

## Meeting Note

<b>Meeting name</b>	GC0074: GCRP Membership
<b>Meeting number</b>	2
<b>Date of meeting</b>	9 May 2014
<b>Time</b>	10:00 – 14:00
<b>Location</b>	National Grid House, Warwick.

## Attendees

Name	Initials	Company
Alex Thomason	AT	Code Administrator (Chair)
Emma Radley	ER	Code Administrator (Technical Secretary)
Rob Wilson	RW	National Grid
Jackeline Crespo-Sandoval	JCS	National Grid
Guy Philips	GP	E.ON
Campbell McDonald	CM	SSE Generation
Robert Longden	RL	Cornwall Consulting
Alan Barlow	AB	Magnow
Abid Sheikh (via teleconference)	AS	Ofgem
John Norbury	JN	RWE
David Spillett (via teleconference)	DS	ENA

In addition to this Meeting note, please refer to the slides for the meeting which have been published to the Grid Code Workgroup webpage:

<http://www2.nationalgrid.com/UK/Industry-information/Electricity-codes/Grid-code/Modifications/GC0074/>

## 1 Introductions and summary of Workshop 1

1. Introductions were made around the group. AT summarised the last meeting and noted that there were still some elements that need to be discussed, in particular the election process.
2. AT reminded the group of the conclusions from the first Workshop. RL asked about the suggestion that there can be two seats for an Interconnector representative and a non-embedded representative, with regard to how they would know which meetings may be applicable and whether they are available to attend if they are not a permanent member. AT responded that the Code Administrator would be responsible for keeping them updated and letting them know in advance that they may wish to turn up to a future meeting. CMD felt that interconnector representative will become more important in the future so may need a permanent seat. AT noted that the interconnector representative could be made a permanent seat in the future if deemed necessary. JN felt that interconnector owners are passive operators and possibly fit into the category of OFTO's as they are not specifically market operated and are not particularly relevant to the majority of Panel work currently. It was also noted that parties in this category of 'occasional attendance' should not be penalised for non-attendance in accordance with the Constitutional rules that state that a Panel Member shall not fail to attend more than 3 consecutive meetings.

**Action: Provide clarity in the consultation on what is meant by 'occasional attendance' and ask a question in the consultation for Interconnector's views on being an occasional member as opposed to a permanent member.**

## 2 Position on Alternate Members

3. AT noted that the concept of Alternates would fall away if there were 12 generator representatives and that voting rights would pass on to another generator representative. The group were satisfied with this approach.

## 3 Voting Rights

4. AT suggested that each representative on the GCRP have 1 vote each with the exception of the Chair, Code Administrator, NG Advisor, Ofgem Representative and BSC Panel representative. JN suggested that it is worthwhile identifying the activities involved in a GCRP vote in the consultation document and that in reality there is very limited scope for voting. GP felt that the question is 'what are the consequences' to a vote. For example, if the Authority goes against the vote of the Panel in other codes, there is a right to appeal. AT advised that this does not apply to the Grid Code as it doesn't have the concept of a 'recommendation' vote and therefore is not bound by the Statutory Instrument. AT advised that it can be reflected in the consultation that the Grid Code is not covered by appeal rights but there is a mechanism to vote if it needs to be used. CMD suggested that 12 votes for generators is excessive and 6 is adequate but it was agreed that the criteria to decide who could then vote may be difficult to manage so it was agreed to have 1 vote each for simplicity.
5. CMD asked about the position on TO/SO NGET representation. RW advised that NGET will continue doing what is done currently and attend as SO but engage with the appropriate TO representatives and have the relevant experts come to meetings where appropriate. The group agreed that they are comfortable with current position.
6. JCS suggested that as it had been agreed that Generator Representation would total 12 Members, then the NGET representation should remain as 4 (not NGET as previously suggested) in order to provide an adequate level of knowledge and experience. The group were satisfied with this approach but were unsure as whether this should constitute 4 votes (1 per Member) or perhaps 2 between the 4.

**Action – Ask question in consultation as to whether the 4 NGET representatives should have 1 vote each, or 2 between them.**

## 5 Election Process

7. AT moved on to looking at a strawman for how an election process would work. JN asked to what extent the Grid Code applies to OFTO's. RW responded that it puts requirements on Grid connections. It was felt that an election would be required as currently there are 3 OFTO's but that this would increase in future.
8. AT suggested using the CUSC Schedule 1 list for nominations. CMD didn't agree with that approach for the reason that if the Grid Code changes for a party that has got an application, there could be an issue – essentially there may be a point where the Grid Code becomes relevant for a party but before they've signed their agreement. RW agreed with this to an extent. CMD asked how it fits in with the new European size grading (a,b,c and d). RW advised that 'd' will cover the vast bulk of parties we will be able to engage with. There was a concern that CUSC Schedule 1 won't cover that. JN suggested doing it by generator licence holder or exemption order, noting that this would need additional criteria. GP noted that many parties have the same parent company, so potentially a number of parties with a vote each will have the same parent company. It was noted that this is how it currently works in the CUSC and BSC. GP felt that CUSC Schedule 1 has some logic. CMD had a concern regarding excluding new developers. GP commented that he did not believe it does if they have applied for a connection. GP noted that there is an obligation in CUSC to comply with the Grid Code. AT noted that it is intended to be a generic election process.
9. The group looked at other alternatives for a nominations list and considered using the TEC Register. It was agreed that the Embedded MW Register would be required as well and to filter out the duplicates. A cut-off date would be specified in order to keep it simple and not have any cross-over. The group agreed with this approach – essentially one agreement, one vote.

**Action – CA to use TEC Register and Embedded MW Register in election process.**

10. AT explained the options for a set of criteria for a proposed election process. The group disagreed with the idea of not being allowed to nominate yourself. JN felt that it should be from the corporate entity. AT suggested that candidates put forward a biography detailing their expertise, experience, affiliations with other industry forums etc.
11. JCS raised a concern about if there were less than 12 candidates put forward and they get automatically elected (as with other election processes), it would erase the benefit of the biography as they get elected anyway. JCS felt that there should be an election process regardless of numbers so there is a filter. AB noted that the ultimate question is around a candidates' vested interest, and that it needs to be relevant to Grid Code. JN commented that although members they are meant to be impartial, the company is important in relation to their interest on the Panel and it would be useful to know what support they have from their company in relation to whether they can attend regularly, participate in WG's etc. AS suggested that rather than a biography it is more like a 'candidate statement'.

**Action: CA to draft a template for candidate statement and include in consultation.**

12. The group moved on to looking at how the votes would be cast. AT put forward two options: (i) 'First Past The Post' (FPTP) voting method and (ii) Preference voting method. AT pointed out that the CUSC and BSC use the preference voting method but added that it is onerous to administer and a complicated process. The FPTP is a clearer and simpler method that gives a clear view of who voters want. The group discussed how to deal with the situation of a tie between candidates. GP suggested using MW to give weight to a candidate, and it was also suggested that the Chair could have the discretion to choose the candidate. The group agreed that however it is decided, it would be fair to give the unsuccessful candidate the option to join if a Panel Member leaves mid-term. If less than 12 candidates were nominated, it was suggested that there would therefore be less Panel Members, but that the Chair could have the discretion to invite a class of User if he felt their representation was appropriate.
13. It was clarified that the election process would apply to the 12 generator seats available and the 1 OFTO seat, and all other members would be selected in accordance with the Grid Code constitutional rules (by notification to the Chair).

## **7 Next Steps**

14. AT summarised the discussions and it was agreed that a draft consultation would be circulated to the group for comment and an update would be provided to the GCRP at its meeting on 21 May 2014. The consultation would then be circulated via email to the GCRP before being published to industry.