

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

GC0164 - Workgroup 9

Date: 15/07/2024

Contact Details

Chair: Deborah Spencer (Code Governance) deborah.spencer@nationalgrideso.com

Proposer: Frank Kasibante (ESO) frank.kasibante1@nationalgrideso.com

Key areas of discussion

Introduction and Agenda Overview

- The Chair started by greeting everyone and outlined the meetings objectives, which included reviewing Workgroup Consultation responses, discussing the Workgroup Report, and updates to the legal text received by a member as part of the Consultation.
- The Chair mentioned that the Workgroup Report was still in a draft format and required some updates before it could be shared with Workgroup members. It will be shared ahead of the next Workgroup meeting on 8 August.
- The Chair mentioned that the legal text updates would be reviewed by the Proposer and shared with the Workgroup ahead of the next meeting.
- The Chair advised there were 3 consultation responses, and the detailed responses will be shared with the Workgroup members.

Workgroup Consultation Responses Review

- The Chair shared a slide reviewing the responses to the questions asked in the consultation. Details can be found on the website [here](#).
- Q1 – Do you believe that the original proposal and / or any alternatives better facilitate the WG objectives – 1 Respondent agreed that the Original proposal better facilitated objectives a, b, c, and d, another agreed that only objective e, was better and a third agreed that a, c, and e were better.
- Q2 – Do you support the proposed implementation approach – All three respondents supported the implementation approach.
- Q3 – Do you have any other comments – The Chair advised that the respondents went through the glossary definitions, planning code and operating code.
- The Chair advised that there were quite a few comments ,1 Respondent shared their comment on the legal text version of the Glossary and definitions, Planning code and Operating code 2, another added their comments to each of the relevant questions asked, the third respondent shared 198 comments on the legal text and the Proposer

addressed them, confirming that the document would be shared with the group after the meeting.

- The Chair read one of the respondent's comments on a missed opportunity to further the DWSTC project adding that there is a significant improvement to the readability and understandability. A workgroup member commented on this response advising legal certainty is an issue that must be addressed.
- The Proposer agreed with the above point emphasising that different parties have varied perspectives, but legal certainty is a priority.
- A Workgroup member added that the ESO needs to manage the consequences of parties' interpretation if legal certainty is not guaranteed.
- The Chair and the Proposer discussed low engagement from industry on this modification.
- The Proposer discussed legal certainty VS simplicity adding that it must be good enough for the ESO.
- Q4 – Do you wish to raise a workgroup alternative and all respondents replied no.
- Q5 – Do you think that the changes proposed makes it easier to understand the existing version – 2 Respondents agreed that the changes proposed did make it easier to understand better than the existing version, 1 Respondent advised it was difficult to form a view.
- Q6 – Do you agree that the Grid Code obligations would not change if this version is implemented in comparison to the existing version – 2 Respondents agreed that the obligations wouldn't change, and 1 respondent advised that some requirements have been changed / removed, although some changes may not have been intentional and were due to editorial changes.
- Q7 – Do you agree that there should be only one set of glossaries and definitions applicable to the entire Grid Code – 2 respondents agreed that there should only be 1 set of Glossary and Definitions. Having multiple definitions for the same term would cause confusion. 1 Respondent did not agree advising this was a fundamental mistake which would affect the dWSTC project.
- The Proposer commented on Q7 and challenges faced while working on glossary and definitions, adding that multiple definitions may cause confusion.
- Q8 – Do you agree with the proposed change to move the position of the generator's performance charts from the operating code to the planning code – All Respondents agreed, 1 Responded added that there are some further areas of OC2 which relate to the Generator performance chart which could be moved into the Planning Code.
- Q9 – In order to help quantify industry resources required to implement this type of change, please indicate the number of hours spent reading and responding to the consultation – Members shared the approximate hours spent, with 1 member noting it was not appropriate to answer.
- The Chair advised the details of Q9 would be shared with the Workgroup members after the meeting.
- The Chair asked for feedback after reading the responses from the consultation.
- The Chair emphasised on ensuring clarity in the Workgroup Report.
- The Chair advised that all 3 respondents supported the proposed implementation.
- A Workgroup member inquired about the expected response rate and minimum requirements for proceeding with the consultation.

- The Proposer agreed with the above point advising that information from this Workgroup and the Consultation Responses will be shared with the Steering Group.
- The Proposer advised rationalising of BC4 / BC5 would mean taking it out of the code but advised to push GC164 further before drawing the line conclusively.
- The Proposer reviewed the legal text. He advised that there were some inconsistencies that needed changing, and he would go through some redrafted clauses to make sure that the requirements have not been changed.
- The Proposer advised he would make the necessary changes and share with the workgroup members before the next Workgroup.

Next Steps

- The Chair advised the Workgroup report would be updated and shared with the workgroup after the meeting.
- The Chair confirmed the timeline and the dates for the next Workgroup and noted that the report would be submitted on 8th August 2024.
- Share updated legal text with the Workgroup members.

Actions

For the full action log, [click here](#).

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
18	WG9	Chair	Share detailed responses from the consultation with Workgroup members.		WG10	In progress
19	WG9	Chair	Share Workgroup report with Workgroup members.		WG10	In progress
20	WG9	Proposer	Review, update and share legal text with Workgroup members.		WG10	In progress

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Deborah Spencer	DS	Code Governance, ESO	Chair
Prisca Evans	PE	Code Governance, ESO	Tech Sec
Sean Nugent	SN	Commercial Codes, ESO	Observer

Frank Kasibante	FK	ESO	Proposer
Andrew Colley	AC	SSE	Workgroup Member
Graeme Vincent	GV	SP Networks	Workgroup Member
Paul Richardson	PR	Northern Power Grid	Workgroup Member
Alan Creighton	AC	Northern Power Grid	Workgroup Member
Stewart Wylie	SW	SSEN Distribution	Workgroup Member