Workgroup Consultation Response Proforma

**GC0168: Submission of Electro Magnetic Transient (EMT) Models**

Industry parties are invited to respond to this consultation expressing their views and supplying the rationale for those views, particularly in respect of any specific questions detailed below.

Please send your responses to grid.code@nationalenergyso.com  **5pm** on **21 February 2025**. Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration.

If you have any queries on the content of this consultation, please contact grid.code@nationalenergyso.com

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Respondent details** | **Please enter your details** |
| **Respondent name:** | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Company name:** | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Email address:** | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Phone number:** | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Which best describes your organisation?** | [ ] Consumer body[ ] Demand[ ] Distribution Network Operator[ ] Generator[ ] Industry body[ ] Interconnector | [ ] Storage[ ] Supplier[ ] System Operator[ ] Transmission Owner[ ] Virtual Lead Party[ ] Other |

**I wish my response to be:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| (Please mark the relevant box) | [ ]  Non-Confidential *(this will be shared with industry and the Panel for further consideration)* |
|  | [ ]  **Confidential** (this *will be disclosed to the Authority in full but, unless specified, will not be shared with the Workgroup, Panel or the industry for further consideration)* |

**For reference the Applicable Grid Code Objectives are:**

1. *To permit the development, maintenance and operation of an efficient, coordinated and economical system for the transmission of electricity*
2. *Facilitating effective 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 electricity transmission system operator area taken as a whole;*
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; and*
5. *To promote efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Grid Code arrangements*

*\* See Electricity System Operator Licence*

**Please express your views in the right-hand side of the table below, including your rationale.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Standard Workgroup Consultation questions** |
| 1 | Do you believe that the Original Proposal and/or any potential alternatives better facilitate the Applicable Objectives? | Mark the Objectives which you believe the Original Solution better facilitates: |
| Original | [ ] A [ ] B [ ] C [ ] D [ ] E  |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 2 | Do you support the proposed implementation approach? | [ ] Yes[ ] No |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 3 | Do you have any other comments? | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 4 | Do you wish to raise a Workgroup Consultation Alternative Request for the Workgroup to consider?  | [ ] Yes (the request form can be found in the Workgroup Consultation Section)[ ] No |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 5 | Do you agree the Workgroup’s assessment that GC0168 does not impact the European Electricity Balancing Regulations (EBR) Article 18 terms and conditions held within the Grid Code? | [ ] Yes[ ] No |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 6 | Do you have any comments on the Impact of GC0168 on the EBR Objectives?  | [ ] Yes[ ] No |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Specific Workgroup Consultation questions** |
| 7 | Do you believe it is reasonable to require those Users identified in the draft legal text in PC.A.9.2.2 to provide an EMT model when requested by the NESO noting the importance of accurate modelling on power system design, operation and post event analysis? | [ ] Yes[ ] No |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 8 | Do you believe the timelines proposed for the submission of an EMT model as drafted in PC.A.9.2.2.1 are appropriate? | [ ] Yes[ ] No |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 9 | Do you believe that it is appropriate to set out the renumeration and cost recovery provision of the models in the CUSC?  | [ ] Yes[ ] No |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 10 | Do you believe it is appropriate to define the detail of the model submission in an Electrical Standard rather than in a specific part of the Grid Code, or as a separate guidance note. If you do not believe this to be the case, please state why you would support an alternative approach? | [ ] Yes[ ] No |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 11 | As part of the electrical standard, it is expected that an EMT model would be submitted in PSCAD Version 5. Do you have any views on this approach and if so, please state what they are? | [ ] Yes[ ] No |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 12 | Do you believe that the timeline proposed for the Workgroup meetings and target date of September 2025 are reasonable? | [ ] Yes[ ] No |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 13 | Does this proposal deal adequately with LEEMPs? | [ ] Yes[ ] No |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 14 | Please could you share your rationale for a cost-recovery mechanism to be put in place supported by evidence, where available. If no cost recovery mechanism were available, what do you believe the implications would be? | [ ] Yes[ ] No |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |