Minutes	
Meeting name	Electricity Balancing System Group
Meeting number	8
Date of meeting	11 Jun 2012
Time	10:00 - 14:00
Location	National Grid, Wokingham

Attendees

Name	Initials	Company
Campbell McDonald	CM	SSE
Christopher Proudfoot	CP	Centrica
John Norbury	JN	RWE
Mari Toda	MT	EDF Energy (by phone)
Nick Sargent	NS	National Grid (Technical Secretary)
Robert Paterson	RP	National Grid
Shaf Ali	SA	National Grid (Chair)
Simon Peter Reid	SR	Scottish Power (by phone)

Apologies

Name	Initials	Company
Cem Suleyman	CS	Drax Power
Chris Morton	CMT	EDF Energy
Dan Webb	DW	Seabank
Graham Bunt	GB	EDF Energy
Guy Phillips	GP	E.ON
Hannah McKinney	HM	EDF Energy
Ian Foy	IF	Drax Power
Joe Warren	JW	Open Energi
John Lucas	JL	Elexon
Lisa Waters	LW	Waters Wye
Martin Mate	MM	EDF Energy
Murray Rennie	MR	Intergen
Simon Amos	SAM	Barking Power
Stuart Middleton	SM	Intergen

1 Introduction

SA welcomed the attendees and opened the meeting.

2 Approval of Minutes from the last meeting

SA asked for comments on the minutes. None were received and the minutes were agreed.

3 Review of Actions

Action 11/05	Ongoing action. Revision to timeline being discussed as agenda item #6.
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 12/12	Completed: As part of the later agenda item.
Action 12/13	Completed: This action was raised on the assumption that TSL was not going to be a parameter. Following the position given by the GCRP at the last panel meeting, this action was no longer required and not followed up.
Action 12/14	Completed. ABB advises this is achievable but will increase complexity of scheduling module and run time will increase as well. Further comment below.
Action 12/15A	Completed: Three responses received via email and discussion undertaken. Further comment below.
Action 12/15B	Completed: Link added to minutes of meeting #7.
Action 12/16	Completed: As part of the later agenda item.
Action 12/17	Completed: As part of the later agenda item.
Action 12/18	Completed

12/14 – Accommodation of Station Synchronising and Desynchronising Intervals (SSI/SDI) parameters on a BMU basis by the EBS system

RP suggested there are potentially two different definitions of the requirement according to generation type. Interpretation could be:

- So many minutes must elapse after this BMU has synchronised before the next BMU may synchronise, which probably applies to Seabank where they are required to clear the post-synchronisation period of higher NOx emissions prior to synchronising the other BMU
- The next BMU may only synchronise after so many minutes following the synchronisation of another BMU at the same station, which might be more applicable to coal and oil-fired steam units, where the issues are prior to synchronisation, rather than after synchronisation (RP)

SR suggested that although usage might be different, the parameter would work in the same way under both instances. It appears though that the description sent to ABB is the same for both definitions.
Sync intervals are introducing another parameter and additional complexity (CP).
The Seabank example was used to understand the problem by considering the synchronisation between large and small modules. For example: big module then

small; 45 minutes synchronisation interval, small module then big; 30 minute synchronisation interval. (RP).
In all these data areas, there's a trade-off between accurately describing all the restrictions at every stations and the degree of complexity this introduces into the market (RP).
SR had additional complexity according to the order of unit sync.
SR suggested that other data submitted by generators is at unit level, not station level. No examples of submitted station level data could be thought of.
It would be difficult to run a system with intervals allocated to units (JN).
This data would need to go to BM Reports for transparency purposes (CP). Agreed (SR).
Is National Grid asking the industry what it wants within EBS, or just advising industry of what the EBS capability is? (JN). Both go hand in hand (SA).
RP asked SR whether the complexities he described occur in practice. Issues occur several times a week when it's windy in Scotland (SR).
JN suggested another definition, which would control the intervals between the first and second, second and third units etc. to synchronise at a station, rather than basing it on intervals between specific named units.
CP suggested that a station level interval, rather than a unit one, could solve, say, 80% of the problems encountered by some generators, but not Seabank or Longannet, or similar smaller generators.
To what extent is the scheduler able to cope with this, can it cope with multiple inputs? (JN). In general the more restrictions you add, the longer the scheduler will take to run and the run time can increase exponentially, rather than proportionately (RP).
If we agree on a station level interval, we need to consider whether we submit the maximum value or alternative work-arounds (CP).
All dynamic parameters will ultimately have the capability to be time varying (RP).

Is the meeting in favour of station or unit level interval? If unit level, members are asked to return with values for review and appraisal (RP).
Overall the industry members present supported a unit level interval.
RP requested that the industry members who were in favour of a unit definition of SSI/SDI bring proposed definitions to the next meeting.

Action: JN, CM & SR to propose definitions for unit-based station synchronising and de-synchronising intervals.

12/15A maximum SSI & SDI limits in normal operation conditions.

JN had figures from 30 mins to 3 hours.
SR would use MEL to indicate unit status although this isn't giving despatch engineers an accurate picture (CM).
Putting an upper limit on sync intervals is not containing actions within the BM window and as such, I'm not in favour of an upper limit (RP).
It wasn't clear in the consultation if it put National Grid under some obligation to honour dynamics that went past the BM window (JN).
It's a case of generators giving National Grid the data and National Grid using it to build an operating plan (RP).
If you've brought a unit on, does this mean you can't change your sync interval? What would this do to Seabank? (CM). Furthermore, what would happen if National Grid complied with submitted parameters then generators made subsequent changes to PN syncs? (CP).

National Grid would not react to the fact that PNs had been moved around on other BMUs in the same station after a "synchronising" Bid-Offer Acceptance had been issued by National Grid (RP). The point is to try and avoid these situations. Does this mean that beyond the wall dynamics are honoured? Is this parameter locking a generator in to anything? (CM)
We don't want to submit data to National Grid just because we're not allowed to submit anything else and reinforces the point that it has to be a unit dynamic (JN).
These arrangements apply to MZT and MNZT broadly speaking and we see no different way of applying them to sync intervals. As some parameters extend beyond the Balancing Mechanism Window into the wholesale market, there have to be some rules to manage potential conflicts (RP).
Will the new system be a black box that sends out instructions without control room intervention? (SR). There will be an automated capability, but unit commitment decisions will be subject to manual review, whereas loading instructions may not be subject to the same level of review (RP).

4 BSC Pricing Issue

The first meeting will take place on Friday 22 June at Elexon's offices. There will be representation from all present on the issue group at least (RP).
There is no more for this group to do (SA).
Feedback from the Elexon meeting to come back to this group at the next EBSG meeting (SA).

5 Two Shifting Limit (TSL) Consultation/SSI SDI CS Upper Limits

The recommendations presented to the GCRP resulted in considerable debate at the last Panel Meeting. The issue became more consideration of the position of smaller generators. There was some support for the smaller players at the GCRP and as such, the GCRP felt the issue had not been solved. Work undertaken by the EBSG was in accordance with the remit of the working group however (SA).
Work to be carried out by an additional GCRP subgroup suggests we're going round in circles (JN).
Despite the majority view, the GCRP feels that more needs to be done although not by EBSG (SA). We now need to get the workgroup report in line with the consultation responses. Our recommendations will be based on responses received under the consultation and subsequent EBSG discussions.
Should the BM work around manufacturers' maintenance regimes or the other way round? (RP). Some of the solution could be to see if manufacturers could be more flexible in their maintenance practices.
There's always pressure on manufacturers to be more flexible by the industry (CP).
One or two extra starts between maintenance regimes is not significant (CP).
We would like to manage our own starts, not pass the responsibility to National Grid (JN).
One of the Eggborough issues was the lack of available resource to manage their parameters all day (SR).
As far as the report is concerned – we're not proposing to formalise TSL (JN).
In line with EBSG discussions, we should recommend that TSL should be removed but wait and see what GCRP propose as the next steps in resolving TSL (SA).
We should see if the industry workgroup ratifies the recommendation (CM). The workgroup may bring another action.
The recommendations will be final once we produce the workgroup report (SA).
The GCRP have asked Tom Derry (GCRP Secretary) to raise (SA).

Action (SA): Comments to be made on the draft GCRP minutes to accurately reflect that any further work on Two Shift Limit will be progressed outside of the EBSG.

6 Pump Storage Despatch

An agenda item raised by CM.
Looking to clarify some of the reason codes that have been used to indicate the nature of instructions given by National Grid.
Some reason codes were used because they were the only ones available – there was no specific code to match the requirement such as "LFSM instruction" (Limited Frequency Sensitive Mode) (CM).
When trying to settle, we do not have a definitive list of reason codes to use (SR).
Previously, when National Grid didn't want a unit on frequency response, the unit was given a non-frequency sensitive instruction, some time ago this was changed to be a LFSM instruction to reflect the fact that we would still want them to take independent action if the frequency had reached 50.4Hz. Now pump storage instructions are a combination of a BOA and an ancillary service instruction plus there's a different EDL instruction set for pump storage units (RP).
Use of existing reason codes will make it difficult to evaluate the nature of instructions. When looking at the replacement of EDL, we should be looking to change reason codes to better accommodate fast response (CM).

We need to understand why the Control Room is sending LFSM instructions (RP).
Is there a specific instruction to go to spin mode? (CM). Yes (RP).
Each pump storage provider probably has differing contractual terms which may not match the Grid Code (CM). They were different at BETTA go-live, but there's been convergence since then.
Grid Code Governance – the definitive document (JN). On the National Grid website.
As we agreed earlier, Foyers doesn't have a Firm Fast Reserve contract, so the situation we are taking about is a spin-gen instruction (RP).
A control room of 34 BMU's would prefer two understandable instructions (CM).
I support CMs argument and it needs to be reviewed (SR).
Further investigation required (SA).
Will the new system allow the generators to block load their dynamics? The concern is that if, during loading of dynamics, a unit is triggered, it's not clear if you're going to get paid. I'd like to have comfort that you get settled against what you delivered (CM).
For pump storage, it would be ideal to have two sets of dynamic data, one for normal operations, one for spin-gen (SR). The dynamics don't change in time, they just depend which mode you're in. It's a lot of work to manually load each time.
Agreed, to toggle between the two sets would be ideal (CM).
We need to understand if this is within the scope of EBS (CP).
Currently in pump storage despatch, there are transition tables that show which parameters need to be taken into account and define "what is the delay before your unit changes output". Some of what you're suggesting might be covered off by making changes to the transition tables (RP).
In response to a question by JN, CM said spin-gen is when the unit is run up to speed but not generating.
The more general issue of different parameter sets for different operating modes sounds like configuration modelling for CCGTs and Cascade Hydros (RP).
If CM can provide examples, we can review and see if this applies to other pump

storage generators as well (RP).
Shouldn't these pumped storage transition times be published as part of transparency (JN)? They are related to Ancillary Services, so there may be a confidentiality issue, though we have recently started to publish
BM Start-up prices on the NG website, so may be we should look to publish this data too? (RP).

Action: CM to forward pump storage "reason code" email to RP
Action: RP to discuss "reason code" email internally and report back.

Action: CM to speak with SR to correlate a joint submission addressing the adequacy of the information available regarding pump storage reason codes and forward to RP.

7 Review of Timeline

RP presented the new layout of the timeline. One consideration before system go-live is to review the Data Validation and Consistency rules as there may be a need to make some minor changes.
JN, CM, and SR are not aware of any changes that need to be made to the Data Validation and Consistency rules. RP said there might be some, like the Submission Maximum Date taking account of ABB's registration and EDT/EDL sub-systems working on a operational day basis, which would mean that this restriction would be relaxed so that data could be submitted for the current and the following five operational days.

In terms of post-go-live activities, can't we schedule uncontroversial changes (e.g. ten ramp rates, time-varying SEL/SIL) in one release soon after EBS go-live, then have subsequent releases for more controversial or complex functionality that has yet to be specified (CM)? RP agreed and would look to update the plan to reflect this.

9 Proposed meeting dates

To discuss the workgroup report. Document to be circulated by at least a week before the next meeting. Next GCRP 18 July (papers day 11 July).

Proposed date for next EBSG: Tue 3, Wed 4, Thu 5 July.

Action: Members to advise NS of availability for proposed meeting dates.

10 Next Steps

Action: JN, CM & SR to propose definitions for unit-based station synchronising and de-synchronising intervals.

Action (SA): Comments to be made on the draft GCRP minutes to accurately reflect that any further work on Two Shift Limit will be progressed outside of the EBSG.

Action (CM, RP): CM to forward pump storage "reason code" email to RP and RP to discuss internally and report back.

Action (CM, SR): CM to speak with SR to correlate a joint submission addressing the adequacy of the information available regarding pump storage reason codes and forward to RP.

Action (ALL): Members to advise NS of availability for proposed meeting dates.

11 AOB

None.