

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Meeting name: Workgroup Meeting 19

Date: 05/09/2024

Contact Details

Chair: **Teri Puddefoot**

Proposer: **Ian Povey**

Key areas of discussion

1. Workgroup Meeting Objectives

The Chair introduced the Workgroup noting the objectives were for the Proposer to provide a progress update on legal text, review the Workgroup Consultation document and discuss the slides prepared by the Proposer.

Update

The Proposer shared the [slides](#) and invited questions.

The Proposer gave an overview outlining the principals of what the workgroup were trying to achieve; for more information please refer to the slides [here](#).

The Proposer discussed the implementation approach noting that The Planning Code would remain unchanged until January 2026, when it was hoped that these changes will be implemented. Post implementation date, all the requirement for Planning Data Exchange will be in the new i) Planning Code 9 (PC.9) detailing submission requirements placed on Network Operators and ii) PC.10 detailing submission requirements placed on the Company.

The Proposer advised that Appendix PC. G provided detail in support of PC.9 and PC.10 outlining what data would need to be exchanged. A number of new and updated definitions had also been added to the Glossary and Definitions section of the Grid Code.

The Proposer continued that the information would be provided in Power System Model (PSM) in CIM format which consists of Structural data, Situation data and Solution data details of which can be found in the [slides](#).

The Proposer provided an overview on the Data Submissions which are detailed in the table contained within the slides provided.

GV requested clarification on Network development projects whether these were projects financially sanctioned and authorised or technically approved or receive funding.

The Proposer responded that these would be for firm projects whether they were connection or reinforcement jobs, and all the information would be there, so it was clear when to expect commission.

PT continued to advise that the stand up models would be based on ETYS operational models that only go out 12/18months ahead.

AC endorsed the good quality of the slides and advised that it was apparent by looking at them that the DNO provided forecasts for next 10 years to what was happening on their system. However, in terms of what was received back from the Company at Week 38 was only for the next 12 months, therefore there were no multiple forecasts and requested clarity.

PT responded that the DNOs had the option to request additional data if it significantly impacted their network.

ZM asked if something could be added within a reasonable time scale as Network Operators don't always include absolutely everything when exchanging data and what would be within reason.

PT responded that, in the new PC, the DNOs would have the right to ask for information on changes that would affect their network. Therefore, for the standard model exchange Week 12 & 38, the ESO models would be based on the operational model of the transmission system at the forecast Day equal to the previous year's date of either trans Peak or Minimum. (E.g. if trans peak was Wednesday Jan 21, 2024, then ESO Peak models would be on the same Wednesday Jan 2025.)

For changes to Transmission system which were further in the future 2 years+ the model to be supplied would be based on an ETYS model, hence the need for a consequential STCP 22-1 change to require the interface points to be included in these models.

ZM questioned what would be automatically submitted to the Network Operators at Week 38?

PT clarified that at Week 12/Week 38 Network Operators would get the transmission system based on the forecasted day of the next peak/minimum. Therefore, at Week 12 the Network Operators would get the summer minimum model at the forecast day of the next summer minimum which would be the same day as the previous year's minimum, and this would also apply to Week 38 the winter peak model of the transmission system based on the forecast transmission peak the same day and week but just a year ahead.

AC addressed the workgroup to say that whilst a very good stable baseline had been established, however, the question was does this supply the information that would be needed to help with e.g., Queue Management and other forward works?

AC advised that he had taken an action to explain what was being proposed here to people in other part of the business who were involved in forward planning to ensure what is being proposed was at least co-ordinated or was a building block for the proposed change.

The Proposer advised that he too had made that note to take forward and maybe this could be raised at the consultation stage.

The Chair endorsed these comments and suggested that this could be one of the questions asked of the industry at consultation stage to get a wider view.

The Proposer concurred with this suggestion.

AC suggested these questions were addressed internally initially before they asked at the consultation stage, which was supported by all the Workgroup Members.

The Proposer continued to give a brief overview on the remaining slides and some extra detail on the Power Flow Definitions used in PC.9, PC.10 and DRC – please see slide pack.

The Chair advised the group that should any further questions/queries arise then it would be good to share as soon as possible, ideally before the next Workgroup which was scheduled for 4 October 2024. It was suggested that any questions be forwarded by 19 September 2024 enabling the Proposer to give them consideration ahead of the 4 October 2024 Workgroup Meeting.

AC advised that as this modification would only affect the Network Operators and the ESO, it would be beneficial to aim to resolve any questions before the Code Administrator Consultation was issued if the timeline agreed by Panel was to be adhered to.

The Chair suggested that the Workgroup met on the 4 October 2024 having done as much as possible in getting feedback and answer the questions already raised. On the 4 October 2024 review the timeline dependant on what the Workgroup come back with and should there be a need to review the timeline then it can be looked at on the 4 October 2024.

PT informed the workgroup that if January 2026 was too soon, then to make this known and consideration can then be given to the timeline accordingly.

ZM sought clarification on January 2026 timeline – was it week 2 or the end of the month?

PT pointed out that week 2 would only be functional if the ESO notify the Network Operators of their minimum date from the previous year. ESO are not bound to do this by the Code and if ESO fail to do so then week 2 does not happen.

Current Code states that ESO has to notify Network Operators by Week 17, therefore January 2026 ESO were not mandated to do it Week 17 which was the current Code, therefore, Week 2 would not be feasible.

The group agreed the slides were very informative to initiate discussions internally within their businesses.

No further questions were raised and as the next Workgroup was scheduled on 4 October 2024, the Proposer requested that any further questions be sent to him for consideration by 2 October 2024.

PT asked if something around the agreement of interface terminals could be incorporated as this had not been covered in the slides and was going to be a requirement.

The Proposer agreed to add this to the slides which will also be incorporated in the Workgroup Consultation.

2. Timeline Review

Decision on timelines: -

- Return on 4 October 2024 for a further review of the Consultation.
- **ACTION** The Chair to progress the Workgroup Consultation along with the Proposer to be reviewed on 4 October 2024.
- Further meeting to review the Workgroup Consultation and legal text.

Next Steps

- Completion of final draft the Consultation and legal text
- Arrange a further meeting to review comments following above actions.

AOB

None

Actions

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
17		TP	Progress the Workgroup Consultation for review on 4 October 2024.			

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Teri Puddefoot	TP	Code Administrator, ESO	Chair
Rashpal Gata-Aura	RGA	Code Administrator, ESO	Technical Secretary

Ian Povey	IP	ENWL	Proposer
Vincent Graeme	VG	SP Distribution	Workgroup Member
Paul Thomson	PT	ESO	ESO Rep
Alan Creighton	AC	Northern Power Grid	Alternate
Somjit Mohanty	SM	National Grid	Workgroup Member
Alan Brown	AB	SSE	Workgroup Member
Behnam Feizifar	BF	SSE	Observer
Lee Saville	LS	Western Power Distribution	Workgroup Member
Zivanayi Musanhi	ZM	Southeastern Power Networks	Workgroup Member
Stuart McLarnon	SM	ESO	Technical Representative
Joseph Boardman	JB	NGED	Observer
Stephen Wood	SW	National Grid	NGED Rep