

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

Attendees		
Name	Initials	Company
Campbell McDonald	CM	SSE
Guy Phillips	GP	E.ON
Isobel Squire	IS	Elexon
John Lucas	JL	Elexon
Lisa Waters	LW	Waters Wye
Nick Sargent	NS	National Grid (Technical Secretary)
Peter Knight	PK	Centrica
Robert Paterson	RP	National Grid
Shaf Ali	SA	National Grid (Chair)
Simon Peter Reid	SR	Scottish Power (by phone)

Apologies		
Name	Initials	Company
Christopher Proudfoot	CP	Centrica
Dan Webb	DW	Seabank
Graham Bunt	GB	EDF Energy
John Norbury	JN	RWE
Joe Warren	JW	Open Energi
Mari Toda	MT	EDF Energy

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.
--------------	---

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	Workloads of members have delayed this action. CM, GB, and SR will provide an indicative matrix ahead of the next meeting. Indicative matrices to be provided ahead of the October meeting.
Action 12/21	CM to forward pump storage "reason codes" email to RP and hold discussion before next meeting due to unavailability ahead of meeting #9. Also part of action 12/22. See additional comment below after this table. Open.
Action 12/22	SR and CM to discuss in support of action 12/21. Open.
Action 12/23	RP to review EDL instruction codes and information to identify relevance to Pump Storage generation See additional comment below after this table. Closed.
Action 12/24	RP to include the requirement to obtain the future roadmap for EDL in terms of connectivity as an action for the EBS IT subgroup See additional comment below after this table. Closed.
Action 12/25	RP and NS to trial the use of Live Meeting prior to the next meeting See additional comment below. Closed.

Action 12/21:

CM will hold a meeting to identify a wish list of reason codes with SR and others. Short presentation will be given at the next meeting by CM and SR. This forum to decide if the issue goes to MSM meeting due to similarity?

ACTION: SR/CM to make small presentation at the October EBSG meeting.

Open.

Action 12/23:

The NETA Despatch Instruction Guide on nationalgrid.com (Grid Code>Associated Documents) is a lightly modified version of an internal procedure. The internal procedure does not cover pump storage for historical reasons. National Grid does have its own internal user guide for the pumped storage despatch software. RP has extracted the sections of interest and sent them to CM and SR. SR and CM thought these very good and met with the requirements. RP copied this to Simon Lord of First Hydro. For EBS, there will be one generation despatch facility and one internal procedure covering all types of generator. An external version will be made available of this internal procedure.

Closed.

Action 12/24:

Completed by RP. Internal meeting to be conducted on 14 September 2012
Issue will sit with IT subgroup.

Closed.

Action 12/25:

In use and tested with SR.

Difficulty with landscape documents to be resolved (use original versions, not pdf's).

Closed.

3 SI, DI, and LTCS consultation

Consultation is in progress with responses due by 21 September 2012 (SA).

Contained the two options – continue with current position until EBS can accommodate the requirements or, formalise sync and desync interval at station level now and change to unit level later (RP).

No further discussion as consultation ongoing.

4 TSL Update

Original recommendation by EBSG, and accepted by GCRP, was not to take TSL further although GCRP requested additional work to give further consideration of the issues surrounding the use of TSL (SA).

National Grid went to see Eggborough Power Limited on 26 July 2012 to discuss TSL, with National Grid finding the meeting very useful to understand operation and plant limitations (SA).

Discussions brought back and followed-up internally resulting in the decision to undertake a separate consultation, although mindful of the EBSG recommendation not to take this further (SA).

In order to ensure a balanced approach, consultation will contain legal text to formalise TSL or completely remove from the Grid Code (SA).

The consultation will not be presented to the next GCRP in September 2012. The initial intention was to bring the draft consultation to next month's EBSG then take it to the following GCRP in November 2012. (SA)

In order to speed up the consultation, would EBSG be happy to review via email? (SA). Yes.

Does it need to come back to EBSG? (CM). This means we get back into the debate again. As this is a GCRP consultation, it does not need formal EBSG input. However, given EBSG's previous involvement, the consultation may benefit from further input from the EBSG.

LW asked for an explanation from National Grid about the use and acceptance of dynamic parameters. Eggborough have been using other dynamic parameters to signal their limitations and had a call from Grid to say "we think you're misleading us". What is National Grid's expectation, especially if you remove the TSL parameter from the Grid Code? (GP,LW).

What does National Grid want us to do to indicate limitations, it has to be clear? (LW).

The whole area has not been clear since last July's paper¹ was issued by National Grid. This has not been helped by the fact the issue is still ongoing despite National Grid's stated position in the July paper(SA).

Are the operational shifts in the Control Room aware of the requirements and work "as one" in their understanding? (CM).

There are discrepancies with how the Control Room request and use data (PK).

¹ The Grid Code Associated Document 'Two Shifting Limit July 2011' can be found on <http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Electricity/Codes/gridcode/associateddocs/>

There's a need to maintain good working relationships between National Grid's and stations' operational staff, plus National Grid need to know that a unit intends to start up to assist in meeting demand – it is no use if we force log a BOA if the unit is not prepared to start up (RP).

If the Authority elected to remove TSL, there would be a position to use other parameters to indicate availability (RP). A letter could also be sent out (if TSL were to be removed) to trading points to make it clear that TSL had been removed from the Grid Code.

Make sure the Authority is aware that if TSL is removed from the Grid Code, which parameters generators will use to indicate their operational regime (LW). This is to prevent Ofgem asking why a generator took a particular action (e.g. a high price), and as such, minimising our regulatory risk by bringing this type of situation to the attention of the Authority.

We need to be clear what we're supposed to do if we don't use TSL (LW).

What would have been seen by the Control Room prior to contacting Eggborough is a generator changing price and parameters – there's nothing that directly tells them that this is to control the number of two shifts they are subject to (RP).

Is the Control Room aware of the specific discussions that have taken place over TSL? (LW). They are aware that they should not be taking notice of TSL and that generators may use other parameters to control their number of two shifts (RP).

We have obligations to despatch in cost order so if parameters indicate the cheapest unit, we should schedule that unit on (RP).

Two debates could arise: Control Room checking if a unit could run a second time in a day, and Control Room seeing short term price and parameter changes and not understanding why (RP).

Are Control Room shifts aware of their own guidelines? They are but there is no flag on the price and parameter changes saying these are linked to TSL (RP).

There seems to be hierarchy of parameters that National Grid wants us to use and if we don't, we get a phone call to tell us what to do (LW).

If there is a preference, tell us in writing and we'll comply (LW).

We'll update the weekly control room guidance document to advise the Control Room not to be surprised if Eggborough changes parameters at short notice because this is what National Grid's earlier paper² tells them to do (RP).

As an industry, we should all be working to the same understanding and we don't appear to be, especially from the side of the Control Room (LW).

For the consultation option of removing TSL from the Grid Code, National Grid should explain what generators are supposed to do subsequently (GP).

DECC are clearly looking at the Capacity Mechanism to consider plant availability (GP).

Is National Grid going to make a recommendation in the consultation? (GP).

Probably not but will depend on the consultation responses (SA).

What is the Grid Code process, does the consultation go to working group? (CM)

Not formally as this is now a GCRP-level consultation (SA).

Is TSL still the right name for this parameter? (JL).

Definition is updated version of existing Grid Code definition (RP). People as used to the existing name, so suggest not changing it (RP).

Would be worth getting a view of the idea of "plant built before..." meaning plant built before a certain date, for example 2014, uses TSL, plant built after this date is encouraged to be flexible, particularly with increasing levels of renewable generation ? (RP). It's important to give all the information we can for Ofgem to make a decision (RP).

No, those that don't want to comply with this would use other parameters anyway

² As per Note 1.

(PK).

Be careful, there has been debate of this as a technical parameter over the life of plant (CM).

View of this meeting, for TSL option, is not to incorporate the “plant built before..” option (RP).

Are there any specific plant characteristics defined as requiring TSL? We should ask (LW).

Balancing Framework Guidelines says there should be no priority for different generation types, including renewables (SA).

Draft consultation to be sent to GCRP and EBSG for comment (RP).

Get a view from next week’s GCRP to see if they want to see it before formal publication (SA).

Send it to everyone (LW).

Makes sense to get comments before formal publication (RP).

ACTION: SA to send draft TSL consultation to GCRP and EBSG distribution lists (subject to feedback from next week’s GCRP).

5 Update from 22 August Multi-Shaft Modelling Subgroup

PK, JL, CM and Simon Amos were present (RP).

The main action, in terms of configuration modelling, was to work up a straw man proposal of what it would look like as it is difficult to define. JL took the action and completed it. Simon Amos is now working up assessment criteria of the adequacy of the straw man that can be brought back to EBSG and GCRP (RP).

When will this be brought back to EBSG? (SA).

It won’t be at the next meeting due to it being rather complicated (RP).

Was this to be sent to the BSC Issue Group? (SA).

Group no longer exists but can be reopened, usually when a proposal requires further consideration (JL). May not apply in this case as the proposal is quite clear.

What’s the timeline? (CM).

Due to the complexity of modelling, will take some considerable time (RP).

6 Review of Project Plan

Part 1 data changes would be addressed approx 6 months after EBS go-live (RP).

A second release for Part 2 data changes of unit sync, de-syncs, TSL would occur after a further 6 months (RP).

A third release around Part 3 MSM data changes may occur after a further 6 months from the Part 2 release but this is not confirmed (RP).

Plan gives a good indication of the project activities (SA).

Part 1 and 2 changes may not require consequential changes to the BSC but Part 3 changes would feasibly result in a BSC mod (RP).

There would be cost savings in the BSC systems if Parts 1 and 2 changes were submitted early on. For this to work, a decision to undertake Part 2 would need to be taken earlier (JL).

A change proposal would be undertaken for Parts 1 and 2 (RP, JL)

A decision to go ahead with Grid Code modifications about a year before Part 1 was delivered would be of assistance to the BSCCo (JL).

National Grid is in the fortunate position that systems have been built in readiness for Part 1 whereas Elexon doesn’t have this position (JL).

The IS changes probably have more flexibility than the industry code modifications (RP).

BSC modifications are less flexible, and tied to three releases a year (LW). We would not expect to be tied to an implementation date if such a date was not in the interest of the industry (JL).

Even with industry support, Elexon would not be happy to place orders with IT providers to support something that has not yet been approved by Ofgem (JL).

The most difficult aspect of a Grid Code modification is including a firm implementation date (RP).

The BSC Panel will need the Ofgem decision before agreeing to fund system changes but a Grid Code implementation date may not be required (LW).

Completing the Grid Code modifications to cover these releases should be undertaken sooner rather than later (SA).

For Part 2 sync, de-sync, LTCS, we will be asking Ofgem for a decision without having an implementation date (RP).

Are we moving on to the testing of the main release this month? (CM).

A new release from ABB will be delivered later this month which will need to be installed and checked before contacting EDL/EDT suppliers to undertake type testing (RP).

Testing proposals are being written for an IT meeting at the end of September (RP).

7 Proposed meeting dates

Wednesday 24 October 2012 – suitable for most attendees.

8 AOB

First Electricity Balancing SCR meeting held by Ofgem and LW flagged up to Ofgem that they need to consider not just prices but technical aspects too. Asking attendees to be aware of developments and how they impact the various sizes of generators (LW).

Grid Code working group looking at power available/high speed shutdown. To be aware that this could link into the EBS system (GP).

Awareness within National Grid (RP).

Should we be aware of automatic generation control within EBS? (CM).

Remote control of generators by the System Operator is being discussed at a European level and could be obligatory for generators. Refer to Article 9 of Requirements for Generators, Clause 2. (CM).

All of Europe has this but GB doesn't (RP). Elsewhere the AGC module is attached to the SCADA systems, but that is for historical reasons and if it were to be implemented in GB, then it would probably be attached to EBS and use the EDL communication links to the stations (RP). National Grid are starting to look at the pros and cons of AGC and we did ask the industry some questions about AGC in the first industry consultation (RP).

9 Next Steps

ACTION: SR/CM to make small presentation addressing the pump storage reason code actions at the October EBSG meeting

ACTION: SA to send draft TSL consultation to GCRP and EBSG distribution lists (subject to feedback from next week's GCRP).