeting. This will be attached to the final Workgroup report.

20. The Workgroup membership can be amended from time to time by the Grid Code Review Panel and the Chairperson of the Workgroup.