

Public

Meeting Summary

Grid Code Development Forum – 05 February 2025

Date: 05/02/2025	Location: MS Teams
Start: 09:00	End: 11:00

Participants

Attendee	Company	Attendee	Company
Claire Newton	NESO (Chair)	Emily Rice	SSE
Frank Kasibante	NESO (Tech Sec)	Nina Harrington	NGED
Thomas West	NGED (Presenter)	Lisa Waters	Waters Wye Associates Ltd
Nnaemeka Anyiam	NESO (Presenter)	Hazem Karbouj	NESO
Jay Chandarana	NESO	Nicola Barberis Negra	Orsted
Bukky Daniel	EDF Renewables	Scott Bull	Ofgem
Garry Cotter	Orsted	Ross Strachan	EDF Renewables
Harry Burns	EDF Renewables	Andrew Allan	RWE
Maria Lopez	NESO	Gareth Williams	SPEN
Paul Youngman	Drax	David Monkhouse	National Grid
ANGELA OLABARRI CANDELA	Iberdrola	Alan Creighton	Northern Powergrid
Phillip Addison	EDF Renewables	Leon Burdekin-Roberts	EDF Renewables
Harriet Eckweiler	SSE	Mike Kay	P2 Analysis
Lizzie Timmins	NESO	Adegboyega Akomolafe	Innovo Renewables

Public

Stephen Sommerville	Aurora Power	John Harrower	SSE
Tim Ellingham	RWE	Joel Matthews	DTUK Ltd
Sigrid Bolik	Siemens	Andrew Larkins	Sygensys
Graeme Vincent	SPEN	Sean Gauton	Uniper

Agenda and slides

A link to the Agenda and Presentations from the February GCDF can be found [here](#).

GCDF

Please note: These notes are produced as an accompaniment to the forum recording and slide pack presented and provide highlights only of discussion themes and possible next steps.

Meeting Opening – Claire Newton (GCDF Chair) & Frank Kasibante (GCDF Tech Sec), NESO

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,

A presentation was shared in relation to proposed changes to the Service Level Agreement (SLA) timelines for user data submission feedback periods, citing increased complexity in modelling, connection projects, and new technologies as reasons for the change. The proposal includes extending the feedback period from 15 to 20 business days for most compliance simulations and 30 business days for Grid forming and Co-located technologies. The presenter added that challenges necessitated the proposed changes to the feedback periods. He proposed legal text changes, indicating where the new timelines would be inserted in the STCP 19-3 and the Grid Code.

Discussion themes / Feedback

Stakeholders provided the following feedback

1. Acknowledged the additional information and analysis provided since the previous discussion at the September GCDF meeting. However, raised concerns about the proposed changes, emphasizing the importance of proper review by all relevant teams

Public

- within the 20 business days, citing previous situations where submissions were made and were not checked properly – comments were received from NESO in a piecemeal way.
2. Concerns that comments received from NESO were pedantic or unclear. Continual cycling of comments could lead to significant delays to projects.
 3. Suggested adopting review codes for documents to help streamline the review process and capture valid comments more efficiently (e.g. Code 1 = rejection of model(s) submitted, Code 2 = Some requirements met but not complete, etc.).
 4. Inquired about the current performance against existing measures, questioning whether the proposed changes were necessary based on current performance data but also asked about the impact of connections reform on future workload, suggesting that the reform might reduce the number of submissions.
 5. Concerns about the impact of the proposed changes on large thermal GB code users, particularly regarding the time required to evaluate submissions and the potential for extended Limited Operational Notification (LON). Modelling guidance needed improving for certain users (e.g. modified sites).
 6. If timelines were going to be extended (thus adding timelines to projects), would LON requirements be extended as well? Also noting that post-commissioning requires mobilisation of contractors meaning that plant would be unable to run or a delay in running the plant.
 7. Suggest any future Grid Code modification that impacts modelling requirements includes input from all NESO compliance teams at the same time. Current Grid Forming requirements are not clear. Generally, clarity of the Grid Code is not good. A great deal could be done regarding guidance notes to help users improve their submissions.
 8. Proposed introducing a requirement for NESO to report compliance with the SLA monthly, providing feedback on common issues encountered during the compliance process. This would help improve the quality of models submitted to NESO and reduce their workload.

The presenter acknowledged the feedback and mentioned that the process would be reviewed to ensure timely and comprehensive feedback, however, he explained that the changes were necessary to address the increased complexity and workload, and that ensuring system security was a priority while working towards cleaner power. He mentioned that the changes were driven by the need to meet new requirements and challenges in the industry.

The presenter noted that the current process already included some flexibility for addressing unresolved issues, such as moving certain items to the schedule of unresolved issues if they are not critical for initial approval. He added that specific performance data against the current SLAs is not currently available.

He further explained that Limited Operational Notifications (LON) could be extended on a case-by-case basis if there were reasonable justifications, such as delays caused by NESO or other

Public

special circumstances, adding that ongoing efforts to provide better guidance and feedback through webinars and other engagement sessions were underway.

He noted that if stakeholders found NESO feedback to be unclear, they should flag the concerns with the assigned NESO compliance engineers or compliance managers.

Presentation: Changes to OC6 to allow for site protection of pre-designated protected customers for Automatic Low Frequency Demand Disconnection - Thomas West, (National Grid Electricity Distribution - NGED)

A presentation was shared in relation to proposed Grid Code changes that relates to protection of essential services and protected sites during Low Frequency Demand Disconnection (LFDD) events. The proposal aims to move the disconnection process from Bulk Supply Points to lower voltages, allowing for more granularity and avoiding the disconnection of distributed energy resources.

Discussion themes / Feedback

Participants provided feedback on NGED's proposal, emphasizing the importance of timely and public communication during interruptions and the need for collaboration with other distribution networks.

They also noted that.

1. The market would need to know quickly and publicly, to minimise the risk of creating a Capacity Market event.
2. A small minority do not like this proposal but added that if it went ahead, moving LFDD away from BSPs does seem sensible. It was worth considering making it directional.
3. ETG and E3C do have discussions about LFDD, and the presenter needs to engage with representatives on those groups, if that had not been done already.
4. When we look at distribution systems, hospitals for example, tend to be quite low demand. These could be hard to isolate and protect.
5. The presenter should engage more with other DNOs regarding this subject to discuss the feasibility and interest in the LFDD proposal for protecting essential services.

The presenter acknowledged the feedback and mentioned ongoing efforts to gather more information from relevant groups.

Presentation: Rationalising Balancing Code 4 (BC4) and Balancing Code 5 (BC5) from the Grid Code - Frank Kasibante, NESO

Public

A presentation was shared regarding the proposed removal of Balancing Code 4 (BC4) and 5 (BC5) from the Grid Code, as they have become redundant following Brexit, noting that post-Brexit GB cannot participate in TERRE as was initially intended.

Discussion themes / Feedback

A forum member enquired whether this proposal is based on the assumption that there is no retained law which would require to maintain these sections.

The presenter indicated that they had checked with colleagues within the NESO European Frameworks team.

AOB

The Chair thanked the attendees and presenters for their contributions and closed the meeting.

The next GCDF will be held on the **05 March 2025** with the **25 February 2025 being the deadline for agenda items and presentations.**
