

**OC1 / OC2 Working Group**  
**Minutes of the second meeting**  
**16 November 2004, Brandon Hall**

**Attendees**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>
John Greasley (JG)	National Grid (Chair)
Shafqat Ali (SA)	National Grid (Secretary)
Patrick Hynes (PH)	National Grid
Phil Sheppard (PS)	National Grid
Chris Rogers (CR)	National Grid
Gareth Pearce (GPe)	National Grid (Interconnectors)
Neil Sandison (NS)	Scottish and Southern Energy
David Ward (DW)	BNFL
John Capener (JC)	British Energy
Garry Pickering (GP)	E.ON UK
John Norbury (JN)	RWE
Andy Burke (AB)	RWE
Paul Ward (PW)	United Utilities
David Hunt (DH)	OFGEM (Observer)
Ijaz Rasool (IR)	OFGEM (Observer)

**1 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

- 1.1 JN clarified the minutes as follows:
- 1.1.1 Paragraph 3.2: The “zero-based” approach, as discussed at GCRP, referred to ‘starting with a blank sheet of paper’ rather than ‘do nothing’.
- 1.1.2 Paragraph 5.1.1: The phrase “and that CEC, a BMU parameter, is more relevant” should be removed.
- 1.1.3 Paragraph 6.1.1: Whilst provision of OC1 data might be in accordance with section Q of BSC, the related statement in the OC1 Review document does not exist in the current version of OC1.
- 1.1.4 Paragraph 6.9.4: The reference to generators should be replaced with Users.
- 1.1.5 Paragraph 6.9.6: The reference to generators should include suppliers or should be replaced with Users, and that the demand management events were not limited to a few events per year.
- 1.2 **Action: SA to circulate electronic copies of the OC1/OC2 Review documents.** [Post meeting note: electronic copies circulated on 22 November 2004.]

## **2 ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

- 2.1 *SA to revise paragraph 3.5 of TORs:*  
Completed - revised TORs circulated to the Working Group on 28 October 2004.
- 2.2 *Action: CM to justify zonal data requirement for other zones:*  
To be picked up at the next meeting.
- 2.3 *PS to consider mechanisms for monitoring quality of OU submissions:*  
PS stated that this would be discussed as part of the OU discussions within this Working Group.
- 2.4 *Working Group members to consider PS's papers and come back with comments at the next meeting.*  
Completed.

## **3 FEEDBACK ON OC2 FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT**

- 3.1 Purpose
  - 3.1.1 NS commented that references to NGC Transmission System should be to GB Transmission System.
  - 3.1.2 JN stated that the current provisions in paragraph OC2.2 capture the objective of OC2 more appropriately and should be retained.
  - 3.1.3 In response to a query from JC, JG stated that the focus of the Working Group is on exchange of information under Grid Code, and that issues associated with the presentation of information to the market would be considered separately under BSC.
- 3.2 Scope
  - 3.2.1 GP stated that the scope needs to clarify how the new OC2 provisions would apply to Interconnector Operators. PS added that, rather than assuming a figure for Interconnector flows, information is required from Interconnector Operators on the actual capability of Interconnectors. DW stated that the 'Moyle' Interconnector does not sell capability (TEC) and hence cannot submit OU data. PH responded that OC2 submissions are about physical availability rather than commercial capability.
  - 3.2.2 JN queried whether an OU submission could be made even if TEC was zero. PH responded yes. GP confirmed that OC2 does not require that OU can only be submitted if TEC was available. PH stated that, whilst there is such a requirement in section 3 of CUSC, the CUSC issues are outside the scope of this Working Group. Further comments were made about the interactions between TEC and CEC, OU and MEL, and their impact on OU submissions.
  - 3.2.3 GP stated that Users need further guidance regarding their obligations on OU submissions, particularly for the timing of first OU submission for a new plant.

- 3.2.4 PS explained that NGC interprets the short term OU data for its own use by taking into account the TEC level but the data published on BMRS is an aggregation of OU submissions without any interpretation of this data by NGC. JN expressed surprise at different treatments of the data and queried whether the associated information received by generators was also devoid of NGC interpretation and hence 'not good'. PS responded that NGC did not impose its interpretation on this data and hence the resulting information was as good as the OU submissions. PS questioned whether the obligation to interpret OU data (i.e. to 'cap' OU using TEC) should reside with NGC or with Users.
- 3.2.5 GP queried whether a revision to the OU definition was within the remit of the Working Group. JN responded that the definition of OU is clear but the published OU data is not. DW responded that the definition of OU is not entirely clear, particularly in relation to OU associated with wind generation. PS stated that it might be useful to publish different categories of OU, and these categories could include wind generation, Interconnectors etc. DW agreed.

### 3.3 Outage Co-ordination and System Security Analysis

3.3.1 'Purpose': No comments.

3.3.2 'Generator to NGC':

- DW questioned the reasoning for NGC requiring information on 'reduction in capacity' rather than OU. JN also preferred OU to 'reduction in capacity', the latter, JN stated, seemed to be a new obligation. PS agreed to change the text accordingly. **Action: PS to replace 'reduction in capacity' with OU.**
- PS also agreed to clarify requirements for OU data and Generating Unit outages. **Action: PS to clarify requirements for OU data and Generating Unit outages.**

3.3.3 'Network Operators to NGC': NS queried whether the requirement was to provide a positive figure (i.e. generation availability) or a 'reduction' in availability. PS confirmed that it was the former; in response to another query regarding interactions with LEEMPS, PS confirmed that the 'Network Operators to NGC' data flows were linked to the ongoing work on LEEMPS.

3.3.4 'NGC to Users': JN stated that the NGC should "circulate", and not just "prepare" the Annual Outage Plan. PS agreed to make the necessary change. **Action: Replace 'prepare' with 'circulate' in the paragraph on Annual Outage Plan.**

3.3.5 'NGC to Generators': JC queried whether the proposed replacement of 'coordinate' with 'liaise and agree' was a tightening of the text. PS responded that the latter was more rigorous but did not change the current obligations.

3.3.6 'NGC to Network Operators': No comments.

### 3.4 Operating Margins and Reserve

3.4.7 'Purpose': GP queried whether it was possible to align the OC2 and BMRS zones. PH responded that it, whilst it would be desirable to align

the two zones, it is necessary to understand the purpose of these zones. PH also commented that the OC2 zonal boundaries are designed to take into account constraints, disposition of power stations and confidentiality of each Generator's OU position. PH further commented that whilst the SYS zones are fixed, OC2 zones are revised on a regular basis. JN asked which zones are relevant for the published data. PS confirmed that the published data was based on OC2 zones. In response to a query, JG agreed to check whether BSC has a map of BMRS zones. **Action: JG to check whether BSC has a map of BMRS zones.**

3.4.8 'Generators to NGC': No comments.

3.4.9 'Network Operators to NGC': No comments.

3.4.10 'NGC to Generators':

- JN considered that the zonal OU and margins data should be available to all generators, even for zones where a generator does not have a power station. JG questioned the rationale for requiring data in other zones. GP responded that a generator may have its customers/suppliers in other zones. JN stated that the availability of all zonal data to all generators would lead to greater transparency. PH stated that the burden of providing additional information is also relevant for NGC, as has been stated from the perspective of generators. JN stated that the provision of all zonal data to all generators by NGC would not lead to additional burden on NGC, and that the main issues is whether all zonal information should be available to all generators. JG felt that it would be more satisfactory, and non-discriminatory, to provide all zonal information via BMRS.
- PH agreed with JG and stated that all the suppliers should similarly have access to all zonal demand data, and that this too should be provided via BMRS.
- AB suggested that the Working Group should await input from CM who originally requested zonal data for 'other' zones.

3.5 Technical Data

3.5.1 No comments on this section.

3.6 Appendix 1

3.6.1 JG commented that, at the last meeting, the appendix to OC2 was considered beneficial [and hence should be retained].

3.6.2 DW requested a confirmation that the revised timescales did not extend beyond year 2. PS confirmed that this was the case, although year 2 is in fact the third year if the current year ('year 0') is considered the first year.

3.6.3 PH commented that any changes to the prevailing timescales could have an impact on SO-TO Code (STC).

3.6.4 PH also commented that NGC could draft the legal text to allow the appendix to be incorporated in DRC. DW preferred the appendix to remain within OC2 rather than in DRC.

### 3.7 Appendix 2

3.7.1 PS commented that the contents of this section had not changed since NETA and stated that NRAPM was required by NGC in the shorter timescales but no for the longer timescales.

3.8 Issues – to be covered elsewhere in the Grid Code or deleted

3.8.1 No comments on this section.

3.9 New or Revised Terminology

3.9.1 JN commented that a debate was required on the definitions of dynamic parameters. PS agreed.

## 4 FEEDBACK ON OC1 FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT

4.1 NGC undertook a number of actions to explain and justify its OC1 information requirements. **Action: PS to circulate a paper to the Working Group, covering the following:**

- A definition and explanation of CDM;
- Justification for requiring CDM information;
- Definitions of 'National' and 'GBSO' demand with reference to 'normal' conditions, Average Cold Spell, Average Hot Spell etc.;
- Teleswitching and OC1 demands

## 5 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

5.1 The next meeting of the Working Group will be held on 19 January 2004.