

Minutes

Meeting name	Electricity Balancing System Group
Meeting number	3
Date of meeting	9 th November 2011
Time	10:00 - 15:00
Location	National Grid Wokingham

Attendees

Name	Initials	Company
Shaf Ali	SA	Chair, National Grid
Ben Smith	BS	Technical Secretary, National Grid
Robert Paterson	RP	National Grid
Guy Philips	GP	E.ON
Hannah McKinney	HM	EDF (by phone)
John Norbury	JN	RWE
Paul Coates	PC	RWE
Scott Keen	SK	Intergen
Christopher Proudfoot	CP	Centrica
Simon Peter Reid	SR	Scottish Power (by phone)
Graham Bunt	GB	EDF
Campbell McDonald	CP	SSE
John Lucas	JL	Elexon

Apologies

Name	Initials	Company
Joe Warren	JW	RLTec
Darren McCann	DM	Logica
Martin Mate	MM	EDF

1 Approval of Minutes from the last meeting

SA went through previous meeting minutes.

JN asked whether there was a wholesale review of OC2, having received a letter from National Grid suggesting a review was going to be carried out. View was that the transparency guidelines at European legislation will need to be in Grid Code.

SA suggested that what is at European legislation will be incorporated once the comitology process has been concluded, this is expected to start early 2012.

JL suggested it may be 6 months after comitology to implement changes

PC suggested this should be raised as a potential risk for this group

SA suggested this sat within the more general risk around changes within industry already contained within the groups ToR's

JN Concerned that with potentially short time scales additional requirements will be on generators to provide data that will be then made publically available

PC suggested there was some uncertainty on what they should do until they have the details of the requirements

RP agreed, and suggested a way forwards would be to put some more text on this and include in the risk register

JN suggested it would be desirable to have foresight of what the changes will be so it is not a shock when it comes in

Action SA to speak internally to get on risk register/ add some more detail to the issue

RP suggested the issue here is that with this size and complexity of project a moment in time needs to be chosen to freeze the scope of the system in order that it can be delivered and then to progress subsequent changes in later releases.

CP asked for clarity if there was a requirement within the new system for submitting OC2 data RP No

2 Review of Actions

Action number 5: Ongoing action

Action number 6: Captured under agenda item 3 of today's meeting

Action number 7: Ongoing

Action number 8: Ongoing

Action number 9: PC suggested that perhaps Grid Code wasn't clear enough on who is responsible for submitting data i.e. interconnector administrator. RP suggested this could be picked up with the other changes (house keeping) to flag up to the panel so that these can be discussed with all interested parties.

Action number 10: Closed

Action number 11: Subsequent meeting to get someone from Tx Access team to come along – not high priority.

Action number 12: Closed – email sent 20th Sept

Action number 13: There is capability in system to query current data and send back to user. RP has asked ABB to describe the functionality in this area and was awaiting their response. JN asked if NG knew what the screens will look like? RP said that where market participants had a computer-to-computer interface with EBS, then the screens would be determined by participants and their EDL/EDT software suppliers, however, where some data was submitted by web-page then participants would use the EBS web-pages. CP suggested it would be beneficial to have AS contract data in the system as it would have the correct data to start from.

Action number 14: Captured under agenda item 4 of today's meeting

Action number 15: Closed as Scott Keen present

Action number 16: Roll over action - CM to send over name of interested party for future use and will also speak to Seabank to confirm if they would similarly be interested in joining.

3 EBS IT Subgroup

JN suggested that an additional paragraph was needed to address what the aim/objective of the group was

Action RP to add in objective to ToR to reflect the aim/ objective of the group

RP advised NG was looking to undertake computer to computer testing and this could also provide an opportunity to test the web pages.

PC advised early site of these to allow for comments to adjust/ influence these

RP suggested the desire was to provide functional documents to the industry to allow for comments and feedback.

PC suggested that the BMRA will need to have a release when the new interfaces go live

RP suggested a discussion between NG and Elexon would also need to take place regarding any changes that may be required to the BMRA/SAA interface as a result of new or revised data items supported by the new industry interfaces.

4 Industry Feedback on Data Forms

RP went through slides (previously discussed at the meeting held on the 19th September)

SPR asked if we would still have faxes as a backup incase the system went down.

RP said yes.

Discussions based on the reactive power capability fax sheet embedded in presentation

HM said that her company supported the proposed changes and was looking to have the existing Grid Code forms revised as soon as possible.

CP asked whether there was a need to include a TAP number on the form. RP said no as the detailed information wasn't used and the fact that it was a tap restriction that prompted the change in capability could be noted in the comments field.

JN suggested that it would be useful to make it clear what data the contents of the fax would revise as it only became clear to him recently that it was the MSA data, rather than the OC2 data.

Action RP to adjust the wording in the form to include that the revision is to the MSA data

CP thought an additional data item would be required to ask whether the Automatic Voltage Regulator remains in service and does this change the voltage, in particular for TAP's that become stuck. RP said, that for the electronic version of the form only, he was proposing that participants could submit whether their AVR was in service or not.

CP thought it emphasised the need to get the forms right, by having the MSA data engraved within the new forms

PC asked if there was a list within National Grid of all the BMUs with NG names or for power park modules names. Doesn't know where to go on NG website for a list of these, but though it would be useful particular at power park module .

RP advised through the ABB system you would be able to submit your own data and see all the names of your own units.

PC thought it would be useful to have transparency of all the unit names.

SA asked whether something like this was available on the BSC site.

JL advised that at a lower level than BMU size (so that of power park modules or generating units) it wasn't

RP said that he thought that all the units that National Grid had data for were listed in the spreadsheet on the Electricity Summary Page of BM Reports.

On the form for frequency response data (labelled Appendix 4)

JN advised it would best to remove the sentence...please provide brief description of reason for unavailability of frequency Sensitive Mode (e.g. testing, technical problem)

RP said, on reflection, that the permitted combinations of frequency response were probably not required. CP agreed as the contractual values are rarely, if ever, changed.

PC asked to clarify whether this form would have contract data from the MSA contained within it and whether a trail of submission would be visible.

RP advised the ABB system will provide back to the user what the current system holds currently. He also advised that the data for frequency response capability was simpler than that for reactive power, essentially being a yes/no per contract mode (or all contract modes) and that participants may not want to return to contractual values as it would make long-term-unavailable modes such as enhanced capabilities on oil units available for instruction.

RP advised the complexity of the requests to revise Black Start contract data fell outside of the scope of the EBS system

CP asked if there would be acknowledgement of submissions of data and whether this will be validated

RP agreed the system would acknowledge receipt and would accept or reject the submissions based on validation rules. EBS would send the acceptance or rejection message back to the participant.

Under other relevant data

Station Synchronising & Desynchronising Intervals (SSI & SDI) RP advised that where there is a single value for each station there wouldn't be a problem having a requirement within Grid Code to provide this.

Action RP based on comments received on all the forms above, work up a revised version of these and put together into a future Grid Code change.

5 Multi-shaft BMU modelling

CM suggested that a sub group of experts be set up to address and feed back in recommendations for taking this forwards.

SA suggested given time constraints this issue is further discussed at a future meeting

6 Two – Shift Limits

CM suggested that the group should invite Eggborough to a future meeting to discuss this and move the issue forwards.

RP suggested that a grid code mod could be put forwards where the points of view are put forward and Ofgem officiates the decision.

SA suggested one option could be to go back to GCRP and suggest a joint group be established to define a resolution.

JN suggested that by limiting the number of start ups rather than shutdowns would ensure a gen would then have more choice on when it is called on rather than having to stay connected as in today's TSL.

RP suggested a mechanism is agreed that can be taken back to GCRP to resolve this.

SA suggested that a consultation on options authored by EBSG to look to get consensus from industry on some of the issue currently being discussed around TSL.

Action CM to invite Eggborough to the next EBSG meeting.

SA suggested that the consultation focuses on TSL's – in terms of timing its not regarded as being urgent.

Action NG to draw up skeleton Consultation

7 Next Steps

Next meeting is to be scheduled for mid December, group's preference to meet up on 13th December 2011 – To be confirmed via email with draft minutes.

8 AOB

No other issues raised.