nationalgrid

Minutes	
Meeting name	Electricity Balancing System Group
Meeting number	12
Date of meeting	13 Dec 2012
Time	10:00 - 14:00
Location	National Grid, Warwick

Attendees

Name	Initials	Company
Campbell McDonald	CM	SSE (dial in)
Damien McCluskey	DM	National Grid
Dan Webb	DW	Seabank
Graham Bunt	GB	EDF Energy
John Lucas	JL	Elexon
John Norbury	JN	RWE
Lisa Waters	LW	Waters Wye (dial in)
Nick Sargent	NS	National Grid (Technical Secretary)
Peter Knight	PK	Centrica (dial in)
Robert Paterson	RP	National Grid
Shaf Ali	SA	National Grid (Chair)
Simon Peter Reid	SR	Scottish Power (dial in)

Apologies

Name	Initials	Company
Guy Phillips	GP	E.ON
Christopher Proudfoot	CP	Centrica
Joe Warren	JW	Open Energi
Martin Mate	MM	EDF Energy
Mari Toda	MT	EDF Energy
Scott Keen	SK	Intergen

Introduction

SA welcomed the attendees and opened the meeting.

1 Approval of Minutes from the last meeting

SA asked for comments on the minutes. None received. Minutes agreed.

2 Review of Actions

Action 11/05	Ongoing action. Revision to timeline being discussed as agenda item #6. As per RP to NS email of Fri 17 August circulated to EBSG on 06 September 2012.
Action 11/11	This is a low priority action to be arranged when other EBS issues have been cleared off (RP). It will be left as live though (SA) so that it's not ignored (CP).
Action 12/19	This action has been superceded by later actions. Closed
Action 12/21	This subject discussed at the Multi Shaft Modelling subgroup with further discussion required. Addressed further by Action 12/26 Closed
Action 12/22	A supporting action for 12/21 which is now closed. Closed
Action 12/26	CM and SR to deliver a small presentation at the February EBSG meeting. Open
Action 12/27	Draft TSL distributed by SA. Closed

3 GCRP proposal paper & Industry Consultation on Grid Code BC2: Reactive & Frequency Response Fax Information

The two papers circulated to the EBSG cover issues that have been discussed by the EBSG previously. These issues relate to the fax forms for submission of Frequency Response availability and Reactive Power capability, and revisions to some dynamic parameters. RP presented his slides giving further detail around the issues.

LW asked for explanation of the definition of NDZ, to be applicable when re-synchronising a unit after it has been BOA'd off.
Eggborough was caught out by the use of NDZ (LW). The issue is really about communications and how people could be flexible to meet requirement (LW). Agreed (RP).

JN asked for clarification as to whether this will have the effect of extending the bid with an impact on BSUoS? RP advised that it was not his intention that it should, nor that Generators should receive BM Start-Up payments – it was more about providing a framework so that it was clear what communications would take place, as at present the Grid Code is silent on the process of re-syncing units following a two-shift. He said that this stage was about identifying issues, rather than necessarily solving them now, which would be covered during the discussions on the consultation and legal text.

DW advised that, generally, when a unit has been BOA'd off, National Grid would follow up with a call to advise the next time when the unit will be used. This however is not transparent to others.

Use of NDZ has not been identified so far as being an issue. It might be a minority issue but if the system works reasonably well, we run the risk of adding further complexity to it (JN).

Understood, but we should consider wind generation on the east coast of England, causing local constraints and requiring National Grid to take actions not seen before (SR). Agreed that intermittent generation could exacerbate the situation and we need a wider view (JN).

The Issues Paper should set out what the issues are, with examples to assist understanding (GB), so that the GCRP can make a decision without undue process delay (LW). We have the issue that larger parties see things differently to smaller parties so consulting on this is worthwhile (LW).

Will the parameters be capable of being time varying from BOA to zero, or fixed at a number of hours from zero, for example? (DW). No, both under the Pool and NETA arrangements, National Grid has not been involved in managing Generators' thermal states (RP).

National Grid would not need Day Ahead Dynamic Data to be submitted to EBS. This would likely require moving Appendix 1 of BC1 to BC2 and would have a greater impact on the Grid Code than amending BC1.4.2 only (RP).
LW and JN agreed with removing the requirement for generators to submit Dynamic Parameters at "Day Ahead". If the definitions were moved to be BC2, would this preclude the submission of this data prior to gate-closure? (JN). This will need to be considered in our discussions (RP).

EBS is due to go live on existing interfaces of EDL and EDT. After go live, EDL* and EDT* will be offered to generators (RP).
New generators will not be required to immediately use these services but it may be pragmatic for them to do so, rather than them adopt the old interfaces and soon after have to change to the new interfaces (RP).

Could we confirm if we have a two year target for non nuclear generators to install the new EDL* and EDT* systems, based on original documentation, or five years based on later documentation and as per other generation types (GB). We are not aware of any proposal differentiating between fuel type (JL). We will look back at the consultation report (RP).

Post-Meeting note: The report on BM Replacement Industry Consultation Report 2 dated 23rd December 2010 said "The indicative timescale for transition to new interfaces (and cut-off period for the existing interfaces) will be around two years, recognising that this may extend to five years."[1] On slide 15 of the pack presented at the first EBS IT meeting in December 2011 (see EBS IT web-page), it said: "The industry was consulted regarding cut-off dates for support of the existing interfaces [and the] view was to support them for up to 5 years after go-live".[2]

[1] Reference: http://www.nationalgrid.com/NR/rdonlyres/73CC8BC8-B070-4BF2-A24E-B1A15A43A9F8/44635/Reportonbmrepconsultation2v11.pdf Sections 1.1.3 and 4.1.6

[2] Reference: http://www.nationalgrid.com/NR/rdonlyres/FC37CBC4-3622-475E-85C1-B7A2DA6F8A85/53104/EBSIT01DECPRESENTATION.pdf Slide 15.

It would be worth communicating obligations to industry once the systems are ready (LW).

We are not necessarily expecting parties to install both EDL* and EDT* at the same time. Large companies may not want to migrate all their stations and their Trading Point at the same time. National Grid had given some thought to this scenario and suspects that Generators having some rules on who submits what data would resolve potential issues and support a phased migration. At the moment, power stations tend to have sole responsibility for submitting dynamic data and Export Limits and a phased migration may require no more than this to continue (RP).

SA asked the Group for views on the preferable approach to place an EBS go-live date in the Grid Code when the exact go-live date is not yet known?
Suggestions included "go live + x", "TBA", define Go Live Date in the Grid Code and raise a further modification once the date is known, or produce report but do not submit to Ofgem until go-live date is known (GB) (RP).
The implementation date is the date the text goes into the Grid Code. The text could identify the period under which old arrangements are used and when new arrangements could take over. Implementation dates are decided by Ofgem but text within the Code would allow others to decide on the implementation (JL).
Usually the new Grid Code version is the current date it is posted on the website (JN).
Options will be considered with the National Grid Legal team (SA).

<u>Comments on the Issues Paper covering Reactive Power and Frequency Response fax forms</u>

These forms are generally filled in by control room operatives who will not be looking at power factors. Enhancements are a lot clearer for these users (DW).
Suggest keeping the receipt acknowledgement requirement in the new form (JN).
Agreed (DW) even though all faxes are acknowledged without the acknowledgement requirement field on the form (RP).
Under the AVR process, is the fax a request for a declaration and does it need National Grid approval? It suggests that this is an optional process (JN). This had been introduced so that staff instructing reactive power were aware that the AVR was out of service, most likely for brush-gear maintenance (RP). He agreed that the words on the form relating to this area would need revisiting.

ACTION RP: Re-visit the section on the reactive capability form that deals with the AVR being in or out of service.

Frequency Response declarations apply to the module and not to the unit (JN).
The contracts apply to the module but the existing Grid Code faxes are at the unit level (RP). He stated that there was an economic and efficient argument for keeping it at the unit level, as if one unit in the module could provide response, this may avoid two-shifting an additional unit over night when response provision was a premium.
There are factors in the response contracts to reduce the response provided if not all the units in a module are running (RP).

No other comments were made on the forms

JN said he would discuss this with his internal Contracts Manager for any other comments over the proposed forms, particularly declaring per module and not per unit.

4 Dynamic Parameters

RP presented slides on the issues raised within the Dynamic Parameters issue paper.
Special actions are generally arrangements for system to generator intertripping or run down rates that National Grid can use post fault. EBS will have the capability to work out transmission restrictions directly from the network model for specific points in time. It's a way of getting more out of the transmission system. This functionality will need to know if there are more emergency rates it can make use of (RP).
JN was unclear on the second category of parameters. If these enhanced rates are going to be utilised, what's the difference between rates in the BM and these rates and under which process will these be utilised? (JN).
Some generators provide National Grid with enhanced rates with special actions being utilised via emergency instructions (JN).
It is encouraging to know that emergency instructions are used in this way. They are a special action against a special set of circumstances and not a BM balancing tool for National Grid use (CM).
If we make modifications in this area we should seek to clarify the circumstances under which these are used and the means of instructions (RP).
These enhanced rates could be accompanied by a different price, under a contract, perhaps with a price within the field (JN, CM).
Maybe it's a big enough issue to move to one side and concentrate on market data issues. In terms of the issue paper, if GCRP make the request, emergency run-up and run-down rates will move out of the dynamic parameters paper (RP) and can be discussed at the GCRP at some future date (SA).

ACTION RP: To remove the section on Emergency Run-Up and Run-Down Rates from the revised parameters and instructions issue paper.

The paper does not mention consequential changes to data validation rules. Page 3 mentions consequential changes to other documents (JN). It is sensible to include Data Validation rules as part of the consultation because these are covered by the Grid Code – under the same governance (JN). Agreed (RP).
Is there a need to include a definition of 'lead' and 'lag' in Appendix 3? (SR)

Comments

Some references to BSCCo system were worded to say that Elexon were publishing more than parameters and instructions. To clarify, BSCCo will publish parameters only (JL).
The references will be reworded for clarity (RP).

The intention is to take both papers to the January GCRP. The paper on fax forms also includes a draft consultation which, if approved by GCRP, could go to industry consultation. The Dynamic Parameter paper is more involved and needs to be developed into an consultation by EBSG, subject to GCRP direction (SA).

The consultation would be expected to be published around the middle of 2013 (SA).

5 Telecommunications Roadmap

Brought up initially at the IT subgroup (GB, RP).

RP made his presentation of the differences between EDL and EDT.
Discussion centred around the suggestion of submitting EDL/EDT to a central location for a party, a data centre, rather than EDT to the trading point, and EDL to the control point.
More phased steps could introduce complexity (PK).
EDT* will also include EDL* so reducing the two means of data submission into one.
What sort of saving would be passed back to the customer? (CM)
The usual arrangements are that any savings and efficiencies are implicitly built into National Grid's price control allowances and incentive schemes (SA).
A lot of this is surrounded in mystery and obligations are not set out. Greater communication is required (JN).

6 Review of Project Plan

RP gave an update to the project plan, and arrangements for and progress on the testing and transition activities. The plan is reviewed weekly, and published every two weeks on the EBS IT website.

The plan is currently close to starting EDT type-testing with IT vendor systems. EDL type-testing is slightly behind.

ACTION: Send link to EBSG participants following next update (RP NS)

7 Proposed meeting dates

Thursday 21 February 2013 @ Wokingham was proposed but unsuitable due to half-term. The alternative date of Feb 26th proposed for later review.

POST MEETING UPDATE: Feb 26th also became unsuitable and Feb 27th is now the proposed date.

8 AOB

On the subject of faxes, there are also faxes from NG to generators. Has any consideration been given to those in the above proposal? (simultaneous tap instruction) (JN). Yes, it is covered in the revised parameters and instructions issue paper (RP).

TSL decision from Ofgem is unlikely to come quickly due to a staff change (LW).

9 Next Steps

ACTION RP: Re-visit the section on the reactive capability form that deals with the AVR being in or out of service.
ACTION RP: To remove the section on Emergency Run-Up and Run-Down Rates from the revised parameters and instructions issue paper.

ACTION: RP/NS to send link to EBSG participants following next update