

# Meeting summary

## Grid Code Development Forum – 4 September 2024

|               |            |                  |          |
|---------------|------------|------------------|----------|
| <b>Date:</b>  | 04/09/2024 | <b>Location:</b> | MS Teams |
| <b>Start:</b> | 09:00      | <b>End:</b>      | 10:10    |

## Participants

| Attendee                 | Company                       | Attendee          | Company            |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| David Halford            | National Grid ESO (Chair)     | Suzanne Law       | SSE                |
| Frank Kasibante          | National Grid ESO (Tech Sec)  | Bukky Daniel      | EDF                |
| Nnaemeka Anyiam          | National Grid ESO (Presenter) | Paul Crolla       | Muirhall Energy    |
| Danish Ullah             | National Grid ESO (Presenter) | Matthew Dowds     | Muirhall Energy    |
| Hazem Karbouj            | National Grid ESO             | Ruth Kemsley      | Our Footprints     |
| Lizzie Timmins           | National Grid ESO             | Phillip Addison   | EDF Renewables     |
| Deborah Spencer          | National Grid ESO             | Sigrid Bolik      | Siemens            |
| Jamie Morgan-Wormald     | National Grid ESO             | Alan Creighton    | Northern Powergrid |
| Stephen Sommerville      | Aurora Power                  | Mike Kay          | P2 Analysis        |
| Mireia Barenys Espadaler | Lightsource BP                | Julie Richmond    | Scottish Power     |
| Lisa Waters              | Waters Wye                    | Graeme Vincent    | SP Energy Networks |
| Paul Youngman            | Drax                          | Benjamin Marshall | SSE                |
| Chanura Wijerante        | Res Group                     | Nigel Platt       | Siemens            |
| Matthew Ball             | EDF                           | Maryam Begum      | Cummins            |
| Cahir O'Neill            | ESB                           | Patrick Wohlfarth | Centrica           |
|                          |                               | Paul Bancroft     | Siemens            |

## Agenda and slides

A link to the Agenda and Presentations from the September 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 – David Halford (GCDF Chair) & Frank Kasibante (GCDF Tech Sec), NGESO

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

### Presentation: Proposed changes to User Data Submissions feedback period (STCP19-3) – Nnaemeka Anyiam, NGESO

The ESO Engineering Compliance team shared an overview of proposals to review the timescales for the ESO to provide feedback on data submitted as part of the User Data File Structure (UDFS) as documented in the STC Procedure, 19-3

#### Discussion themes / Feedback

A forum member noted concerns in relation to the six-week review period for some of the compliance activities as if any ESO comments are received after this period that require the User to make further changes then there could be another six-week period for Users to have wait for ESO feedback. It was also noted that there was no SLAs stated for basic voltage control tests which are required as soon as possible in order for the Interim Operational Notification to be removed.

*The presenter noted that in relation to the six-week review period, it will mainly relate to Grid Forming and Co-Located Technology which are outside of the bulk of the projects applying for a connection at this point in time. In terms of basic voltage control tests, feedback should be given within a maximum of two working days, and we will ensure that this is included in the proposed table of SLAs.*

A forum member noted that ordinarily, vendors will not hold open their FAT test environments for three months plus to support verification, so there needs to be some precise language in terms of what would be covered in the proposed six-week period. Going forwards this might be possible but there are concerns in respect of possible retrospectivity. There are a number of projects in flight at the moment and introducing this change now could disturb those project schedules and contracts. Could there be an alternative option rather than stating maximum working days you could have or as otherwise agreed within the bilateral agreement?

*The presenter agreed that this is something that we could take away and consider the option of having this discussed earlier on in the connection process and possibly included in BCA for relevant connection, but the logic in relation to the proposed changes was to ensure the current 15 Business Day period is amended to reflect the various compliance activities that take place. Our view is that in relation to the six-week review period, compliance testing is known and agreed over a long period of time so should not impact the ability for customers to achieve connection. Also, FAT's are not necessarily a regular part of the compliance process for all projects, hence timescales can be considered on a case by case basis.*

A forum member asked whether analysis was available that details the various compliance review activities that currently aren't meeting the 15 Business Day period? What is the justification for the various review periods for the proposed compliance review activities as these should be presented at future Working Groups?

*The presenter confirmed that some internal analysis had been completed and feedback has also been gained at the recent Compliance Conference. While timescales are being met in the majority of cases, this is putting strain on the Compliance Teams, and we are looking at how we can work differently going forwards. Also, justification has been provided in the presentation, showing that due to Grid code modifications and a change in the technology types connecting to the GB network, many of the compliance requirements have changed substantially over time, necessitating additional modelling and simulation requirements that impacts the turn around timescales. The previous SLA turn around period was agreed long ago and does not capture the changes that have taken place. The ESO*

---

---

*compliance team has had some time to observe the impact of these changes and mitigate them through other means and agree that a review of the SLA timescales has become imperative.*

A number of discussions took place in relation into whether the STCP is the most appropriate place for these timescales to be codified on the basis that the majority of the impact is on Users rather than the Transmission Owners? Should these obligations be more appropriate within the Grid Code?

*The proposer agreed that this was a good point and will be taken away for review and consideration.*

A forum member asked if consistency could be applied in terms of “week” and “days” and whether the term “case by case” could be reviewed to be more robust and generic?

*The proposer agreed that the references to “weeks” and “days” will be amended for consistency. The rationale behind using “case by case” is that in a scenario where the review is more complex, we can agree and update the User in terms of the timescales required.*

A forum member noted that under the current timescales of 15 Business Days, this can often take much longer as based on the feedback received from the ESO Compliance Team, it can take a number of weeks to arrange a meeting to clarify the points that have been fed back. After the meeting, any issues have to be fixed which then results in the 15 Business Day timescale starting again so can add up to many months over time.

*The proposer noted that the Compliance Team should be able clarify any feedback the User receives within a short space of time with a meeting normally being able to be set-up within 2-3 days.*

A forum member noted that in terms of compliance studies assimilations, the Grid Code guidance documents are not well written in terms of language and requirements and can lead to delays and reiterations. It’s important that the ESO produce guidance notes that are more thorough and less open to interpretation.

*The proposer noted the feedback and welcomed any comments that could help to improve the guidance notes that are produced by the ESO. Compliance Engineers are also on hand should any Users have any questions or require clarification on any aspects of the process. Strengthening our engagement process with Users is very important and something that we aim to continue to improve.*

A forum member asked that in relation to the compliant review of RMS and EMT Models, does this include the integration into the wider system models by other areas of the ESO or this purely completed within the Connections Compliance Team?

*The proposer confirmed that there are a series of tests that are completed which are shared across different teams within the ESO which include different areas of functionality and integration into the wider GB networks. These reviews take place concurrently with feedback then provided to the User by the Connections Compliance Team.*

A forum member asked whether the ESO should be moving towards more automated methods of compliance review for more simpler projects such as a single battery system or wind farm?

*The proposer confirmed that the ESO already have some forms of automation in place which increases the efficiency of analysis. Processes are being standardised which should enable a swifter turnaround on reviews.*

## AOB

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

It was noted by the Chair that Workgroup Nominations had been extended until the 13<sup>th</sup> September for Grid Code Modification Proposal [GC0174](#), and [Grid Code Review Panel Elections](#) are now open.

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.

---

# ESO

---

The next GCDF will be held on the 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2024 with the 25<sup>th</sup> September 2024 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 |
|----|-------------|-------------|-------|-------|-------------|--------|
|    |             |             |       |       |             |        |
|    |             |             |       |       |             |        |
|    |             |             |       |       |             |        |

---