

Minutes

Meeting name	Electricity Balancing System Group
Meeting number	14
Date of meeting	17 April 2013
Time	10:00 - 15:00
Location	Walters 3, National Grid Wokingham

Attendees

Name	Initials	Company
Campbell McDonald	CM	SSE
Dan Webb	DW	Seabank
Joe Warren	JW	Open Energi
John Lucas	JL	Elexon (dial in)
John Norbury	JN	RWE
Lisa Waters	LW	Waters Wye
Nick Sargent	NS	National Grid (Technical Secretary)
Robert Paterson	RP	National Grid
Sally Lewis	SL	National Grid
Shaf Ali	SA	National Grid (Chair)
Simon Peter Reid	SR	Scottish Power (dial in)

Apologies

Name	Initials	Company
Christopher Proudfoot	CP	Centrica
Damien McCluskey	DM	National Grid
Graham Bunt	GB	EDF Energy
Guy Phillips	GP	E.ON
Mari Toda	MT	EDF Energy
Peter Knight	PK	Centrica

Introduction

SA welcomed the attendees and introduced the agenda. No additional items were requested.

1 Approval of Minutes from the last meeting

Minutes of the February meeting were agreed.

2 Review of Actions

11/05: Review of Project Plan

To be discussed under agenda item #6.
Ongoing.

11/11: Max Generation data

To be arranged when other EBS issues have been cleared off.
Open, low priority.

13/01: Amendments to February meeting draft minutes

References to “Steve Curtis paper” removed.
Closed.

13/02: Frequency Response Fax Form wording

Wording reviewed by National Grid and to be discussed further under agenda item #4.
Closed.

13/03: Generator availability for Frequency Response

RP raised the question with Andy Walden (National Grid) regarding the consistency of declaring frequency response availability at a generating unit level and the definition of plant configuration factor in the Ancillary Services contracts and elsewhere.

Andy Walden’s view was that he could see no contractual reason as to why the plant configuration factor cannot be applied to represent either the unit being shutdown or running but unavailable for frequency response.

JN suggested it seemed inconsistent and at odds for frequency response to be declared on a generating unit basis when it is currently declared on a module basis and asked how will we declare under the new EBS system, particularly as unit data is not kept because it’s not required under the Grid Code?

RP responded that at times of low demand, frequency response was a scarce commodity and that there were secure, economic and efficient reasons for providing availability at the generating unit level as per the existing Grid Code fax form.

CP proposed that generators should be able to make whole module and also generating units unavailable.

Closed.

ACTION: RP took an action to look at the options for being able to declare on both a module and generating unit basis. (13/12)

13/04: Definitions for new and legacy interfaces

Wording reviewed by National Grid and to be discussed further under agenda item #5.
Closed.

13/05: Automatic logging devices

To be reviewed as part of agenda item #5.
Closed.

13/06: Industry newsletter

RP has been in discussion with Jane Oates (National Grid). The issue of providing a

newsletter is in progress with a publication date being considered around May. LW was concerned that the requirement for a newsletter is dragging out and asked if something could be produced earlier than May, perhaps an email, giving an update to; EBS status, testing, party involvement, and other relevant information, rather than a link to the Project Plan. In general, a brief overview of where the project is would be useful (DW).

Open.

ACTION: RP will progress this as a priority with a target date of May. (13/06)

13/07: Implications of EBS on new connections

RP has been discussing with the BM Unit registration team leader to make sure that new generators are made aware of the implications of EBS as part of a new connection. This will also include embedded generators who are not BM Units but may wish to be (RP to LW).

For clarity, this is also a good example of where a newsletter would be beneficial (LW).

Closed.

13/08: Re-synchronisation of Units after being bid off

Grid Code text for managing the re-synchronisation of units following being bid off by National Grid has been drafted for review under agenda item #5.

Closed.

13/09: Other Relevant Data that is taken into account by the Control Room

RP presented a slide on Managing Other Relevant Data detailing various items received over time. A number of BM Units also notify Two Shift requirements for being resynchronised after being BOA'd off.

The slide also raised the question as to whether notifications of frequency response upper and lower limits were, in practice, Other Relevant Data.

CP was against upper and lower limits suggesting this gave some users commercial advantage. JN agreed. As far as the Grid Code is concerned, SEL is not defined and so the only obligations fall under BC3.

JN suggested that obligations under BC3 in the Grid Code should be taken out and placed into the contract documents. This may offer efficiencies for the whole industry.

Closed.

ACTION: RP to raise the group's concerns as a separate action regarding upper and lower limits for frequency response within National Grid and to report back to the group (13/13).

Closed

13/10: Key milestones from the IT subgroup

See comments under 13/06.

Open.

ACTION: RP will progress this as a priority with a target date of May. (13/10)

13/11: Use of Day Ahead Dynamic Parameters

A letter was submitted to the Grid Code and Operational Forum distribution lists, and later published on the website¹, advising that Day Ahead Dynamic Parameters are not used by National Grid and no longer need to be submitted by participants. JN expressed his appreciation to National Grid for addressing this point and publishing the open letter.
Closed.

3 Draft TSL Guidance

SA advised that a meeting was held with Eggborough on 25th March 2013 in order to gain feedback on the Two Shift Limit Guidance document (which was subsequently incorporated in the Guidance document), and that National Grid would now like to receive additional comments from the EBSG on the Guidance document before presenting it to the GCRP and Ofgem.

There was some confusion over the example in the Guidance document which RP explained further.

CP suggested it would be easier for everybody to change one parameter rather than the proposed two parameters. Yet this would depend on what you're trying to achieve (RP).

LW asked for another example just using the "on time" and the impact this would have on plant margin calculations, or if it creates a margin measurement issue?

RP advised that margin assessment would take this into account.

LW asked if using these parameters had an impact on REMIT, particularly MZT. Flagging availability via MZT rather than MEL may address Ofgem's concern regarding the affect on REMIT.

This would depend to what extent a parameter is used for a genuine engineering reason (JN). The purpose "to manage the number of starts" needs to be clearer. For example, the Guidance makes no reference to the timescales for managing the number of starts.

SR agreed with JN. This needs to refer to BM time frames.

JN suggested that the introduction may need a preamble to clarify the move away from TSL and "x" starts in a day (CP).

There may be a number of reasons which will affect these parameters. It's not a rolling window, but a snapshot of one operational day (SR).

The paper is clear on what to do in the absence of TSL (LW).

It is not for National Grid to manage starts over a long term, but only over a short term as part of the SO function. The concept of a start at 04.59 being ok, but not at 05.01 is a BM problem that needs to be solved (CP SR).

The Guidance could refer to operational timescales (SA).

Discussion over availability scenarios continued.

There have been a number of attempts to compartmentalise this over the years but basically a unit is limited to a number of starts between maintenance outages (RP).

This is about signalling to the SO on how to manage a number of starts that a unit is subject to (LW) and needs to be more comprehensive in order for it to be closed off (JN) however we are in danger of making this more complicated than necessary.

We should work with what we agree on and focus on the number of starts (SA).

¹ <http://www.nationalgrid.com/NR/rdonlyres/17D7CC76-F468-4586-A42B-13803A0FA88D/60077/OpenletterD1DynamicParametersv10.pdf>

We should be clear in the paper and have suitable guidance from National Grid. These parameters are being changed by generators' Operational Room staff who may not be fully conversant with the process. This issue arose because Eggborough was not being despatched in accordance with its dynamic parameters (LW).

ACTION: RP to revise the TSL Guidance document to include a scenario where only one parameter (MZT or MNZT) is amended. (13/14)

Another dimension is that this is only looking at operational timescales but in general, plant might reach the "start" position it needs after a few months (JN).

Control Room staff across all shifts must be suitably updated with requirements and changes to ensure consistency of approach (CP).

The next step in the process is to send this Guidance to the GCRP via email following changes that have been highlighted here (SA).

4 Reactive and Frequency Response Fax Form Information

RP said he had reviewed the wording relating to generating unit on the Frequency Response fax form in accordance with action 13/02 and thought that it was acceptable. He advised that the Genset id for OC2 Output Usable (OU) submissions was referenced on the fax as National Grid and Generators already have names for generating units in a module, which they use to communicate the start and finish times of generation outages via the TOGA system.

JN would be surprised if OU data was being sent on a genset basis. This is the issue with using a fax submission that's trying to identify a unit that's not even registered. Can we clarify what "used for OC2 output submissions" means?

ACTION: RP to look up the Grid Code reference to where it refers to submissions on a genset level. (13/15)

Post-meeting note – they are referred to in OC2.4.1.2, but Generating Unit or Synchronous Generating Unit are probably better terms than Genset.

JN and CP suggested that a genset could be a module or a generating unit which cross refers this action to action 13/12.

5 Dynamic Parameters Consultation

SL presented four new definitions which RP explained to the meeting. These definitions serve to address undefined existing terms within the Grid Code.

RP agreed with JN's point that the definition for Automatic Logging Device did not currently cover the issuing of Emergency Instructions and it needed to.

EDL and EDT will still be needed under the new system until all participants have transitioned to the new EDL* and EDT*.

JN asked if the new definitions should include "pursuant to the requirements of BC2"?

ACTION: RP and SL to include clarification and reference to BC2 for instructions and BC1 and BC2 for market and ancillary service data submissions. (13/16)

SA explained that this presentation was to give a flavour of the legal text following comments received from the last EBSG meeting in February.

RP presented the text in response to action 13/08, and used it to support the “Managing Re-Sync” diagram. He explained the diagram and took questions around various scenarios. It is intended that the presented text is elaborated upon following comments and then submitted for insertion into the Grid Code as part of the Dynamic Parameters consultation.

The text needs reviewing before input from the legal experts, followed by drafting of the consultation document. It is planned to have reviews undertaken by the next EBSG meeting so that EBSG attendees can advise agreement or otherwise prior to drafting of the consultation.

Dynamic parameters would now only be referred to in the main body of BC2, rather than both BC1 and BC2 at the moment (RP). In that case the appendix to BC1 which provides the definition of the dynamic parameters should be moved to BC2 in order to ensure ease of reference (LW/JN). Reference to non-legacy EDL/EDT facilities can also be removed where superfluous (DW).

ACTION: RP/SL to amend the text to move the Dynamic Parameter definitions from the appendix of BC1 to BC2 and remove superfluous references to non-legacy EDL/EDT Facilities. (13/17)

ACTION: RP/SL to finish drafting the dynamic parameters text, obtain legal input, and present back to the next EBSG in June (13/18).

6 Review of Project Plan

RP presented the Project Plan and advised that EDL cutover is now late November 2013.

This version of the Project Plan was updated Monday 15 April 2013 and is now on the website.

SR asked if much testing has been completed as feedback received suggests otherwise. Does National Grid know where the hitches are?

We are making progress – there a few issues that have arisen when type testing with some suppliers’ EDL and EDT systems, mostly as a result of the change of the operating system at the National Grid end. In general, these issues have either been resolved or are on their way to being resolved (RP).

JN suggested it might be useful to circulate such changes to industry representatives that are working with National Grid on the project. RP advised that changes are circulated to the IT subgroup and an IT technical contacts list.

New market entrants and small companies would not be included in this circulation. This is where the Newsletter becomes important (LW).

ACTION: SA – to use the Operational Forum distribution list to distribute information on EBS updates in order to capture more parties. (13/19)

In response to JN, the MS Project plan as presented, is now more useful and up to date in showing key milestones. National Grid is inclined to continue using this as a medium that is suitable for both managing internal activities and external communications rather than update the original Key Milestones chart which is only used for external communications and may get out of step with the MS Project plan (RP).

ACTION: RP – to draft a plan that detailed the activities required to introduce the new industry interfaces EDT* and EDL*. (13/20)

7 Next Meeting Date

Thursday 06 June – National Grid, Wokingham.

8 AOB

JN said he would appreciate a more detailed understanding of the intended timescales for progressing the issue to consultation, Responding to this question, RP/SL said they would work to finish drafting the dynamic parameters text and obtaining legal input for the next meeting. The only remaining activity would then be the drafting of the consultation text and questions, which was expected to be reasonably straightforward.

ACTION: RP/SL - To finish drafting the Grid Code dynamic parameters text and to have it reviewed by National Grid's legal department (13/21)

SA stated that, as part of the ongoing re-organisation within National Grid, there may be changes to individual roles and attendance at the EBSG. LW suggested that it may be useful to share the new organisational structure with the industry.

9 Actions and Next Steps

13/03

RP to look at the options for being able to declare on both a module and generating unit basis. (13/12)

13/06

RP - to progress the industry newsletter by May. (13/06)

13/09

RP to raise the group's concerns regarding upper and lower limits for frequency response within National Grid and to report back to the group (13/13).

13/10

RP - to add IT subgroup key milestones into the industry newsletter aligned with 13/06. (13/10)

Draft TSL Guidance.

RP - to revise the TSL Guidance document to include a scenario where only parameter (MZT or MNZT) between non-zero PNs is amended (13/14)

Reactive and Frequency Response Fax Form Information

RP - to look up the Grid Code reference to where it refers to submissions on a genset level. (13/15)

Dynamic Parameters Consultation

RP and SL to include clarification and reference to BC2 for instructions and BC1 and BC2 for market and ancillary service data submissions. (13/16)

Dynamic Parameters Consultation

RP/SL - to amend the text to move the Dynamic Parameter definitions from the appendix of BC1 to BC2 and remove superfluous references to non-legacy EDL/EDT Facilities.. (13/17)

Dynamic Parameters Consultation

RP/SL - to finish drafting the dynamic parameters text, obtain legal input, and present back to the next EBSG in June (13/18)

Project Plan

SA - to use the Operational Forum distribution list to distribute information on EBS updates in order to capture more parties. (13/19)

Project Plan

RP – to draft a plan that detailed the activities required to introduce the new industry interfaces EDT* and EDL* (13/20)

AOB

RP/SL - To finish drafting the Grid Code dynamic parameters text and to have it reviewed by National Grid's legal department (13/21).