

## Data Exchange Grid Code Working Group

Meeting Name	Data Exchange Grid Code Working Group
Meeting No.	2
Date of Meeting	18 <sup>th</sup> December 2007
Time	10:00am – 2:00pm
Venue	Room C3.1, National Grid Offices, Warwick

This note outlines the key points from the second meeting of the Data Exchange Grid Code Working Group

### Members Present:

Duncan Burt	DB	Chairman
Richard Dunn	RD	Secretary
Lilian McLeod	LM	National Grid
John Zammit-Haber	JZ-H	National Grid
Claire Maxim	CM	E.On
John Morris	JM	British Energy (BE)
Alan Michie	AM	Scottish Power Transmission
Jim Molley	JM	Scottish Hydro Electricity Transmission (via teleconference) (SHET)
Bridget Morgan	BM	Ofgem

### Apologies:

Paul Jones	E.On
Sigrid Bolik	E-connect

### 1. Introductions/Apologies for Absence

1. Apologies for absence were received from Paul Jones and Sigrid Bolik.

### 2. Review of Minutes of the Meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2007

2. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

### 3. Working Group Discussions

#### Possible Solutions

3. CM explained the proposals in a paper circulated by Paul Jones (PJ) after the first meeting of the Group held on 1<sup>st</sup> November. The paper provided a more detailed description of Option 5 (STC Schedule 3 and Grid Code change via coordinated governance) that the Group believed merited further consideration.
4. CM indicated that the key to the proposal was the flow diagram in Appendix 2 to the paper. This suggested how a Grid Code Modification relating to User Data Exchange could be triggered concurrently with an STC Amendment Proposal on the same issue. The aim of the proposal was to ensure that both Modifications under the two Codes should reach Ofgem in similar timescales so that they could be implemented together if the Authority approved them. National Grid would need to take a decision on whether or not a joint Working Group was required comprising Members with knowledge of the two Codes. The timing of the consideration of the Modifications under the two Codes could be an issue under this proposal since the STC was prescriptive in terms of the timescale by which a report should be provided to the Authority for decision whereas the Grid Code was much more flexible in this area. The idea however was that, after appropriate consideration of the changes necessary for both Codes, the process for submission to the Authority for decision should revert back to the respective governance arrangements in the two Codes. The main advantages of this proposal was that the amendment process provided a

## Data Exchange Grid Code Working Group

reasonable element of User scrutiny and involved minimal changes to the current Codes. The disadvantages were that the proposed processes were highly dependent on National Grid coordinating the necessary work for both Codes without express requirements in either Code to do so and where a joint Working Group was required there were also no express governance arrangements to cover the workings of such a Group.

5. DB thanked CM for this explanation of the Option 5 proposal and invited comments from the other Members of the Group. LM acknowledged that option 5 was a possible solution to the issue but queried whether this delivered the assurances that Users were seeking in the context of adequate monitoring of the exchange of their data between National Grid and the Scottish TOs. The proposal also had weaknesses in that the details of the User Data to be exchanged was not described in the Grid Code and would remain in the STC. The proposal was flexible but would rely on significant cooperation between all Parties without the arrangements being reinforced in a User facing Code.
6. JZ-H noted that there were likely to be a lot of STC changes in this area in the next 12 months to align the data under discrete headings and a joint Working Group to consider them would be resource intensive and probably not a good use of the time of the Members of such a group. CM explained that E.on supported the proposal based on option 5 but recognised it had weaknesses and would be keen to explore a more enduring solution. JM (BE), AM and JM (SHET) indicated that the proposal could be made to work but agreed that it contained weaknesses and would support a proposal that promised a more enduring solution.
7. LM indicated that National Grid had taken an action from the first meeting of the Group to assess further the various options discussed. National Grid believed that the most appropriate enduring solution to the issue that provided the level of assurance sought by Users was a variant to option 3a (Schedule 3 provisions transferred from the STC to the Grid Code).
8. National Grid had circulated a brief note to all Working Group Members on 17<sup>th</sup> December outlining the proposal. This would involve the inclusion of new provisions within the Grid Code (Planning Code) which would specify the User data being exchanged to the Scottish TOs for the purposes of investment planning. These provisions would cross-reference the relevant data items obtained via the PC appendix provisions submitted by Users to National Grid under the week 24/28 process. This would provide transparency for all Users of their data that was being transferred to the Scottish TOs. Any subsequent changes to this User data would require a formal change to the Grid Code and thus Users would have an opportunity to debate the changes fully under the Grid Code governance arrangements. Additional changes to the General Conditions of the Grid Code so that the Scottish TOs could contribute to the discussions regarding any changes to the Planning Conditions would also be required (they could already participate in any proposed changes to the appendix to the Planning Code). Changes to Schedule 3 of the STC would also be required to identify the data items specified in the Grid Code.
9. National Grid believed the solution would alleviate Users' concerns over the transfer of their data between National Grid and the Scottish TOs since it would provide long term visibility of the data being exchanged and ongoing opportunity to comment and monitor any future changes to the data transfer provisions. This option would involve some significant work for National Grid in the short term to work up the proposal into a Grid Code amendment but it would be an enduring solution and meet the needs of all Parties and therefore National Grid commended this option to the Group. JZ-H reminded the Group that National Grid's proposal would only apply to User data and not for example data based on National Grid modelling that employed the User data.
10. CM supported the National Grid proposal and noted that it could be useful to have an enduring solution on these lines before OFTOs were established and operating

## Data Exchange Grid Code Working Group

under the Offshore regime in due course. The Working Group agreed unanimously that the National Grid proposal of a variant on option 3a provided the best prospect for an enduring solution acceptable to Users, National Grid and the Scottish TOs. It was agreed therefore that the Group should now concentrate on developing this option into a Grid Code amendment.

### 4. Next Steps

11. A number of issues were identified in discussion that would need to be addressed as part of working up the Grid Code amendment proposal including:

- Inclusion of the OC2 data that contains User data;
- how to deal with the “boundary of influence” requirement for User data from other TOs and DNOs ;
- treatment of data on mothballed stations;
- inclusion of new data arising from the revised Black Start arrangements;
- identification of the relevant schedules in the Data Registration Code that would need to be identified in the amendment (the Group began this at the meeting)

National Grid agreed to consider these issues further as part of the development of the Grid Code amendment proposal.

**Action: National Grid**

12. It was agreed that National Grid would take the lead in the following areas for consideration at the next meeting of the Working Group:

- Preparation of a table listing all the parts of the Grid Code that refer to User data;
- draft legal text for the amendment proposal;
- Liaison with a DNO representative about the proposals;
- Providing a paper to the February GCRP on the progress made by the Group
- Drafting of the necessary amendments to the STC

**Action: National Grid**

13. The Group discussed whether there was a need for coordination of the Grid Code amendment with the related amendment to the STC. It was agreed that the STC amendment was not dependent on the Grid Code amendment but if necessary the two could be pursued on the basis of the Appendix 2 arrangements described in the E.on paper elaborating on option 5.

### 5. Date of Next Meeting

14. The next meeting of the Group would be held on Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> January at NGH commencing at 10am.