

Minutes

Meeting name	GC0048: Joint GCRP/DCRP Workgroup on National Application of RfG
Meeting number	10
Date of meeting	19 May 2015
Time	10.00 – 16:00
Location	National Grid House, Warwick

Attendees

Name	Initials	Company
Rob Wilson	RW	National Grid (Chair)
Sara-Lee Kenney	SLK	National Grid (Technical Secretary)
Alan Creighton	AC	Northern Powergrid
Alastair Frew	AF	Scottish Power
Amir Dahresobh	AD	Nordex
Andy Vaudin	AV	EDF Energy
Antony Johnson	AJ	National Grid
Bob Weaver	BW	Powercon UK & BEA
Campbell McDonald	CMd	SSE
Celine Reddin	CR	National Grid
Chris Whitworth	CW	AMPS
Dave Hamblen	DH	Centrax
David Spillett	DS	ENA
Joe Duddy	JD	RES
John Norbury	JN	RWE
Judith Ross	JRo	Ofgem
Julian Rudd	JR	DECC
Julian Wayne	JW	Ofgem
Lesley Rudd	LR	Sustainable Energy Association
Mike Kay	MKa	Electricity North West
Peter Bolitho	PB	Waters Wye Associates
Richard Woodward	RJW	National Grid
Rupika Madhura	RM	Ofgem
Sarah Carter	SC	Ricardo-AEA
Steven Mockford	SM	UK Power Networks
Zoltan Zavody	ZZ	Renewable UK

1 Introductions

RW

1. The Chair welcomed attendees and sought feedback on the theatre style layout which had been introduced to ensure the volume of registered attendees could be accommodated.
2. JW announced he will be leaving Ofgem at the end of July to work for RES on energy storage in GB and Ireland. JW advised Ofgem has considered if there are any conflicts of interest with him continuing with the RfG and DCC work prior to his departure. He advised Ofgem have put measures in place and are happy for his work to continue. However JW encouraged the workgroup to advise if they had any concerns whatsoever with his continued work on the European network codes to raise these directly with Judith Ross (Head of Network Regulatory Policy; judith.ross@ofgem.gov.uk) or Gareth Evans (Gareth.evans@ofgem.gov.uk) copying in Rupika Madhura (Rupika.madhura@ofgem.gov.uk). To ensure Ofgem continuity Gareth is now going to be attending Comitology meetings with Rupika.

2 Stakeholder Representation

RW

3. The Chair noted the Stakeholder Representation as a standing agenda item for this workgroup, in particular to ensure effective representation from manufacturers and smaller parties. The

workgroup is open to all but for reasons of room capacity does need to be limited to one representative from each organisation.

4. Lesley Rudd (LR), Policy and Public Affairs Manager for the Sustainable Energy Association joined the workgroup for the first time attending on behalf of manufacturers.
5. The workgroup discussed the April Joint European Stakeholder Group (JESG) where the approach for implementation and stakeholder engagement was considered for the HVDC and DCC network codes. This had been discussed at the last GC0048 meeting held in March and was taken as an action (Action 71) for the RfG Chair to contact the JESG Chair. For information purposes, once an approach has been agreed with stakeholders, the GC0048 workgroup will be updated accordingly.
6. JW provided an update on his work to engage stakeholders further (Action 59). Gemserv, who administer the FiT Register, have advised that they will post an item, written by RJW, in their newsletter and also on their website to publicise the GC0048 workgroup and invite stakeholder attendance. LR also offered to inform members of the Sustainable Energy Association of the GC0048 Workgroup and of relevant discussions.

3 Review of actions & approval of minutes

SLK

7. SLK ran through the Action Log and progress made to date.
8. The following actions were closed at this meeting: Action 19 'ENC definitions', Action 29 'Costs to Generators' and Action 32 Preliminary Banding Data Sources (moved to Action 69 on banding), Action 59 'FiT Register for Stakeholder Representatives', Action 62 'FRT parameters table 3.1 and 7.1', Action 64 'RfG/Dcode/Grid Code Mapping links', Action 68 'Dcode/RfG Mapping', Action 70 'Project plan legal requirements', Action 71 'RW to contact JESG on Connection Codes engagement' and Action 72 'Comments on workgroup report'.
9. The Action Log was approved by the workgroup and will be updated and circulated with the minutes of the meeting.
10. SLK highlighted that the previous meeting minutes had been updated with the changes received from John Norbury and Mike Kay.
11. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved by the workgroup and will be published in the 'workgroup' section of the Grid Code website¹.

4 Progress Update

RM/JR

12. JR provided an update from the Cross Border Committee Meeting held on 29 April 2015. The main focus of this meeting was RfG however all three connection network codes were discussed. Member States were asked to provide comments back to the Commission by on the latest versions of these by Friday 15 May.
13. The Commission has indicated that further work is required for DCC and therefore HVDC will enter Comitology ahead of DCC.
14. The next Cross Border Committee Meeting is expected to take place on 25/26 June where all 3 connection network codes will again be discussed.
15. It is expected at this meeting that there will be a formal vote on RfG, with voting on HVDC in July followed by DCC in September.
16. CW queried if discussions to date included the Emergency and Restoration (ER) network code since this references RfG bandings? RM advised that this has been submitted by ENTSO-E to ACER and the next step is for ACER to recommend its onwards submission to the Commission; however, the Commission are aware of the links between the RfG and ER codes.

¹ <http://www2.nationalgrid.com/UK/Industry-information/Electricity-codes/Grid-code/Modifications/GC0048/#>

17. AV asked when Member States are likely to have sight of an updated version of RfG? JR advised this would be expected two weeks prior to the next Cross Border Committee Meeting however it is yet to be confirmed at what point this can then be shared with a wider audience. RM added that there shouldn't be a huge amount of changes to RfG, as the main focus at the moment appears to be translation of this network code.

5 Guidance on Implementation

MK & RW

18. MK and RW discussed the draft 'Implementation Guidance' covering note and document they had produced and circulated ahead of the May GC0048 workgroup meeting. This follows on from the presentation provided by MK and SC at the March GC0048 workgroup meeting and the April JESG in relation to the RfG to Distribution Code (DCode) mapping.
19. MK advised the main focus to date had been on the RfG network code and subsequent changes to the GB framework; however the intention of the Implementation Guidance paper is to also look at other network codes in relation to implementation and GB structures and invited the workgroup's thoughts and comments on this.
20. MK noted that in terms of GB changes as a result of the European network codes, a large amount of the content is already detailed within European standards and therefore there is the potential to slim down some of the work in terms of the volume of changes where current documentation exists. However, MK advised it is important to agree on the structure of the changes and documents ahead of focusing on the detailed content. RW added the anticipated RfG Mapping exercise in July should help develop the detail further. RM advised the focus should now be on the content based on the volume of work and engagement carried out to date on the overall structure and also to ensure that any issues or concerns with the content or requirements are flagged up in advance.
21. CW asked for clarification on the overall requirements for implementation of the European network codes? RM and JR recapped that existing GB law and codes are superseded by European law, and therefore as the European network codes are European law GB needs to align the existing GB framework to them to improve usability and to allow easier demonstration of compliance. RM added that it is also necessary to set national parameters as required in the code.
22. CMd queried for example where a type D 90MW generator connecting in England & Wales could currently be licence exempt and bound only by G59, what would 'turn on' Grid Code requirements? MK advised that while some of these cross overs are yet to be fully thought through for this instance as is the case now the Connection Agreement would turn on the DCode requirements and then this would refer on to the Grid Code. CMd also advised that there currently isn't a standard DNO connection agreement in GB (i.e. all are different) and queried if this would be easier to standardise? RM and MK advised this is what we would expect to be covered through the RfG mapping workshop exercise.
23. RM reiterated that the work completed by MK, SC and RW on structures had been of great benefit however we now also need to focus on the detail and on what we need to do to ensure compliance with the EU Codes. By parking the structure, as long as we are happy that this is sufficiently flexible to take into account what comes out of the other network codes, and focussing on the detail, we should then hopefully be in a position where once we have more visible progress across the board we can reflect this.
24. RW added that in relation to the suggested July code mapping of the final RfG version, a task register would be created for each clause in the RfG network code, the vehicle they lie within and who the actions detailed within that clause sit. RW advised the workgroup that the template produced to date for this mapping exercise will be circulated for comment as we are only going to be able to repeat the mapping once more and it is very important that we get it right. RW proposed the mapping exercise would take place once RfG has been voted on by Member States. At the moment the anticipated timescales are for RfG to be voted on at the end of June and therefore provisionally the 20th and 21st of July are proposed for the RfG mapping exercise. The 20 July would replace the July GC0048 workgroup meeting and SLK has sent a placeholder to the workgroup for the 21 July to complete the 2nd day of the RfG mapping exercise.
25. PB added in terms of structure it feels this has been developed and is in hand and therefore welcomed the next steps in regards to mapping and developing the details and content further. AV highlighted that this is clearer for the DCode however further clarity is required for the Grid Code.

6 Definition of Synchronous Power Generating Modules

AJ

26. AJ provided a presentation which aimed to clarify the definitions associated with 'Synchronous Power Generating Modules', 'Connection Point' and 'Maximum Capacity' detailed within the RfG network code. AJ outlined the current GB approach and the associated RfG interpretation along with worked examples of how this would be applied.
27. AJ summarised that the overall ENTSO-E definitions are adequate but do require some interpretation and in general most industrial sites within GB are historic and therefore will not be caught by the new requirements. RfG will capture new units within a complex and for a plant with a connection point below 132kV the requirements applicable to the new unit would be based on Generation Capacity only. For a site connected at 132kV or above any new unit would need to satisfy the RfG Type D requirements unless a derogation was sought. AJ added that it is suggested that as part of a Connection Offer (or modification thereto) the classification and banding is clearly stated and the reasons why.
28. From this presentation the workgroup agreed the issues and questions had been fully explored and therefore it was not proposed to discuss any further at this point in time.

7 RfG Banding: GC0048 Workgroup Report Progress

RJW

29. RJW discussed the draft workgroup report which will outline the discussions and work carried out by the GC0048 workgroup in determining the RfG banding thresholds for GB.
30. RJW stressed the report needs to clearly state a position which is inclusive of all GC0048 workgroup members' feedback and determines an agreed banding threshold position regardless of whether that is to leave the banding thresholds as currently detailed within the RfG network code or to provide an alternative agreed and lower position. Either way this decision has to be supported by a Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) produced to substantiate it as detailed within the RfG network code.
31. JN suggested that the path to market of services required by RfG, which is stated in the draft report as being out of scope, would be an important addition to the scope and should be included. RW suggested that NPV (Net Present Value) analysis could also be used to aid cost analysis of an incurred cost and deferred or future benefit.
32. AF queried what volume of controllable plant NGET require to maintain system control? AJ advised this is based on the volume of Generation which can be controlled and instructed by NGET as a percentage of System Demand. RJW asked for AF to provide these comments for inclusion within the report.
33. In terms of progressing this work, CMd advised the workgroup should spend more than 1 hour during meetings discussing the types of issues raised in paragraph 32 above. He noted that email trails on the report and thresholds required a more focussed session?
34. ZZ suggested a technical needs case be provided from NGET and examples/ scenarios of how much response NGET needs at that time and how much is actually available. AD advised this has already been discussed at recent GC0048 workgroup meetings through presentations from NGET on the System Operability Framework (SOF) and Frequency Response Services. JW supported ZZ's suggestion that it was a good start but ideally NGET should provide a figure they need to manage the system. It was further suggested that the work being undertaken should be related back more directly to the Future Energy Scenarios (FES).
35. JN also questioned if NGET's administrative, despatch, monitoring and IS systems would have the capability to support such changes and these costs would need to be included within the CBA? JN added that a mandatory obligation on capability would necessitate a mandatory service delivery and as the thresholds are reduced there will be more of a requirement on NGET to amend or expand systems. JD stated that we need to determine what is actually required – and if this could be provided by 50MW+ generators then there would be no need for change; JW added that conversely this could be a driver to take the thresholds lower.
36. AD added that system inertia is also an issue noting that the system characteristics today will be very different to those predicted in the near future (e.g. circa 2020 plus).

- 37. CMd also suggested the requirement to determine the data requirements for new technology types. RJW advised this will be included within the report as well as links to the Future Energy Scenarios (FES).
- 38. RJW will capture the comments along with feedback received during the discussions and align with the next steps required for the report drafting (as detailed on slide 3 of RJWs '[workgroup report presentation](#)'). CMd suggested this should be in the paper. RJW advised this is detailed in slide 3.

8 Project Plan Update

CR

- 39. CR talked through the latest updates for the RfG project plan. CR advised the project plan will be updated with the new entry into force date which will also need to capture the next level of detail for other activities that are required/ associated with the modifications together with the critical path. The details following the RfG mapping exercise will also link into the project plan where applicable.
- 40. CR also talked through the 'plan on a page' which covered the Grid Code and Distribution Code modifications required as a result of RfG and will be the main area of focus for future GC0048 meetings.
- 41. RM added that the DECC/Ofgem ENC Steering Group has advised the GC0048 workgroup should be looking to use one project plan so the industry is clear on what is required when. RM added the RfG mapping exercise in July should assist this process and will link into the project plan. RM advised the RfG project plan will need to be finalised by the end of August.
- 42. JD asked if there is information or a document which outlines in more detail the scope of each modification. CR confirmed there is (this has been shared with the workgroup previously), and will re-circulate the Project Plan documentation to the workgroup.

9 Risk Register

RJW

- 43. RJW ran through the red risks and any associated updates or changes. RJW highlighted that Risk 6 had changed from Red to Amber. This is based on the changes to the timescales detailed in the regulatory aspects article in DCC which is likely to apply across all the connection codes. This change is based on the latest draft of DCC which moves the timescale from 3 years to 2 years for regulatory decisions however the overall implementation window for demonstrating compliance is 3 years. RM added she is clarifying this further and will update the workgroup accordingly in due course.

10 DECC/Ofgem Steering Group Reporting

RM/All

- 44. The workgroup discussed escalation of items through the DECC/Ofgem Steering Group and agreed that there were no items for escalation this month however noted the action previously mentioned by RM to progress and finalise the RfG project plan by August 2015.
- 45. RM mentioned items on the horizon for the DECC/Ofgem Steering Group include future stakeholder engagement and implementation groups. She noted it was important to ensure these groups are aligned and efficiently set-up and running. JR added that the main focus of current discussions at the DECC/Ofgem Steering Group is the Capacity Allocation and Congestion Management (CACM) guideline.
- 46. MK queried if minutes are published or made available from the DECC/Ofgem Steering Group meetings? RM and SLK mentioned an update is usually given at the Joint European Stakeholder Group (JESG) meetings where applicable.

11 Agree Actions

SLK

- 47. For information: The HVDC and DCC approach for implementation and stakeholder engagement is due to be finalised following the May JESG stakeholder feedback meeting. Once a position has been determined this will be reported by the GC0048 workgroup for information.

48. Workgroup members are invited to provide any comments to MK and RW in relation to the implementation guidance paper for inclusion ahead of more detail being added and discussed at the 16 June workgroup meeting.
49. Provided that RfG is accepted and voted on by Member States in June an RfG code mapping workshop will be held as a 'JESG subgroup' on Monday 20 and Tuesday 21 July at National Grid House, Warwick. SLK has sent a meeting invite as a placeholder for this workshop; RW will also circulate an RfG mapping template to the workgroup for comment ahead of finalising at the next workgroup meeting on 16 June.
50. RfG Banding work: RJW will look into the Future Energy Scenarios (FES) and System Operability Framework (SOF) and will seek to align the work on banding thresholds with these.
51. CR to circulate the project plan and scope for modifications to the workgroup. She will also provide the project plan in Word/Microsoft Project format as appropriate and available.

12 AOB / Next Meeting

SLK

AOB:

Your Feedback: Today's Meeting

52. [Attendee feedback welcomed via an online survey:](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/SKGWGXZ)
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/SKGWGXZ>
53. RM updated the workgroup to advise that she will leave her current role working on the Electricity European Network Code Programme in September to take up another position within Ofgem focussing on the Gas side of the industry. Judith Ross (JRo) will cover RM's roles and will potentially recruit an additional position. RM thanked the workgroup for their work and support and noted her last GC0048 meeting will be 16 June. RM will continue her work within the Comitology process until she moves to her new role in September.

Next Meeting:

The next RfG Workgroup meeting will take place on **Monday 20 July** at **National Grid House, Warwick**. **In advance of then on Tuesday 16 June, Ofgem will host an RfG Stakeholder workshop at Ofgem Offices, 9 Millbank, London SW1P 3GE**. Please also find attached below all future dates arranged for this workgroup for 2015:

(Calendar invites have been sent out for these dates, please contact Sara-Lee if you have not received them)

- Monday 20 July & Tuesday 21 July (potential RfG Mapping)
- Tuesday 18 August
- Friday 25 September
- Wednesday 28 October
- Thursday 19 November
- Thursday 17 December