

Digitalised Whole System Technical Code (WSTC) Meeting Minutes

Consultation 1 Stakeholder Engagement Session 1

Date: 05/10/2021 **Location:** MS Teams
Start: 11:00 **End:** 12:00

Participants

Attendee	Attend/Regrets	Attendee	Attend/Regrets
Sean Gauton (SG) - Uniper	Attend	Pramod Tiwari (PT) - TCS (Tata Consultancy Services)	Attend
Charles Mnjanjagha (CM) - SSE	Attend	Gary Swandells (GS) - Smart Meter Consultancy that works closely with WPD	Attend
Ed Rees (ER) - Citizens Advice	Attend	Paul Bedford (PB) - Drax	Attend
Christian Hjelm (CH) - WPD	Attend	Stewart Whyte (SW) - NGET	Attend
Vicky Allen (VA) - NGESO	Attend	Frank Kasibante (FK) - NGESO	Attend
Laetitia Wamala (LW) - NGESO	Attend		

Minutes Recipients

Industry - Published on the WSTC website

Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Presentation of Slides & Discussion
3. How to provide feedback & Thanks

Discussion

The discussions held during the presentation are summarised below:

1. Introduction (Section 2)

SG: Have you had discussions with the Distribution Code administrator?

LW: Yes, we have had discussions with the ENA; the Distribution Code Administrator who have been working with us and supporting the WSTC project team.

ER: This is set out as one consultation but looking at two workstreams; Digitalisation and Consolidation.

The consolidation approach is potentially quite low regret, given the ECR is ongoing and this is a key direction of travel set out by Ofgem. On the other hand, Digitalisation is higher regret given the forthcoming reforms. It feels like there is a high risk of pushing a digitalisation approach.

Consider addressing digitalisation and consolidation separately, because of their different risk profiles.

LW: This is discussed later under Item 6; the link between this project and the ECR on consolidation.

Section 3.4 (Work that can progress independently of the ECR outcome), discusses the different options of how we will work on the project either as different workstreams or as a single coordinated project.

2. Potential Solutions (Section 3.1 Whole System Consolidation or Alignment)

PB: Can you explain how the 3rd option works? Where you have an overarching code and retain the existing codes.

LW: This option was proposed by stakeholders, who have indicated that they would rather retain the existing codes and anything that looks at whole system alignment across both Transmissions and Distribution should be added into an overarching WSTC.

3. Potential Solutions (Section 3.2 Digitalisation)

SW: Is there any reason that you've not included the System Operator, Transmission Owner Code (STC) given that it is just a re-creation of the Grid Code? The reason the STC was created was because ESO were previously part of NGET and therefore covered under the same license. A whole code was created following legal separation. With legal separation in place, the STC is completely superfluous. It would make a lot of sense to just completely subsume it. I would have thought that NGESO would see value in including the STC within scope of this consolidation given that the Grid Code is all about users and Network Operators.

LW: Prior to finalising the NGESO RIIO-2 Business Plan, there was a lot of stakeholder engagement asking about which codes should be consolidated that concluded with the consolidation of the Distribution Code and the Grid Code. This is a question that has been raised more than once. It is something that we can take forward if there is consensus from industry. Please let us know the value of including the STC in scope within your consultation response.

LW: On digitalisation, ER raised a query about the different platforms. In the consultation we are acknowledging that once ECR has happened, there are some code administrators that might not have the codes that are currently within their portfolios. Therefore, when we are developing the scope, we are going to ensure that the digitalisation platform can be easily transferred to a different entity. Hopefully this addresses ER's concerns over the different platforms.

ER: Yes, I think it does thank you. It's helpful.

ER: I think we could end up with duplicated processes if we don't think about how WSTC interacts with other codes. I think it's important you think about how this will actually operate in practice, in relation to those other codes that are going to be impacted by or work closely with this project.

LW: It has been included. Where we create a WSTC, and the GC & DC are obsolete, there will be a requirement to:

- Cross reference the additional codes that are related to the existing technical codes
- Update contracts between the DNOs and their customers and
- Update contracts between NGESO and their customers

ER: It is also a way of working issue. Where there's lots of cross code projects, there will be a need to ensure close alignment. It's just about how that process will work in practice and considering how closely they are aligned.

LW: This should also cover the ways of working across the relevant codes.

4. Potential Solutions (Section 3.4 Work that can progress independently of the ECR outcome)

PB: My concern would be about making digitalisation cost effective. Having some form of digitalisation does potentially make sense. Have any thoughts been given to what the digitalisation might look like?

LW: What the digitalisation might look like will depend on the responses we get from the consultation.

What I'm hearing from you is the fact that you would want it to be simplified so you would easily be able to get a summary of a particular connection.

PB: I'd agree with that. And certainly, anything else that makes it more plain English. But would still have the ability to readily get hold of PDF copies as well.

LW: That would be useful for you to include in your response.

PB: I will.

SW: What was the reason for including Security and Quality of Supply Standard (SQSS) and P2/7? And how do you envisage the ongoing governance? Obviously, they are design standards and operational standards and have quite a different emphasis to the Grid Code which is about user requirements.

LW: Inclusion of the SQSS and P2/7 have been proposed by some of our stakeholders.

With regard to the SQSS and the Grid Code, currently there is a separate SQSS panel and a separate Grid Code Review Panel and thus when changes are being made, they have two different governance routes.

Some stakeholders within industry have felt that it is not necessary to have the governance for these separate.

Not being so close to the DC, we are relying on responses from industry to inform whether P2/7 is included.

The SQSS feels like a good 'no regrets' option. Do you feel that adding P2/7 into the DC would not give value?

SW: From my perspective, working closely with the Grid Code, I am concerned about adding the SQSS to the Grid Code as it has a different focus. The SQSS' focus is the design of the transmission system which does not directly affect all users.

LW: It would be interesting to get your feedback, because what I'm hearing is you don't see the value in including the SQSS in the GC. The reason it was included here is because some stakeholders think it is going to be valuable. Please do give us your feedback and we'll take that into consideration. -This consultation is here to try to figure out what the scope of the project should be.

SW: That was my reason for asking. What was the value you saw?

LW: It was simplifying in terms of governance. There some stakeholders who are part of both the SQSS panel and GCRP. It felt like an easy way to simplify things.

SW: I don't think they are the same people.

5. Potential Solutions (Section 3.5 Delivery of Solutions)

ER: You want a clear picture on what is to happen before you can decide on an implementation approach. It's very hard to judge that delivery approach without having a planned solution. It's very hard to answer this question: either a or b. And I don't think they are mutually exclusive either. I think you could probably have a bit of both.

LW: The idea is that when we get all the responses back, the different panels would be writing to Ofgem with the recommendation from industry regarding the consolidation of these codes. Then we would wait for Ofgem to respond to that.

Ofgem has also committed to give a resource to be on the steering group. We have also requested to have a representative from BEIS on the steering group. This approach will enable us to remain aligned with the BEIS/Ofgem ECR.

ER: That sounds good, thank you.

6. Key Benefits (Section 4)

No questions

7. Project Governance (Section 5.1 Decision Making)

PB: One of the concerns that we have raised as a supplier is about the level of industry representation on the advisory groups. Are there any limitations on which advisory groups will be consulted?

What are your thoughts on the makeup of the advisory groups?

FK / LW: This is subject to the consultation. Your ideas are welcome in your response and to what you would like these advisory groups and workgroups to look like as well as the composition of the steering group.

If there is any forum that you think should be included or have this presented, then please let the WSTC team know. We want a broad range of stakeholders to be involved because this consultation needs to be run by industry for industry.

8. Project Governance (Section 5.2 Proposed Terms of Reference – Steering Group)

LW: This is a good one to take forward that a supplier's advisory group is required, and suppliers need to be added onto the membership of the steering group.

9. Project Governance (Section 5.3 Stakeholder Engagement)

PB: Approach so far has been easy with the links to multiple engagement sessions like this webinar, which was really, really good. Access has been straightforward. The two-way dialog that we are having is much more useful. It's been really good thank you.

FK: Thank you.

10. Project Governance (Section 5.4 Schedule)

No questions

11. How to Provide Feedback

No questions
