

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

GSR029: Review of Demand Connection Criteria to Align with EREC P2/7 Workgroup 12

Date: 16/02/2024

Contact Details

Chair: Milly Lewis, National Grid ESO , milly.lewis@nationalgrideso.com
Proposer: Fiona Williams, National Grid ESO , fiona.williams@nationalgrideso.com

Key areas of discussion

The aim of the meeting was to review the Action Log, Terms of Reference and to work on the Workgroup Consultation document.

Review of Action Log

The Workgroup reviewed the action log and agreed to close actions 37, 42, 47, 49 and 50.

Action 5 and 7 - The Workgroup commented that those actions might need to be close before we can progress to Workgroup Consultation. The Chair agreed to review those actions closer to the Workgroup Consultation being issued, to assess the need for them to be completed.

Action 40 and 45 – To remain open and to incorporate those discussion into the Workgroup Consultation. To review closed to the Workgroup Consultation being issued.

Review of Terms of Reference

The Chair presented the Terms of Reference. There were no comments or questions from the Workgroup.

Proposer's Presentation/Workgroup Consultation

The Proposer gave an overview on the work done in merging the Proposer's solution document into the Workgroup Consultation. The Workgroup reviewed the Workgroup Consultation document, and the main highlights were:

- PC.A.s – There are several PC.A's sections that have been developed by the Proposer to illustrate how the changes in the Grid Code consequential modification would be presented and how it will help enact GSR029 work the Workgroup is developing. A Workgroup member shared concerns regarding GC0139 and the expectation that it will be implemented for January 2026, suggesting that the changes

proposed for the Grid Code consequential mod will only last perhaps a year. The Proposer stated that we should try to reduce the interaction with CG0139 and focus on the work GSR029 is trying to achieve. A Workgroup member advised that GC0139 effectively deletes PC.A for Network Operators.

- The Chair recommended that the Workgroup keeps the suggested Grid Code changes (caveated) in order to be able to consider the requirements for GSR029 in the Grid Code current Baseline, and that the Workgroup should also consider the impacts if GC0139 does get implement as it still needs to go through the modification process. The Proposer agreed not to go into a lot of detail about the Grid Code consequential modification work but advised that some level of understanding is needed by the Workgroup when considering the changes that will impact the Grid Code, suggesting we should keep the text proposed as a guidance.
- The Chair suggested that it should be considered raising the Grid Code modification after GSR029 Workgroup Consultation as this was planned to be a package deal, not the SQSS modification in isolation. A Workgroup member asked why we are doing this modification and why are we doing it now, considering all that is happening with Storage at the moment.
- 1.1.1.1 Aggregation of individual Users into larger demand groups – A Workgroup member suggested to delete “as determined by the Electricity System Operator”, explaining that in NEGT they are the ones actively doing the specified work, not the ESO. The Proposer clarified that the Grid Code doesn’t apply obligations on the TOs unless it is stated specifically in the Grid Code or if the STC refers to the Grid Code, explaining that most of the actions are obligations on the ESO, although many of them are discharged to the TOs on the behalf of the ESO.
- Storage – The Proposer clarified that it doesn’t make a difference the definitions of small, media and large Power Station (currently being looked at by GC0117) as we are trying to harmonize them in terms of the effects removing the distinction of small, media and large Power Stations in terms of the modelling of the Group Demand.
- The Proposer shared some diagrams and scenarios with the Workgroup. A Workgroup member pointed out that when talking about the connection of a large storage plant not having an impact, if the storage is acting as an import there will be an impact. The Proposer clarified that if storage is treated as a generator and its demand as negative generation, this will be added back. Advising that he was under the impression that this already happened.
- A Workgroup member highlighted that the aim of this modification is to align with P2.7 or P2.8, not to the potential P2.9, concluding that the Proposer suggestions are out of scope. The Proposer clarified that to achieve consistency it is needed to consider the Workgroup that is looking into P2.9 and take into consideration what they are doing. A Workgroup advised that the work on this modification started around P2.7 and then P2.8 changes happened, advising that all the Proposals for P2.8 don’t mention storage in them. The Workgroup member suggested that all the complications started with P2.8 being changed with extra terms being added looks like it is out of scope.

- The Chair and the Proposer advised that they would have further discussions to assess how the modification should be progressed and will share the plan with the Workgroup so they can feedback into it. After the modification will go to Panel so the plan can be shared with Panel Members to assess that we are on the correct track.

Next Steps

- The Chair to circulate the modification progress plan with the Workgroup.
- Workgroup to consider and provide feedback.
- Workgroup members to work through the outstanding actions.

Actions Log

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
5	Workgroup 2	TO Reps	TOs to provide feedback on the impact assessment for group demand using Method 1 and/or Method 2 (depending on the site)		Click or tap to enter a date.	Open
7	Workgroup 2	TO Reps	TOs to assess the contribution from large power stations using the methodology in EREP 130 and compare with current practice to understand the impact for change		Click or tap to enter a date.	Open
37	Workgroup 9	Proposer	To have further conversations with ICL with regards to AC comments and BA question		Workgroup 10	Closed
40	Workgroup 10	WG	Write a problem statement considering the future forecast Demand and the historic Demand		Workgroup 11	Open
42	Workgroup 10	WG	Provide wording for redefining PCA 4.3.2 a)		Workgroup 11	Closed
45	Workgroup 10	GL	Provide an example of the historic vs future Demand		Workgroup 11	Open
47	Workgroup 11	BA	Formally invite members of the Batteries Sub Group of the Strategic Connections Group to join the GSR029 Workgroup		Workgroup 12	Closed
48	Workgroup 11	ZM	Share information on organisation's process for forecasting demand for compliance purposes		Workgroup 12	Open
49	Workgroup 11	BA	Investigate and summarise how storage is going to be assessed under generation connection criteria		Workgroup 12	Closed
50	Workgroup 11	FW	Amend the storage diagrams		Workgroup 12	Closed

51	Workgroup 12	Chair	To review and assess the need to Action 5 and 7 to be closed before Worgkroup Consultation	Click or tap to enter a date.	Open
52	Workgroup 12	BA	To check how GC0139 interacts with PC.A.	Workgroup 13	Open
53	Workgroup 13	BA	To provide rationale to Grid Code proposed changes in the current baseline	Workgroup 13	Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Milly Lewis	ML	Code Administrator National Grid ESO	Chair
Catia Gomes	CG	Code Administrator National Grid ESO	Technical Secretary
Bieshoy Awad	BA	National Grid ESO	Alternate
Fiona Williams	FW	National Grid ESO	Proposer
Terry Baldwin	TB	National Grid ESO	Workgroup Member
Graeme Vincent	GV	SP Energy Networks	Workgroup Member
Roddy Wilson	RW	Scottish & Southern Energy	Workgroup Member
Philip Bale	PB	Roadnight Taylor	Observer
Peter Stanton	PS	NGET	Alternate
Alan Creighton	AC	Northern Power Grid	Workgroup Member