

Data Exchange Grid Code Working Group

Meeting Name	Data Exchange Grid Code Working Group
Meeting No.	3
Date of Meeting	22 nd January 2008
Time	10:00am – 2:00pm
Venue	Room B2.1, National Grid Offices, Warwick

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

Members Present:

Lilian MacLeod	LM	Chairman
Richard Dunn	RD	Secretary
John Zammit-Haber	JZ-H	National Grid
Richard Proctor	RP	National Grid
Bec Thornton	BT	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:

Duncan Burt	National Grid
Paul Jones	E.On
Sigrid Bolik	E-connect

1. Introductions/Apologies for Absence

1. Apologies for absence were received from Duncan Burt, Paul Jones and Sigrid Bolik. LM welcomed BT and RP to their first Group meeting. BT was attending as she would be responsible for presenting any consequential changes to the STC at the STC Committee and RP because he had been closely involved in identifying the provisions of the Grid Code that provided for data exchange.

2. Review of Minutes of the Meeting held on 18th December 2007

2. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

3. Working Group Discussions

3. LM explained that National Grid had drafted Legal Text for some of the changes to the Grid Code, a draft Progress Report to the February GCRP and a draft Working Group Report and the Working Group agreed that it should consider these documents in turn.

Draft Legal Text

4. LM explained that new Grid Code provisions PC.3.4 & PC.3.5 would be required as well as changes to PC.1.1, GCs and G&D (new definition of "Relevant Unit"). Changes would also be required for the STC. The legal drafting put to the Working Group here only covered new PC.3.4 & PC.3.5. The new PC.3.4 listed the data provided to Relevant Transmission Licensees on a GB transmission basis. The new PC.3.5 listed the data provided to Relevant Transmission Licensees on a boundary of influence basis. The table in the legal drafting would become Appendix D to the PC and essentially replicated Schedule 14 of the STC. This was also all detailed in the DRC and the Working Group noted that the cross referencing would need to be

Data Exchange Grid Code Working Group

carefully checked. BM suggested that planning/construction assumptions in the data might need to be separately identified in the cross-referencing. National Grid agreed to consider how the cross-referencing could best be organised to achieve the desired outcome.

Action: National Grid (J Z-H)

5. LM indicated that data was also transferred to the DNOs and they had indicated that they were content with the drafting and this included the implications for LEEMPS data. J Z-H also noted that the drafting would need to be robust in the context of an offshore regime and the emergence of OFTOs in due course. LM noted that two current Grid Code consultations included new provisions for data exchange. These were the black start Grid Code consultation (G/07) and B/07 – Improved Planning Code Data Exchange for Compliance Assessments. G/07 was currently out to industry consultation and B/07 was with the Authority for determination. BM suggested that the Data Exchange report could refer to these other changes on an “if this consultation is approved then the following would apply” basis.
6. BM noted that there were some inconsistencies between PC.5.2 and PC.5.4 (preliminary and committed project planning data) but did not consider it was appropriate for this Working Group to pursue them. National Grid agreed to consider these inconsistencies separately from Data Exchange. CM noted that a consequential change would be required to PC.5.4 (e). It was agreed that National Grid would raise this at a forthcoming meeting of the JPC under the STC Committee (scheduled for 24th April).

Action: National Grid (J Z-H)

Draft Progress Report to the February GCRP

7. LM explained that the draft progress report reminded Panel Members of the background to the Data Exchange issue and categorised the possible solutions into two broad headings – Process and Codification solutions. The note then explained why the Working Group preferred a Codification solution and that the Group was working on a solution that codified the data exchange in the Grid Code rather than the STC so that the arrangements were fully User facing and any further changes were subject to User comment. Finally the briefing note included revised Terms of Reference for the WG. Comments on the draft Progress report were requested by Thursday 24th January as this was circulation day for the papers scheduled to be considered by the GCRP on 7th February.

Action: WG Members

8. It was agreed that CM should be included in the list of WG Members in the Terms of Reference. In response to a question from JM, LM indicated that consequential changes to the CUSC were not envisaged but National Grid would check that this was the case. BT also noted that a paper would need to be provided to the STC for its meeting on 19th February informing TOs of the progress in the Working Group to date.

Action: National Grid (LM)

9. All WG Members confirmed that the codification approach described in the progress report was still the preferred approach over a process approach.

Draft Working Group Report

10. LM confirmed that National Grid would amend the WG Report to the Panel in the light of the discussion on the draft progress report to the GCRP. LM raised the issue of the need for greater analysis of the costs and benefits to the industry and consumers in reports to the Authority on Code changes. Ofgem had recently identified this issue in its letter of 28th November 2007 on Code governance and this area would be a key feature of the governance review that was described in the letter. The WG agreed that the report would need to be clearer on these costs and

Data Exchange Grid Code Working Group

benefits although this was probably a bigger issue for the CUSC and the BSC. BM noted that the report would need to be clear why the particular codification option had been chosen by the Group and why other options had not been progressed. It was agreed that National Grid would provide a further draft of the WG report to Members in due course and request comments within two weeks.

Action: National Grid (LM)

4. Next Steps

11. It was agreed that another meeting of the WG would be required which National Grid would arrange for end February/early March. The overall aim was to submit the final version of the Working Group report to the May 2008 GCRP.

Action: National Grid (LM)

5. Date of Next Meeting

12. The next meeting of the Group would be held on Tuesday 4th March at NGH commencing at 10am (subsequently postponed to 7th April).