

Grid Code Alternative and Workgroup Vote

GC0103: The introduction of harmonised Applicable Electrical Standards in GB to ensure compliance with the EU Connection Codes

Please note: To participate in any votes, Workgroup members need to have attended at least 50% of meetings.

Stage 1 – Alternative Vote

If Workgroup Alternative Requests have been made, vote on whether they should become Workgroup Alternative Grid Code Modifications (WAGCMs).

Stage 2 – Workgroup Vote

2a) Assess the Original and WAGCMs (if there are any) against the Grid Code objectives compared to the baseline (the current Grid Code).

2b) Vote on which of the options is best.

Terms used in this document

Term	Meaning
Baseline	The current Grid Code (if voting for the Baseline, you believe no modification should be made)
Original	The solution which was firstly proposed by the Proposer of the modification
WAGCM	Workgroup Alternative Grid Code Modification (an Alternative Solution which has been developed by the Workgroup)

For reference the Applicable Grid Code Objectives are:

- i. *To permit the development, maintenance and operation of an efficient, coordinated and economical system for the transmission of electricity*
- ii. *Facilitating effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity (and without limiting the foregoing, to facilitate the national electricity transmission system being made available to persons authorised to supply or generate electricity on terms which neither prevent nor restrict competition in the supply or generation of electricity);*
- iii. *Subject to sub-paragraphs (i) and (ii), to promote the security and efficiency of the electricity generation, transmission and distribution systems in the national electricity transmission system operator area taken as a whole;*
- iv. *To efficiently discharge the obligations imposed upon the licensee by this licence* and to comply with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decisions of the European Commission and/or the Agency; and*
- v. *To promote efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Grid Code arrangements*

* See Electricity System Operator Licence

Workgroup Vote

Stage 1 – Alternative Vote

Vote on Workgroup Alternative Requests to become Workgroup Alternative Grid Code Modifications.

The Alternative vote is carried out to identify the level of Workgroup support there is for any potential alternative options that have been brought forward by either any member of the Workgroup OR an Industry Participant as part of the Workgroup Consultation.

Should the majority of the Workgroup OR the Chair believe that the potential alternative solution would better facilitate the Grid Code objectives than the Original proposal then the potential alternative will be fully developed by the Workgroup with legal text to form a Workgroup Alternative Grid Code

Public

modification (WAGCM) and submitted to the Panel and Authority alongside the Original solution for the Panel Recommendation vote and the Authority decision.

"Y" = Yes

"N" = No

"–" = Neutral (*Stage 2 only*)

"Abstain"

No Alternative Requests were raised.

Stage 2a – Assessment against objectives

To assess the Original and WAGCMs against the Grid Code objectives compared to the baseline (the current Grid Code).

You will also be asked to provide a statement to be added to the Workgroup Report alongside your vote to assist the reader in understanding the rationale for your vote.

AGCO = Applicable Grid Code Objective

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (i)	Better facilitates AGCO (ii)	Better facilitates AGCO (iii)	Better facilitates AGCO (iv)	Better facilitates AGCO (v)	Overall (Y/N)
	David Monkhouse – National Grid Ventures					
Original	–	–	–	–	–	N
Voting Statement: I'm not completely convinced by the materiality of the defect. Equipment covered by the RES is already standardised as far as possible by reference to International Standards (e.g. test levels are specified in IEC/BS EN). The remaining requirements not specified in International Standards cover site specific requirements which can only be specified by the User, e.g. requirements specific to Safety Rules,						

environmental conditions etc. Although the difficult task of combining the three individual TO's RES into a combined AES has been competently executed as far as is possible, I am not convinced that the AES in its current state is a better document than the RES's it is proposed to replace. I worry that "standardisation" has the potential to remove some important requirements.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (i)	Better facilitates AGCO (ii)	Better facilitates AGCO (iii)	Better facilitates AGCO (iv)	Better facilitates AGCO (v)	Overall (Y/N)
	Frank Kasibante – NESO					
Original	Y	Y	Y	-	-	Y

Voting Statement:

We support this proposal as it seeks to harmonise common standards across the whole of GB thereby promoting a level playing field and also defines a minimum standard for Users to connect to the Transmission System within the Busbar Protection Zone.

In this respect we support the proposal specifically in respect to Grid Code objectives i, ii, and iii.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (i)	Better facilitates AGCO (ii)	Better facilitates AGCO (iii)	Better facilitates AGCO (iv)	Better facilitates AGCO (v)	Overall (Y/N)
	Garth Graham – SSE Generation Ltd					
Original	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Voting Statement:

As the Proposer I set out the reasoning as to why GC0103 better facilitates the Applicable Grid Code Objectives when raising the proposal which, for the sake of brevity, I refrain from repeating here (as it's set out in the Workgroup Report). Those reasons have stood the test of time and remain valid today.

In addition to those, I would also note the additional evidence, as set out in the Workgroup Report, in terms of *"The Needs Case for GC0103"*, *"Winser Review"*, *"Industrial Strategy – Clean Energy Industry Plan"*, *"Nuclear Regulatory Taskforce Interim Report, 2025"* and *"Authority and Harmonisation"* which further supports that reasoning as to why GC0103 better facilitates the Applicable Grid Code Objectives.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (i)	Better facilitates AGCO (ii)	Better facilitates AGCO (iii)	Better facilitates AGCO (iv)	Better facilitates AGCO (v)	Overall (Y/N)
	Graeme Vincent – SP Energy Networks					
Original	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Voting Statement:

The introduction of a common set of 'Applicable Electrical Standards' should provide clarity and remove uncertainty and complexity in the application of the Grid Code requirements (in relation to Electrical Standards) to those connecting directly to the Transmission System.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (i)	Better facilitates AGCO (ii)	Better facilitates AGCO (iii)	Better facilitates AGCO (iv)	Better facilitates AGCO (v)	Overall (Y/N)
	Mark Stockton – SSEN Transmission					
Original	–	–	–	–	–	Y

Voting Statement:

No statement provided.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (i)	Better facilitates AGCO (ii)	Better facilitates AGCO (iii)	Better facilitates AGCO (iv)	Better facilitates AGCO (v)	Overall (Y/N)
	Mark Waldron – National Grid Electrical Transmission					
Original	-	-	-	-	-	Y

Voting Statement:

Both the baseline and the original deliver the Applicable Grid Code Objectives in a substantially similar manner with little substantive difference. However, since the TO's have produced the common AES in order to move forward the work of GC0103, implementing it will provide a more streamlined way of presenting the relevant TO requirements in a common framework.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (i)	Better facilitates AGCO (ii)	Better facilitates AGCO (iii)	Better facilitates AGCO (iv)	Better facilitates AGCO (v)	Overall (Y/N)
	Graeme Vincent (Permitted representative of Mike Kay) – Electricity North West					
Original	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Voting Statement:

The original reduces the overall complexity of connecting to the transmission system and reduces the volume of requirements which connectees need to be familiar with.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (i)	Better facilitates AGCO (ii)	Better facilitates AGCO (iii)	Better facilitates AGCO (iv)	Better facilitates AGCO (v)	Overall (Y/N)
	Richard Wilson – UK Power Networks					
Original	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Voting Statement:

I am satisfied that the original proposal meets the objectives of the modification and better fits the requirements of the system moving forward.

Of the 8 votes, how many voters said this option was better than the Baseline.

Option	Number of voters that voted this option as better than the Baseline
Original	7

Stage 2b – Workgroup Vote

Which option is the best? (Baseline, Proposer solution (Original Proposal))

Workgroup Member	Company	Industry Sector	BEST Option?	Which objective(s) does the change better facilitate? (if baseline not applicable)
David Monkhouse	National Grid Ventures	Interconnector	Baseline	n/a
Frank Kasibante	NESO	System Operator	Original	i, ii, iii
Garth Graham	SSE Generation Ltd	Generator	Original	i, ii, iii, iv, v
Graeme Vincent	SP Energy Networks	Transmission Owner	Original	i, ii, iii, v

Public

Mark Stockton	SSEN Transmission	Transmission Owner	Original	n/a
Mark Waldron	National Grid Electricity Transmission	Transmission Owner	Original	n/a
Graeme Vincent (Permitted representative of Mike Kay)	Electricity North West	DNO (re. Electricity NW)	Original	i, ii, iii, iv, v
Richard Wilson	UK Power Networks	DNO	Original	i, ii, iii, iv, v