

ANNEX 4

Summary of Housekeeping changes Post GC0136 falling within the scope of Grid Code Modification GC0169

Proposers Solution (subclause from GC0169 Report)	Section	Query	Notes	Status	Scope / Notes
(e)	BC2.13	<p>LIAISON WITH INTERCONNECTOR OWNERS</p> <p>(a) Calculate the Interconnector Scheduled Transfer</p> <p>i) <b>Interconnector Owners</b> shall use best endeavours to deliver an updated <b>Interconnector Scheduled Transfer</b> to NGET by 10 minutes after each <b>Intraday Cross-Zonal Gate Closure Time</b>.</p> <p>ii) The updated <b>Interconnector Scheduled Transfer</b> shall fully reflect the results of the Single Intraday Coupling.</p> <p>iii) <b>Interconnector Owners</b> must ensure that the updated <b>Interconnector Scheduled Transfer</b> is received in its entirety and logged into NGET's computer systems by the time of 10 minutes after each <b>Intraday Cross-Zonal Gate Closure Time</b>.</p>	<p><b>Intraday Cross-Zonal Gate Closure Time</b> is bold but not a defined term – should it be unbolded or added as a defined term?</p> <p><b>Interconnector Scheduled Transfer</b> is bold in some cases but not a defined term – should it be unbolded or added as a defined term?</p>	<p>Some of the GC0099 legal text is in the current baseline, but some is not, so there is an inconsistency in the baseline. The new defined terms don't appear in the Glossary &amp; Definitions as per the GC0099 legal text, but the new section BC2.13 includes the terms in bold.</p> <p>No change to be made as fixing this would be a material change. We propose picking this up separately, potentially once TERRE and MARI have been implemented</p>	<p>Within scope of GC0169</p> <p>Guidance received from SME's – Advice is to unbold the non-defined Grid Code terms. (If they were bolded the all the other protocols and legal documents would need to be updated which has little value.</p> <p>Latest Grid Code already removes undefined bold terms so need to change.</p>
(f)	GC5.1	Should the text define which User's the obligation applies to rather than who it does not apply to	Checked with Legal and text revised	Consequential change arising from GC0169 and should be within scope of mod	Discussed with NESO Legal and Workgroup  Text updated

Proposers Solution (subclause from GC0169 Report)	Section	Query	Notes	Status	Scope / Notes
(f)	GC.5.2	Unless otherwise specified in the <b>Grid Code</b> , all instructions given by <b>The Company</b> and communications (other than relating to the submission of data and notices) between <b>The Company</b> and <b>Generators</b> and/or <b>DC Converter Station</b> owners and/or <b>Suppliers</b> , shall take place between the <b>The Company Control Engineer</b> based at the <b>Transmission Control Centre</b> notified by <b>The Company</b> to each <b>Generator</b> or <b>DC Converter Station</b> owner prior to connection, or to each <b>Supplier</b> prior to submission of <b>BM Unit Data</b> , and either the relevant <b>Generator's</b> or <b>DC Converter Station</b> owner's or <b>Supplier's Trading Point</b> (if it has established one) notified to <b>The Company</b> or the <b>Control Point</b> of the <b>Supplier</b> or the <b>Generator's Power Station</b> or <b>DC Converter Station</b> , as specified in each relevant section of the <b>Grid Code</b> . In the absence of notification to the contrary, the <b>Control Point</b> of a <b>Generator's Power Station</b> will be deemed to be the <b>Power Station</b> at which the <b>Generating Units</b> or <b>Power Park Modules</b> are situated.	Suggest rewording this section for clarity / readability – unclear on meaning of the passage	No change made – out of scope for GC0136	Within scope of GC0169  Text updated and discussed with Workgroup and checked with NESO Legal
(f)	GC.5.4	If the <b>Transmission Control Centre</b> notified by <b>The Company</b> to each <b>User</b> prior to connection, or the <b>User Control Centre</b> , notified in the case of a <b>Network Operator</b> to <b>The Company</b> prior to connection, is moved to another location, whether due to an	Suggest rewording this section for clarity / readability	No change made – out of scope for GC0136	Within scope of GC0169  NESO Legal review received and happy with proposed changes as are Workgroup.

Proposers Solution (subclause from GC0169 Report)	Section	Query	Notes	Status	Scope / Notes
		emergency or for any other reason, <b>The Company</b> shall notify the relevant <b>User</b> or the <b>User</b> shall notify <b>The Company</b> , as the case may be, of the new location and any changes to the <b>Control Telephony</b> or <b>System Telephony</b> necessitated by such move, as soon as practicable following the move.			
(b)	G&D	I notice in the G&D the definition of <b>Caution Notice</b> – only because it has moved. But it’s not a good definition. It’s a moot point why a safety rules term needs defining in the Grid Code – but wouldn’t it be more appropriate to be more specific and refer to its use to demark a point of isolation?		Potentially material so out of scope	Within scope of GC0169  Two comments received – one from NGED and one from NGET – Proposed suggestion is <b>Caution Notice</b> “a notice in an approved form that indicates <del>a</del> <b>safety precautions</b> <del>point of Isolation</del> and prohibits unauthorised interference” still requires confirmation.
(b)	?	I can’t immediately spot where the newly defined inertia terms are used – but there should be no confusion - it is not permissible to make SI units into plurals... the use of “s” is specifically deprecated because of this: SI units are both singular and plural. I do note, however, that you seem to be deviating from	It’s in G&D as ‘Active Power Seconds or MWs	This issue is material and requires a separate mod. Change removed from legal text.	Within scope of GC0169  The initial view is that this should be MWs – The text has been changed.

Proposers Solution (subclause from GC0169 Report)	Section	Query	Notes	Status	Scope / Notes
		SI practice in using MVAR instead of MVar. So although what I think you're doing for MVAR is actually wrong (according to SI who clearly can't get the staff these days) – I like it!			Resolved in discussion between Proposer and Stakeholder in meeting held on 11/10/2024 – Included as Annex 5 in the Workgroup Report
(f)	GC.11.2	<p>This isn't clear to me.</p> <p>Can NGET change an electrical standard?</p> <p>I think that a User or NGET can change an annex a document a User or The Company can change an annex b document a User or SP Transmission can change an annex c document a User or SHE Transmission can change an annex d document</p>		Out of Scope, no change made	<p>Within scope of GC0169</p> <p>Discussed with workgroup Comments received from Stakeholders and checked with Legal</p>
(f)	GC15.1	Can this be removed		No change made – out of scope	<p>Within scope of GC0169</p> <p>AJ discussed with NESO Legal and agreed this can be deleted.</p>
(g)	G99 11.2.4.3 and 12.2.4.3 and 13.2.4.3 ECC 6.3.7.1.4	For PPM this will not be required if the wind has dropped to a level where the PPM power output is below the Minimum Stable Operating Level. Need wording indicating so		No change made – out of scope	<p>Within scope of GC0169</p> <p>Grid Code – ECC.6.3.7.1.4 and BC3.7.3(a) updated. G99 has not been updated. Workgroup agreed drafting.</p>

Proposers Solution (subclause from GC0169 Report)	Section	Query	Notes	Status	Scope / Notes
	& BC3.7.3a				<p>There is not believed to be any need to change the CCs as this requirement is covered in BC3.7.3(a) – the only close reference is CC.6.3.7(c)(i) but no change is necessary for this clause.</p> <p>Issue resolved – G99 now reflects Grid Code and Isaac has confirmed this.</p> <p>Comments from Stakeholders including correction of typos. Text deletes in BC3.7.3a as it is not necessary. The same comment applies in ECC.6.3.7.1.4.</p>
(g)	C.9.3.3	Comments re min stable operating level		Out of scope for this mod, may be possible to include in GC0138 compliance mod, but will require discussion with the proposer	<p>Within scope of GC0169</p> <p>G99 issue</p> <p>As above – Latest version of G99 is now consistent with Grid Code – issue resolved</p>

Proposers Solution (subclause from GC0169 Report)	Section	Query	Notes	Status	Scope / Notes
(c)	G&D	I've also noticed from the list of Electricity Licensees that Ofgem publish from time to time that Scottish Hydro Electric Transmission is also a plc – so whether you wish to make this amendment at the same time or wait till they notify you as it probably also means changing all references to SHETL as the L is no longer applicable. There are quite a few SHETL references in use throughout the Grid Code, so not just as easy as making a couple of changes within the definitions.		Change made for SP Transmission plc vs current SP Transmission Limited)  SHET plc has not been updated as this is quite a substantial change due to the number of times it appears	Within scope of GC0169  Proposer has checked with NESO Legal and happy for this to be changed to plc.
Out of Scope	CPA3.2.1	CP.A.3.2.1 is changed from currently open loop to closed loop response. This may be difficult looking at the Synchronous generators Excitation system and a significant shift in analysis looking at the voltage control excitation of the synchronous generator to the voltage control at the terminals of the generator, it is additional work and may increase costs.		No change made. Out of scope for GC0136. This comment refers to CPA3.2.1(iii) – agree	<b>Specialist issue - outside scope of GC0169</b>  Resolved separately through Action 460 of Grid Code Review Panel  Resolved
(d)	<del>CPA3.2.1</del> OC9.6.4	OC9.6.4 – needs more work in formulation and important that there is a clear action.		No change made – out of scope agreed with group	Within scope of GC0169 – Reference to CPA.3.2.1 is believed to be in error  Workgroup agreed there is no need to change the text.

<b>Proposers Solution (subclause from GC0169 Report)</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Scope / Notes</b>
					Proposer has contacted Stakeholder who originally raised the comment and agreed to close action – Propose to leave text as is.