

Minutes

Meeting name	Electricity Balancing System Group
Meeting number	2
Date of meeting	19 th September 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
John Norbury	JN	RWE
Paul Coates	PC	RWE
Joe Warren	JW	RL Tec
Christopher Proudfoot	CP	Centrica
Simon Peter Reid	SR	Scottish Power (by phone)
Graham Bunt	GB	EDF
Campbell McDonald	CP	SSE
Andrew Greaves	AG	EDF

Apologies

Name	Initials	Company
John Lucas	JL	ELEXON
Darren McCann	DM	Logica
Martin Mate	MM	EDF

1 Approval of Minutes from the last meeting

SA went through previous meeting minutes. Agreement made by the group to review these for future meetings via email following circulation by BS.

PC asked whether the IT/IS group would be established as per previous discussions, citing that early establishment would be desirable.

SA suggested that it would be important that the IT/IS subgroup would have dialogue with the EBSG working group to ensure continuity.

Action: RP to provide outline ToR's for the IT/IS group.

Action: SA to obtain a list of existing industry IT/IS contacts held by National Grid

Action: All to provide BS with nominations from organisations for the IT/IS group

JN asked if it was possible to have clarity of the responsibilities relating to the submission of Grid Code data by Interconnector Users.

Action: National Grid to look at what the codes say about user obligations, including those of Interconnectors Users, for submission of data.

CM suggested that EBSG also monitors developments with European legislation and the impact these may have on the EBSG work.

JN also suggested that the European Transparency Guidelines could also have a fundamental impact on data requirements.

2 Review of Actions

Action number 5: BS went through a draft timeline. The group agreed it would be useful to continually review this and suggested the following could be added:

- Milestone's of key IT changes, including EBS go-live
- Infrastructure update dates
- Participant testing dates

Action: BS to update timeline and continue to review with the group

Action number 1: RP described the current options of providing SEL/ SIL data. Two options were discussed, the first a 'slope' effect, the second a 'step' effect, defined by start and end times.

CP asked whether the new system could support both methods? RP suggested the 'slope' effect would be more complex, but would offer more options/ flexibility

SR suggested it would be worth asking the System Operator if they wanted the additional information.

CP suggested a further option could be to move to a more graphical view rather than a static

data point.

RP summarised by proposing that the groups views seemed to suggest that the preferred option would be the 'slope' version.

PC suggested the change would need reflecting in the BMRA documents too.

Action number 2: SA advised the group this would be covered under agenda item 4 of the meeting

Action number 3: HM advised the group having spoken to a non BM STOR provider that the user had a single system that was dated. RP asked what technology might replace SRD (what does this stand for? Standing Reserve Despatch system) – suggesting smart metering could be one possible option.

GB asked if this could be done via a simple web page .

JN suggested that if the user wasn't a signatory of the CUSC or Grid Code then it would fall outside of the remit of the EBSG work as it was being funded by TNUoS charges. CM suggested there are a number of parties that are compliant and would need to be considered. RP suggested this may fit lower down the list of priorities but was still important to explore. SR suggested for non-BM STOR providers there could be a forum to explore alternative options that allowed participation in a timely manner (i.e. web based application). GB suggested perhaps critical systems should be focussed on with a later discussion to be held for non critical systems. RP suggested this was not dependant on the size of the provider.

Action: RP to speak to the contracts team to convey the group's view that non-BM STOR providers would like to be consulted when the options to replace the SRD system are being considered.

SA suggested the group should continue to monitor this.

Action number 4: CP said that a couple of their units would be capable of providing a Maximum Generation service, but the fact that it involved separate data-flows to those of BM data made him question whether it was worth participating. CM suggested the new electronic system may open up use for maximum generation data going forwards and thought it would be beneficial going forwards. CM said that in future many units would be constrained by the TEC they had purchased and thought there would be a future for a service that allowed available generation to be accessed.

JN asked if National Grid's contract team could provide clarity for the group here.

RP suggested the previous understanding was that the Maximum Generation service would decline with the closure of the majority of the ex-CEGB coal and oil-fired stations; however following these discussions the feeling is that there seems to be a future for a service of this type.

Action: RP to speak to the National Grid Transmission Access team and report back to group.

3 Draft Code Amendments

BS went through slides previously sent to working group members.

RP advised he didn't think that OC2 Run-up and Run-down rates were impacted by the

proposal to move to ten ramps and nine breakpoints for use in the Balancing Mechanism, instead it was the Balancing Code section of Grid Code that would need amending.

Various attendees questioned whether OC2 Run-Up and Run-Down Rates were submitted by TOGA, or used by National Grid. It was proposed that the group determine whether these are submitted and used, and if not, to remove the reference within OC2 as part of a house keeping modification.

JN noted that, as the version of the Data Validation and Consistency Rules is recorded in the entry in the Grid Code Glossary, a formal Grid Code modification would be required to modify them.

4 Draft Data Forms

RP went through slides (circulated to members post meeting)

RP Suggested that the revised MVAr Data within Lead/Lag entries needed further points of clarity to ensure users understand what is required.

CP advised it would be desirable to have a receipt of confirmation when NG receives the forms, furthermore some data validation rules would also be desirable.

HM suggested a comments section would be helpful to allow users to add clarity to some data fields.

JN asked if the document could be made clear that it was an adjustment to the data. CP added it would also be beneficial if the MSA (full wording? Mandatory Services Agreement) data could be engraved into the forms as the default value.

Frequency Response Data

RP advised that only data could be accepted that was within the boundaries of what was in the MSA .

JN asked if it was possible to see a typical MSA appendix

Action: RP to send out a MSA appendix to the group.

Revised Black Start data

GP advised that this could improve the way of submitting data

5 Principles of Reactive Power Instructions

RP went through slides (circulated to members post meeting)

6 Other Relevant data

SSI, SDI & CS

The view of the meeting was that Station Synchronising Interval, Station Desynchronising Interval and Minimum Notice to Cancel a Synchronisation should be incorporated in the Electricity Balancing System and be promoted to formal parameters within the Grid Code Balancing Codes.

Two Shifting Limit

RP said he was keen that the group focused on what the future requirements were for

parameters, rather than the past when demand and generation patterns were more predictable.

CP expressed concern with the outcome of GCRP's conclusions on two shift limit. RP suggested that it would be sensible to leave industry to debate the arrangement relating to current IT system at GCRP. JN and GP noted their support of the discussions at the GCRP.

CM view was that two shifting a unit over the early afternoon brought with it risks of not meeting their PN's over the evening peak when imbalance prices were at their highest and consequently his company did not offer National Grid this option.

JN supported the move to avoid National Grid and Industry having to bear the cost of keeping units on as they don't want to or like to come off.

CP thought that generators should be rewarded for offering flexibility

CM suggested there was a need to define what we wanted going forwards and a need to address how many times the generator could come on over a longer period i.e. months rather than within day. He also stated that the number of unit starts was a safety issue, and therefore within his company the only person who could revise the two shifting limit was the station manager. CM supported generators being true to their plants' limitations at all times and National Grid's actions should not force them to violate them. He suggested the topic is revisited at a later date.

7 Firm Frequency Response, Firm Fast Reserve and STOR Operational Data

JN suggested users would benefit from having a default value in the fields. RP suggested the system will be able to store the data it has for users.

JN suggested it would be useful to see what data National Grid has similar to existing online internet sites, i.e. stored address details. This then allows the user to log in and change any necessary fields.

Action: National Grid to see if the system is capable of providing this.

Action: Industry members to provide feedback (at next meeting or by e-mail) on the proposals for Reactive Power, Frequency Sensitive and Revised Black Start Contract data, Reactive Power instructions, Other Relevant Data and FFR, Firm FR and STOR data.

8 Next Steps

Next meeting is to be scheduled for 2nd week in November 2011 preferably on Tuesday/ Wednesday/ Thursday.

Action: BS to send reminder out for IS/IT subgroup membership together with draft ToRs (previous action)

9 AOB

CP to speak to InterGen/ CM to speak to Seabank regarding interest in joining the subgroup looking at multishaft BMUs.