

## GC0074 GCRP Membership

Industry parties are invited to respond to this consultation expressing their views and supplying the rationale for those views, particularly in respect of any specific questions detailed below.

Please send your responses by **1 August 2014** to [Grid.Code@nationalgrid.com](mailto:Grid.Code@nationalgrid.com). Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration.

These responses will be included in the Report to the Authority which is drafted by National Grid and submitted to the Authority for a decision.

<b>Respondent:</b>	<i>Pavel Miller</i> <i>Senior Policy Manager - Generation</i> <a href="mailto:Pavel.Miller@energy-uk.org.uk">Pavel.Miller@energy-uk.org.uk</a> 0207 747 1833
<b>Company Name:</b>	<i>Energy UK</i>
<b>1. What are your views on Interconnector users being given a seat on the GCRP as an occasional attendee when it is deemed appropriate by the GCRP and/or the Code Administrator based on the subject matter, rather than as a permanent member where an Interconnector Representative would be expected to attend all meetings.</b>	<p>We agree that Interconnector representatives should be given a seat on the GCRP when deemed appropriate by the GCRP and/or the Code Administrator.</p> <p>Interconnector representatives should be allowed to make a request to attend GCRP meetings where they think there are issues of relevance or where they are able to provide expertise that will help the panel.</p>
<b>2. Do you agree with the group that (i) the Scottish TOs should continue to have a seat on the Panel (ii) that the DNOs should continue to be represented by three seats on the Panel (2 for England &amp; Wales and 1 for Scotland) and (iii) that manufacturers should not be represented on the Panel.</b>	<p>We agree that Scottish TOs should continue to have a seat on the Panel and that DNOs continue to have 3.</p> <p>We agree with the Working Group conclusions that it would not be appropriate for manufacturers to be represented on the Panel as they may be able to influence costs and could also cover a number of technologies.</p>
<b>3. Do you believe that each NGET Representative should hold 1 vote each, as for other representatives, or that this should be reduced to, for example, 2 votes between the proposed 4 NGET Representatives.</b>	<p>Each NGET Representative should hold 1 vote provided that the voting member composition of the GCRP is kept as proposed i.e. 12 generator, 4 NGET, 7 other networks, 1 supplier and 1 non-embedded.</p> <p>Energy UK supports proposals to bring open governance to the Grid Code. A proposal was recently raised at the 16 July GCRP meeting and</p>

	we await the outcome of the Working Group process. Bringing the Grid Code modification process in line with the CUSC would give real meaning to the voting process at GCRP.
<b>4. How do you think a tied vote should be dealt with in an election?</b>	In the event of a tie, the fairest way to resolve the situation would be to draw lots.
<b>Do you believe that GC0074 better facilitates the appropriate Grid Code objectives?</b>	GC0074 would better facilitate Grid Code objectives but the benefits could be maximised in conjunction with the introduction of open governance to the Grid Code, which is subject to further discussion at the Working Group.
<b>Please provide any other comments you feel are relevant to the proposed change.</b>	