Notes of GB Grid Code Meeting
Tuesday 30th July 2002, Coventry and Perth

Present:

Bridget Morgan	Ofgem Technical	BM
David Nicol	Scottish Power	DN
Andy Balkwill	NGC	AB
Geoff Charter	NGC	GC
Ian Moyes	Scottish and Southern	IM
Louise Elder	Ofgem BETTA Project	LE

1. Notes of the Previous Meeting

The notes of the previous meeting were agreed.

2. Recovery of GB Grid Code development costs

BM explained that Ofgem had briefly reviewed cost recovery options for works associated with the development of a GB Grid Code should the existing panels choose to take this work forward outside of the BETTA project (i.e. in the same way that the GB distribution code was developed). Ofgem considered that in this case, recovery of efficiently incurred costs would be via the existing transmission price controls.

BM explained that for the option where the development of a GB Grid Code was carried out as part of BETTA, then the issues of cost recovery for the associated works would need to be assessed as part of Ofgem/DTI's wider consideration of the treatment of BETTA related costs.

3. Comparison of the two grid code panel constitutions

IM presented his paper comparing the composition of the two Grid Code Panels. Although there was some reflection of the two different communities they were very similar.

AB referred to the process whereby a GB Distribution Code had been developed by first establishing a single governing Panel of two codes and then bringing the two codes together. There appeared to be no barriers to bringing together the two Grid Code Panels from the perspective of constitution and rules.

It was yet to be seen how the SO/TO split would affect the Grid Code but it was suggested that any prospect of having separate panels dealing with SO and TO issues looked messy. However, the governance had to be appropriate to deal with the issues.

IM offered to reissue his paper incorporating the minor changes discussed.

4. Review of the Scottish Grid Code Connection Conditions

DN presented his paper comparing the Scottish and English & Welsh Connection Codes (CC). Although they are different, the differences were not, as had been suggested, related to the absence of a CUSC in Scotland. NGC's CC had more detail than the Scottish code

but broadly speaking they cover the same areas. GC noted that some of NGC's connection process appears in the Scottish Planning Code.

DN offered to reissue his note incorporating the minor changes discussed.

5. Comparison of sub-codes of the existing Grid Codes

GC presented his paper comparing each code of the Grid Codes. He had used the number of pages as a rough indicator of the amount of change which he believed would be required. Some codes were very similar and some, such as the balancing codes and scheduling & dispatch codes were quite different.

Looking at the similar codes in turn. The Scottish Code has an Introduction which NGC's does not have. GC thought this was a useful section.

General Conditions: are almost identical. DN questioned the circumstances under which the arbitration association in NGC's code would be used stating the usual remedies as being enforcement under licence or breach of connection contract. This was generally for use concerning the failure of NGC and a User to agree on technical issues, but was not thought to have been used.

Planning Code (PC): NGC's had 41 pages and the Scottish Code 18. The main difference was that The Scottish Code used the schedules in the Data Registration Code as part of the Planning Code whereas NGC used it to gather all the data requirements across the code.

Connection Code (CC): NGC's code was 41 pages compared to 12 pages for the Scottish Code. This was mainly due to the detail on frequency response requirements.

Operating Code (OC) 1 (demand forecasts): IM considered the E&W version of this code had changed radically. Scotland asked for far more information from Suppliers and considered their code was ready for review. GC said there were also some superfluous provisions in the E&W code. E&W version seeks information from Network Operators rather than Suppliers and the Distribution Code gives Network Operators the right to ask Suppliers for data to assist them in preparing their grid code data submissions.

Operating Code 2 (operational planning and data provision): Obvious differences in the generation outage planning area because of the different market arrangements. In planning transmission outages, NGC's code reflects the one to many relationship with Network Operators. CCGT provisions currently only in E&W but it was proposed might be appropriate to Scotland also. NRAPM provisions in NGC's code may no longer be appropriate under NETA as bids and offers now enable NGC to manage these occasions.

Operating Code S3 (E&W4 – Operating Margin): OC4 no longer exists in E&W. This was mainly a Pool requirement which was reviewed post-NETA. Remaining requirements were placed in OC2 and the PC.

Operating Code 5 (testing and monitoring): This code doesn't exist in Scotland although there are some provisions relating to testing in the Scottish CC. The Scottish Grid Code Review Panel had noted this. Some of these issues were dealt with in Service Level Agreements within the Scottish companies. Requirements were being progressed for windfarms in Scotland and renewables in E&W.

Operating Code 6 (S4 – Demand Control): There were significant differences here. OC4 of the Scottish code was on the review panel's 'in need of updating' list, but viewed as low priority work currently.

Operating Code 7 (S5 – Operational Liaison): Similar provisions although each code had a different system of warnings.

Operating Code 8 (S6 – Safety Coordination): Generally very similar however changes to this code would have to be given much consideration as it deals with safety issues. This could be very difficult to bring together.

Operating Code 9 (S7 – Contingency Planning): Codes covered similar areas. NGC's code reflects more detail because of the one to many relationship with Network Operators.

Operating Code 10 (S8 – Event Information Supply): Similar provisions.

Operating Code 11 (S9 – Numbering and Nomenclature): Similar provisions.

Operating Code 12 (S10 – System Tests): This section in both codes had possibly never been used and as such not reviewed. It was suggested that it may be better to try to change it to make it more usable or remove it completely.

Balancing Codes (BC) and Schedule & Dispatch Codes: The Scottish Code has specific conditions for the Moyle Interconnector whereas the E&W code has no special arrangements for any Interconnector. There were general issues associated with market to market trading which had not been resolved. DN thought that Moyle trading would need to be considered in the context of the BSC. There is a separate operating agreement between NGC and RTE (in France) which contains sections of the BCs and other requirements relating to the operation of the dc link. This was not a public document. Ofgem had been in discussion with Scotland over the publication of the equivalent Moyle agreement. AB said that the French agreement had been in existence since pre-privatisation and dealt with technical and communication requirements. AB added that the interconnector trading rules were publicly available.

GC considered that the Balancing Codes would be fairly easy to extend to GB subject to consideration of the handling of the Moyle Interconnector provisions.

Data Registration Code: it was suggested that significant work would be required to create a combined schedule.

6. Way Forward

In summary, it was suggested that there were some codes which required significant changes whereas others were very similar. AB thought that more detail on the allocation of functions between the SO and TO was crucial and agreement to the fundamental principle that there should be a single panel to manage the new code. Without a single panel it would be difficult to bring the two codes together. DN agreed that the governance was crucial and that initially the two codes could be stuck together with a move to a single code over time. Too hasty a development of a single code could affect the quality.

BM reflected on the objectives of commonality or consistency and DN said that the two panels could redouble their efforts in this area. AB/GC and IM/DN agreed to take an action

to categorize areas of the code into 'must do', common, consistent and different to get to a GB Grid Code.

BM asked what criteria could be applied to identify changes required for BETTA. Changes to the Grid Code arising from NETA had been limited to only those necessary for NETA. GC said that this had led to a significant post-designation activity required to tidy the code. The circumstances under BETTA were different in that the GB Grid Code was to be constructed from two existing codes. Whatever criteria were agreed, AB noted that it would be sensible to identify all desirable changes when the new code was being developed so that the review resource was not wasted in this respect.

BM stated that Ofgem intended to issue a consultation paper on the GB Grid Code by the end of August and thanked the companies for providing information at the meetings which had helped in its preparation.

Actions should be circulated by e-mail by 19th August. There will be a short meeting after the Scottish Grid Code Review Panel meeting on 22nd August via teleconference links to NGC.

Actions

1. IM to reissue his paper incorporating the minor changes discussed. IM

2. DN to reissue his note incorporating the minor changes discussed. DN

3. AB/GC and IM/DN to categorize areas of code into 'must do', common, consistent and different to get to a GB Grid Code. AB/GC,DN/IM