

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

GC0164 - Workgroup 10

Date: 08/08/2024

Contact Details

Chair: Deborah Spencer (Code Governance) deborah.spencer@nationalgrideso.com

Proposer: Frank Kasibante (ESO) frank.kasibante1@nationalgrideso.com

Key areas of discussion

Introduction

The Chair welcomed the Workgroup members and shared the meeting agenda, highlighting the key areas of discussion.

The Chair informed the Workgroup that the draft Workgroup Report had been previously distributed and encouraged Workgroup members to review the document and provide any additional comments or feedback.

Terms of Reference Review

(a) Implementation and Cost

The Chair addressed the topic of implementation and cost, emphasizing the importance of reflecting these discussions in the Workgroup Report. Members were invited to provide suggestions or comments on these matters.

A Workgroup member suggested assessing how much time and effort had been invested by Workgroup Members, these details could be taken into consideration when deciding on similar projects going forward.

(b) Review draft legal text should it have been provided. If legal text is not submitted within the Grid Code Modification Proposal the Workgroup should be instructed to assist in the developing of the legal text

A Workgroup member highlighted that while the OC2 and the Planning Code have been reviewed, other areas of the Grid Code that reference OC2 may also need to be reviewed and suggested it may be a good idea to review the entire Grid Code to identify and update such references, particularly in the Balancing Code 1 which refers to OC2.46 (a clause that may no longer exist) and The DRC (Data Registration Code), which refer to various clauses related to OC2 that need to be reviewed to ensure they reflect the intended updates. The Proposer took this as an Action.

A Workgroup Member advised that this task should be completed concurrently with OC2, as it is essential to avoid referencing clauses that may no longer exist as part of this modification.

The Chair asked if this piece of work was to be discussed during a further Workgroup meeting. The Proposer advised he would aim to include the Grid code OC2 reference review along with the updated legal text when it is shared.

(c) Consider whether any further Industry experts or stakeholders should be invited to participate within the Workgroup to ensure that all potentially affected stakeholders have the opportunity to be represented in the Workgroup. Demonstrate what has been done to cover this clearly in the report; and

The Chair acknowledged the Proposer had tried on numerous occasions to engagement with industry to gather their view without success.

A Workgroup Member highlighted the importance of obtaining feedback from different users of the Grid Code, including potential new users. He suggested leveraging the OC2 forum held by National Grid as a platform to invite further feedback and input from code users.

A member confirmed that an industry Forum (OC2 Forum) was to take place at the end of September, the Proposer agreed to attend and engage with industry parties to gather feedback on the work carried out so far for OC2.

The Chair asked the Workgroup Members if the Proposer attending the OC2 Forum in addition to the engagement efforts already undertaken and incorporating these perspectives into the Workgroup Report would be sufficient to address the objectives outlined in the Terms of Reference.

The Proposer advised he would engage with the trade associations that have been involved in the early stages of this modification to gather further insights and input before the next meeting.

A Workgroup Member expressed a concern regarding the lack of engagement from Generators, emphasizing the importance of obtaining their perspectives alongside Network Operators for a comprehensive representation of Stakeholders.

The Proposer agreed and advised it was a highlighted risk if the Generator perspectives are not included in the Workgroup Report.

A Workgroup Member offered to reach out a Generator to obtain feedback. The Proposer agreed with this.

(d) Consider EBR Implications

A Workgroup member stated that the proposed changes should not have any EBR implications as no obligations on any party is being altered, other members agreed.

(e) Consider whether the proposed redrafted OC2 is easier for stakeholders to read and understand and that the existing obligations on all parties set out in the current OC2 version have been retained.

A Workgroup member expressed the need for feedback from other Stakeholders as it would be valuable in ensuring the redrafted OC2 adequately addresses their obligations.

Another Workgroup member advised we find a way to demonstrate that the clarity and retention of existing obligations have been retained.

The Workgroup discussed the need to reach out to these Stakeholders, a Workgroup member advised they could assist in facilitating this engagement.

(f) Consider whether it is appropriate to have two sets of Grid Code definitions, one set to use with OC2 and a second (existing) set to be used for all other parts of the Grid Code

The Proposer advised this was considered but deemed impractical due to the potential confusion it would cause for readers.

A Workgroup member agreed, adding that doing this could be legally questionable but they also had concerns about how the wider issue regarding definitions could be resolved.

The Proposer emphasised the importance of considering this aspect when carrying out code simplification under the Energy Code Reform (ECR) initiative.

A Workgroup Member advised that having two sets of definitions for the Grid Code would contradict the overall objective of simplifying the code.

(g) Workgroup to assess and form a view whether there are material changes or not to be the modification.

The Workgroup agreed that there have been no material changes.

Chair's Updates

The Chair advised that further work was needed on the Terms of Reference to ensure that it included as much detail as possible when it goes into the Workgroup Report.

The Chair proposed a revised timeline, noting that after discussions with the Proposer, it was agreed that an additional month would be beneficial, extending the timeline to October.

The Workgroup agreed to request an extension of the timeline, with the intention to submit the Workgroup Report at the October Panel, pending approval.

A Workgroup Member inquired about the eligibility criteria for the workgroup vote. The Chair advised that this information would be compiled and shared.

Legal Text Review

A Workgroup Member requested review of the ESO comments on the legal text in the Consultation Response.

The Proposer suggested reviewing the legal text separately, first focusing on the Workgroup members input and then addressing concerns separately.

The Proposer mentioned that a Workgroup member suggested re-organising the text to group restoration owners together. Adding, OC214 has been brought to OC218 and OC218 had been brought to OC214 to provide for better flow.

They went on to advise work on house style and consistent referencing is still ongoing.

The Proposer said there was a lack of consistency in introducing titles to the diagrams and proposed using the word overview consistently throughout the document, adding they had aligned the key with the metrics.

The Proposer noted that the next version will be shared via email to ensure everyone has a word version for easier collaboration and commenting, as feedback had been received by members advising updating a live document that is subject to changes was confusing.

A Workgroup Member mentioned that the flow diagrams should accurately reflect the corresponding text, the Proposer agreed to review this and share details subsequently.

GC0156 was mentioned in relation to a missing section / omission in the current text.

The Proposer mentioned that the text prior to the BC2 (Balancing Code 2) references in OC2 differed and added that alignment and consistency was necessary.

A Workgroup member suggested “financial year” is defined with details, there was some discussion on this point and the Proposer advised “financial year” was defined to emphasize a specific timeframe in OC2.1.8. An action was taken to clarify this.

The Workgroup discussed the difference between “Outage Plan & Outage Program” in the Grid Code and which one should be used consistently. The Proposer took an action to check with the outage Planning teams for clarification.

The Proposer mentioned their intention to revise and refine the text, ensuring clarity before sharing the updated version with the Workgroup Members for their input and review.

Next Steps

Share revised Legal Text document with Workgroup Members.

Share Timeline updates via email.

Actions

For the full action log, [click here](#).

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
18	WG9	Chair	Share detailed responses from the consultation with Workgroup members.		WG10	Closed
19	WG9	Chair	Share Workgroup report with Workgroup members.		WG10	Closed
20	WG9	Proposer	Review, update, and share legal text with Workgroup members.		WG10	In progress
21	WG10	WG Members	Share time invested in the process.		WG11	In progress
22	WG10	Proposer	Review GC for OC2 reference update.		WG11	In progress
23	WG10	Proposer	Align current text to GC156.		WG11	In progress
24	WG10	Proposer	Review definitions on financial year.		WG11	In progress
25	WG10	Proposer	Share revised Legal text.		WG11	In progress

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Deborah Spencer	DS	Code Governance, ESO	Chair
Prisca Evans	PE	Code Governance, ESO	Tech Sec
Sean Nugent	SN	Commercial Codes, ESO	Observer
Frank Kasibante	FK	ESO	Proposer
Andy Keegan	AK	National Grid	Workgroup Member
Graeme Vincent	GV	SP Networks	Workgroup Member
Richard Wilson	RW	UKPN	Workgroup Member
Alan Creighton	AC	Northern Power Grid	Workgroup Member
Stewart Wylie	SW	SSEN Distribution	Workgroup Member
Garth Graham	GG	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member