Code Administrator Meeting 1 Summary

GC0139: Enhanced Planning-Data Exchange to Facilitate Whole System Planning.

Date: 06 May 2020

Contact Details

Chair:	Rob Pears, National Grid ESO	Rob.Pears@nationalgrideso.com	07866 165540
Proposer:	Ian Povey, Electricity North West	Ian.Povey@enwl.co.uk	

Key areas of discussion

- The Proposer summarised the background to the modification, explained the defect, and proposed enhancements to week 24, week 50 and week 42 data submissions. He highlighted that changes will be required to the Planning Code along with Schedules 5, 11, and possibly 14 of the Data Registration Code. As a starting point, he suggested they should explore the Open Networks Proposal for Implementation of Electronic Exchange of Network Planning Data along with other manual data exchange options and address any issues around data confidentiality.
- The workgroup reviewed the Terms of Reference, no amendments were made.
- The workgroup considered the changes that may be required to the legal text and raised the following points:
    - The changes to the Planning Code are only intended to apply to Network Operators but much of the text applies to the general “User”, who would not be expected to provide this level of data. Should they try and amend the Code (which could make the document very difficult to read/understand) or create a separate new section for Network Operators.
    - The Planning Code has not been updated to reflect changes in generator types from small, medium and large to Types A/B/C and D. If they revert to A/B/C/ and D, there may be implications for the CUSC. But, if they stay with S/M/L this could go out of date if GC0117 is implemented.
    - They need to be mindful of the CUSC Statement of Works modification CMP298, which is currently in progress, as this may impact the changes they make to the Grid Code.
    - They could make other housekeeping updates that are required to the Grid Code, at the same time as this modification.

- The workgroup reviewed the proposed changes to Schedules 5 and 11 and had the following discussions:
    - The Proposer explained that these changes would provide a lot more additional information, help model different scenarios on the network and make sure all reporting was aligned.
    - Schedule 5 and 11 data would also be aligned with the Statement of Work requirements. So, that whenever there was a requirement in the CUSC to supply an Appendix G, these schedules would also be supplied in the Grid Code. The workgroup highlighted changes may also be required to Schedule 14, if they were to go down the route of electronic data exchange.
    - The Proposer explained that he would also be looking to align Schedule 11 with a DCOUSA change proposal (if it goes ahead), so that all the information produced for the capacity market is also aligned.
    - The workgroup deliberated inconsistencies, in current data requirements within the Grid Code for medium power stations not connected to the sub-transmission level. The Proposers view was that they should not have to provide this information as part of week 24 data submissions.

- The workgroup discussed the enhanced requirements for week 42 data submissions and that a single boundary format would be extended over a switch level model, with details of asset ratings, so that we get a much better view of the impacts on the transmission system.
- The workgroup touched on what data confidentiality issues they would need to address if the data was made publicly available, in an interoperable format as per the recommendations made by the Energy Data Task Force.
- The workgroup debated whether they were happy with the level of data exchange being requested, or whether it was too much and if anything else may be required.
- The workgroup considered the efficiencies around using a manual or electronic form of data exchange such as the Common Information Model (CIM), and whether they needed to carry out a cost/benefit analysis. The workgroup went to explore the potential costs and timelines needed to implement either methods and referred to the findings in the Open Networks Proposal for Implementation of Electronic Exchange of Network Planning Data. The workgroup acknowledged that most Distribution Network Operators do not currently have CIM capability. If CIM were to be implemented it would have to be a phased transition, over several years. The workgroup highlighted that the cost of CIM, would have to include the initial set up cost and the cost of ongoing maintenance. The workgroup considered whether they needed to look at the benefits of each method through a broad or narrow field. They also considered whether they needed workgroup involvement from an IT specialist to help ascertain a more accurate reflection of the timelines and costs. The workgroup concluded that further consideration was required in these areas before they could justify adopting a method of data exchange. This is summarised in the Actions below.

Next steps

The workgroup agreed that the next meeting should take place on Tuesday 2nd June 2020.

Action Log

Number	Action	Action Owner	Due by
1	Legal Text - Confirm ESO views on whether they should try to amend/manipulate the existing text, or if they should create a new separate section for Network Operators.	Matt Baller	WG 2
2	Try and provide a link/information to the European working group that is already looking at TSO-DNO data exchange.	Paul Thomson	20 May 2020
3	Schedule 11: Medium Power Station Data – Confirm what WK 24/Appendix G data is required when **NOT** connecting to the sub-transmission network.	Paul Thomson & Mahalingam Thiruvarankan	WG 2
4	Check if an expected connection date is included in the list of small embedded power stations data	Ian Povey	20 May 2020
5	Review schedules off line and confirm: a) If you are happy with the amendments being proposed/if not what further amendments are required. Highlight any points that were not discussed in Workgroup 1 that need to be discussed at the next session.	All WG Members	20 May 2020
6	Model scenarios to prove/disprove that it is not feasible to do this level of data exchange via spreadsheets.	Paul Thomson	WG 2
7	Check if it is feasible to assimilate 5 National Grid models into their software via excel spreadsheet data exchange.	DNO Reps	WG 2
8	Read Open Network report – **Proposal for Implementation of Electronic Exchange of Network Planning Data**. Feedback your views on whether you feel the costs/timescales within the report are reasonable.	All WG Members	20 May 2020
9	Feedback views on whether: a) The actual enhanced data exchange is required/necessary, b) You are happy with what is being proposed/or are any amendments needed, if so what are they.	All WG Members	WG 2
10	Propose a table for WK42	National Grid ESO	WG 2
11	Think about how we justify moving to CIM or another form of electronic data exchange.	All WG Members	WG 2
12	Review all Workgroup 1 documents and circulate any feedback to the Workgroup.	All WG Members	20 May 2020
13	Arrange the second Workgroup for 2/6/20 1-4pm	Code Administrator	13 May 2020

Participants

Attendees	Company	Position

Ian Povey	ENWL	Proposer and Workgroup Member
Rob Pears	Code Administrator National Grid ESO	Chair
Shazia Akhtar	Code Administrator National Grid ESO	Technical Secretary
Matt Baller	NGESO	Technical Rep & Workgroup Member
Dimitris Konstantinidis	SHEPD Southern Electric	Workgroup Member
Graeme Dean	SHE Transmission	Workgroup Member
Graeme Vincent	SP Distribution	Workgroup Member
Liam McSweeney	Western Power Distribution	Workgroup Member
Mahalingam Thiruvarankan	NGET	Workgroup Member
Paul Thomson	NGESO	Workgroup Member
Sam Turner	Northern Power Grid	Workgroup Member
Will Monnaie	SEPD Southern Electric	Apologies
Zivanayi Musanhi	South Eastern Power Networks plc	Workgroup Member

For further information, please contact the Code Administrator.