Public

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Meeting name: GC0166 Workgroup Meeting 13

Date: 19/03/25

Contact Details

Chair: Claire Goult (NESO) claire.goult@nationalenergyso.com

Proposer: Steve Baker (NESO) stephen.baker@nationalenergyso.com

Key areas of discussion

- **Introduction** – The Chair outlined the meeting agenda, which included Workgroup member expectations, timeline objectives, legal text discussion, Workgroup Report review and a Workgroup vote.
- **Draft Legal Text discussion** - The Proposer presented the latest updates to the Draft Legal Text. After detailed discussion the Workgroup agreed the Draft Legal Text for GC0166.
- **Terms of Reference** – The Workgroup discussed the Terms of Reference. The Workgroup discussed the implementation approach and costs, including the timeline for operational implementation (6-12 months) and the need for industry readiness. The Workgroup highlighted the Code Administrator Consultation which allows for wider industry feedback. The Workgroup agreed that the Workgroup Terms of Reference for GC0166 had been met.
- **Workgroup Vote** - The Chair led the Workgroup Vote, with the majority agreeing that the original proposal better facilitates the grid code objectives compared to the baseline.
- **Action Update** - The Chair presented the actions update and proposed actions to be closed. The Workgroup agreed actions proposed as completed.
- **Next Steps** - The Workgroup Report will be presented to the Grid Code Review Panel, 1 May 2025.

Public

Actions

Action Number	WG Raised	Owner	Action	Status	Latest
25	WG6	BD	Provide explanation on how reserve calculations are completed	Closed	This is a calculation done by NESO, so at most it should be in an advisory document
32	WG11	SB	Clarify the code implementation and enactment timelines and provide an indicative schedule.	Closed	Note sent by NESO with intent to implement the solution on OBP Strategic. NESO can go live at anytime once OBP Strategic is in. NESO are to finalise the steps needed once EDL/EDT has been transitioned (from BM to OBP). Would then be waiting on Industry readiness. Need Industry to give us firm timelines on their readiness in order to send out a schedule for implementation. We could probably set this out at last workgroup. Re: the word implementation we need to be clear on what we mean.
33	WG11	HK/JH	NESO to provide written assurance alongside the proposal to Ofgem that the solution proposed will meet the requirements of the original submission.	Closed	Revised Modelling addresses this point- this has been circulated to Workgroup members including Ofgem. We believe that the proposed solution will meet the requirements of the original submission. Address challenges around how assets are dispatched efficiently and how to best plan for use of such units

34	WG11	HK/JH	Clarify multiple BMU's with single source of energy, single BMU with multiple sources of energy and single source of energy with Hybrid aggregated BMU	Closed	NESO to treat multiple BMUs with a single source of energy as individual units.
35	WG11	HK/JH	Consider FSoE risks in terms of could no data be better than data that could change considerably.	Closed	Data submission covers the entire period a PN is submitted for. And the data , as for a PN, defaults at 11:00 each day. The reason for covering the entire period: To ensure assets with few changes do not have to submit data on a ongoing basis and only when they make a PN change or have a SoE limitation restricting ability to deliver a BOA for a 90 minute duration. To ensure, in the event of communication or system failure the BM can continue to operate until communications are restored, otherwise the BM would have no MDO/MDB data to continue sending instructions. To ensure units with no changes required on a typical day will have the data defaulted at 11:00 each day. To enable future improvements to enhance the accuracy of FSoE model which covers the entire period a PN is submitted for.
36	WG11	SB	Extend the scenario diagrams to include	Closed	Modelling sent to Workgroup on 24/02.

			period 4 to ensure clarity on responsibilities and permitted actions		Worked Example WG12 papers.
37	WG11	HK/JH	Consider impact on all asset types and how this could be managed through exemptions or otherwise.	Closed	For BMUs of longer duration- default value facility provided. MDO and MDB are designed to apply to all units; Propose insertion of clause in BC2.5.3.4 to the effect that – Workgroup agreed to insert into legal text "(e) if a participant doesn't submit values by *11am each day for the next Operational Day** they will default to the previous value submitted until updated"
38	WG11	HK/JH	Consult with the NESO market monitoring and compliance teams to ensure that the proposed solution for MDO/MDB parameters does not lead to unintended market consequences or breaches.	Closed	Done whilst creating Worked Example
39		HK/JH	Define defaulting rules for MDO/MDB parameters.	Closed	Defaulting rules are specified in the Data Validation, Consistency and Defaulting Rules. There is no change to the applicability of the Defaulting Rules. They define how data is 'defaulted' at 11am each day if no new data is submitted. In

					section 1.2 it states that the defaulting rules are applied in cases of missing data which should have been submitted. They apply at 11am each day. The obligation remains on the BM Unit to submit accurate MDO and MDB in the same way that the obligation sits with BM Units to submit accurate MEL, MIL, MNZT, MZT, etc. etc. As per 37.
40	WG11	SB	Review and refine the legal text to include definitions for limited storage, the use of FSoE, and defaulting rules.	Closed	Spoke to Legal re: use of (FSoE) and suggested insertion as per Legal Text slide (1). Definitions for Limited storage to be considered when data is available. See Action 39 re Defaulting Rules. As per 39 and 37
41	WG11	HK/JH/ SB	Legal Text - consider the impact of including a statement that committed FPNs should be excluded from the calculation of MDO and MDB.	Closed	See tweaks suggested in: new definitions: Future State of Energy (FSoE) Maximum Delivery Offer (MDO), Maximum Delivery Bid (MDB)
42	WG12	HK/JH	Create a data diagram that shows all the data flow and details from the tech team and investigate the possibility of developing an interactive tool for testing the submission and understanding of	Open	

	data between control room and industry.

Attendees

Claire Goult	CG	Code Administrator, NESO	Chair
Andrew Hemus	AH	Code Administrator, NESO	Tech sec
Steve Baker	SB	NESO	Proposer
Luke McCartney	LM	Ofgem	Authority Rep
Hannah Kernthaler	HK	NESO	SME
Bukky Daniel	BD	EDF Renewables	Workgroup Member
Chris Mcleod	CM	EKU Energy	Workgroup Member
Eli Treuherz	ET	Arenko Group	Workgroup Member
Giorgio Balestrieri	GB	Tesla	Workgroup Member
Graz Macdonald	GM	Waters Wye & Associates	Workgroup Member
Hooman Andami	HA	Elmya Energy	Workgroup Member
Jamie Clark	JC	Conrad Energy	Workgroup Member
Kamila Nugumanova	KN	Drax	Workgroup Member
Lauren Jauss	LJ	RWE Supply & Trading GmbH	Workgroup Member

Mark Steger	MS	EDF Energy (UK)	Workgroup Member
Pete Noyce	PN	KrakenFlex	Workgroup Member
Peter Errington	PE	Flexitricity Ltd	Workgroup Member
Richard Devenport	RD	Shell	Workgroup Member
Robert Longden	RL	Cornwall Insight/Eneco Energy Trade BV	Workgroup Member
Stephen Knight	SK	SSE	Workgroup Member
Andrew Colley	AC	SSE	Observer
David Graves	DG	Quorum Development	Observer
Gail Devenny	GB	Scottish Power Global Energy Management	Observer
Naomi Baker	NB	Energy UK	Observer
Nigel Goodwin	NG	NESO	Observer
Sean Nugent	SN	NESO	Observer
Steve Dale	SD	NESO	Observer