

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Meeting name: GC0139 – Enhanced Planning, Data Exchange to Facilitate, Whole System Planning. Workgroup Meeting 18

Date: 11/07/2024

Contact Details

Chair: **Teri Puddefoot**

Proposer: **Ian Povey**

Key areas of discussion

1. Workgroup objectives

The Chair introduced the Workgroup noting the objectives were for the Proposer to provide a progress update on legal text and for the Workgroup to review the Workgroup Consultation document to date.

2. Progress Update

The Proposer provided an update on progress stating that Planning Code (PC) 9 and 10 legal text updates are now complete, and that work is continuing with Appendix G, glossary, defined Terms and legal text. The proposer estimated that this would take a further 2 weeks and would then make it available for the Workgroup to review and provide comments. It was agreed that the Proposer would share this with the Workgroup on the ESO Collaboration Space (**ACTION 12**)

The information gained for the code, has identified gaps for CIM and other data that may be needed, for e.g., the language used and the accuracy of information, to ensure this is understood, (from point of view of an Electrical Engineer) to transition into using a Common Information Model.

3. Review Workgroup Consultation

The Group reviewed the document and agreed to further discuss, and update as required, to include legal text, at the next sub-workgroup. The Proposer agreed to send a copy to TP and for this to be shared with the Workgroup on the ESO Collaboration space A. draft of the document would be available by approximate date 26 Jul. (**ACTION 13**)

The group had discussions on the term “network operators” and agreed that the consultation needed to have a consistent flow and defined terms to provide clarity, including National Grid ESO, Transmission system owners, DNOs and pointing out that this includes independent system owners. This would give ease for the reader and a high impact for category users and how the detail related to them.

The group discussed the information model, sub transmission level and low level, for any alternatives. Early discussions had been raised in the use of a spreadsheet; however, costs and time would need to be considered and no WACGM has been raised for this to be considered as an option. Impact for any changes, extensions and developing an alternative solution would need to be defined and included in the legal text and the emerging

requirements of CIM interface between DNOs, TOs etc., for any of the changes to be managed around everyone's capabilities.

Main body of text:

Why Change? Proposer solution

The group discussed the obligations relating to the information exchange between ESO and the network operators, which are to be replaced by PC10. Existing schedules 5 & 11 will be unchanged and used in 2025, and new schedules added for 2026 onwards which would replace them. In principle the Proposer commented that the two schedules 13 & 14 data sets provided by DRC would need to be aligned with the current proposal. Information on 13 & 14 would need to be checked to see if the PCA is in scope of the Mod and included in the CIM model.

The group discussed if any changes to date and times be stated chronologically to define the changes. Consequential timelines changes need to be defined as this clarifies what the Network Operators and ESO need to do. The Proposer stated that there are 2 CIM models not 3 scenarios, these being minimum demand, daytime demand, with information for daytime peak being in the schedules. Agreement was sought that week 2 schedule is NETS Minimum model and week 28 is a NETS Peak demand model and these are the two models. The proposer went on to state that one is NETS peak and other NETS Minimum Demand. Clarification is needed on 12 and 38 and what is the obligation of the TO, to the ESO. It was noted that these models are based on the STCP requirements, to maintain or build data of STCP 16.1, 22.1, 19.4,12,1 and maintain SCS. The guidance for this is in the legal text currently being developed.

The group discussed the clarification that no changes were required on the STC to implement this modification. There will be a consequential modification to the STC, however, this is around the longer-term relevant network changes where the requirement is put to the NGESO to notify the Network Operators of a significant change, and subsequent need to use the future model and not this part of the change. Should an obligation be placed on the TOs within the Grid Code, this should be implemented via the STC as they are not party to the Grid Code. The obligation for the information to be shared with the TOs sits with the STC cross code for impact. If the TOs can't use the models, then this part of the Mod does not work if they are not preparing in the same way.

IP / AC if PCA relates to schedules 13 & 14 are implicitly within the model then, Jan 2026, this is not going to apply. To be taken offline and discussed and see how this may impact on this modification. **(ACTION 14)**

Work Group Considerations:

The Workgroup discussed other modifications that could impact on this proposal, and it was suggested that GC117 could have an impact, however clarification was needed into what is being proposed in this modification and how this will change the obligations in definition or may change the application. It was noted that if the thresholds were to drop, then it would alter the current process but not the new process.

ZM provided an update on CMP434 Implementing Connections Reform, in revamping all connections processes which will impact on the Evaluation Transmission Impact Assessment (ETIA), which aims to coordinate the development of the Transmission Network and the anticipated reinforcement of avoiding delays:

- GET 1 – affects transmission parties in each current form in updated solution. One application window that closes. The ESO/TOs go away and start to enter the codes at network design and interaction is in how the ESO/TOs get interaction with the understanding of what is likely to come with distribution with the embedded generator connection, 1MW in generators in England, 150 and 250 kW in Scotland. Distribution forecasted transmission capacity the DNO have been SEG have been developing this, with challenges of what is the governance to stakeholder vs transmission services. A separate process was suggested to be incorporated in the week 24 process as this is an annual change, to provide a generator GSP by GSP as part of GET 1 submission to facilitate TOs/ESO to commence development network profile.
- GET 2 – affects customers including embedded customers, who get confirmed connection dates and confirmed connection point offered. This is only at certain windows of the year (3)

The Workgroup went on to discuss updating schedules to include by technology type by each GSP, questioning would this be something that could be incorporated in GC0139 as an enduring process and provided to the ESO/TOs to facilitate this code network design.

The group discussed looking at the schedules in the next sub-workgroup, to include forecast of each technology type as this would take considerable time to go through and it was identified that the exiting schedule 11's does require, forecasting on generation by technology type, not capacity installed. The scope for forecasted Connection by technology type would need agreement on the factor(s) in terms of output/time on demand. The timelines for this are for 1 Jan 2025, however, would need to be incorporated into the modification when this comes into effect. The timelines for Ofgem to approve Nov 24, however, needs to fit in with the list for planning of data exchange due to demand in scope for connection. NGED are keen to incorporate this for alignment in the modification and as part of the original defects we need to ensure we are not adding scope creep. The group agreed that this needs more discussion to understand the information ask of the DFTC, for inclusion into the schedule 11, to ensure the development is in parallel and might help create some separation.

IP to arrange meeting to discuss above with NGED 24 Aug at 15:00 **(ACTION 15)**

4. Timelines

Decision on timelines and how many more workgroups are required.

- Complete legal text
- Code Admin on consultation
- Further meeting to review.

Suggestion of 3 more workgroups, before going to working group consultation.

IP – 3 weeks to complete finalized legal text (2 Aug) (ACTION 16)

Documents to be shared with group on SharePoint.

From 2 Aug potential next Working group approx. 2 weeks (1st week in Sep)

5. A.O.B

None

Next Steps

- Completion of final draft of legal text
- Code Admin on consultation all updates to be completed and final draft uploaded on SharePoint for workgroup to review and comment.
- Arrange a further meeting to review comments following above actions.

Actions

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

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
12		IP	Proposer would share this with the Workgroup on the ESO Collaboration Space. Approximate date 26 Jul to provide draft.			
13		TP	TP to upload document for review onto the ESO Collaboration Space			

for working group to read and comment. Approximate date 26 Jul to provide draft.

14	IP/AC	If PCA relates to schedules 13 & 14 are implicitly within the model then, Jan 2026, this is not going to apply. To be taken offline and discussed and see how this may impact on this modification. To arrange meeting to discuss further.
15	IP	Arrange meeting with NGED 24 Aug at 15:00
16	IP	3 weeks to complete finalized legal text (2 Aug)

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Teri Puddefoot	TP	Code Administrator, ESO	Chair
Karen Hughes	KH	Code Administrator, ESO	Tech Sec
Ian Povey	IP	ENWL	Proposer
Paul Thompson	PT	ESO	ESO Rep
Phil Moseley	PM	NGED	NGED Rep
Rose Galloway-Green	RGG	Ofgem	Ofgem Rep
Mzamoyabo Sibanda	MS	SSE	Observer
Somjit Mohanty	SM	NGRID	Workgroup Member
Stuart McLamon	SMC	ESO	Technical Rep
Alan Creighton	AC	Northern Power	Alternate
Euan Kirkmorris	EK	Ofgem	Ofgem Rep
Behnam Feizifar	BF	SSE	Observer
Lee Saville	LS	NGED	Workgroup Member
Zivanayi Musanhi	ZM	South-eastern Power Networks	Workgroup Member
Graeme Vincent	GV	SP Distribution	Workgroup Member