

Minutes

Meeting name	Offshore BMU Configuration Working Group
Meeting number	3
Date of meeting	7 th December 2011
Time	11:00 - 15:00
Location	St. Catherine's Lodge, Wokingham, RG41 5BN

Attendees

Name	Initials	Company
Graham Stein (Chair)	GS	National Grid
John Towie	JT	National Grid
Tim Truscott	TT	National Grid
John Norbury	JN	RWE
Jane McArdle	JM	SSE
John Lucas	JL	Elexon

Apologies

Name	Initials	Company
Steve Curtis	SC	National Grid
Mick Chowns	MC	RWE
Sarah Graham	SG	ScottishPower Renewables

1 Introductions & Apologies for Absence

1. Mick Chowns, Sarah Graham and Steve Curtis sent their apologies.

2 Agreement of Previous Meeting Minutes

2. The minutes from the previous meeting, held on October 18th, were briefly discussed. The following correction and addition were to be made;

- Paragraph 31, textual error when referring to codes - error corrected within approved minutes
- Attachment of Gwent Y Mor example for inclusion in Working Group report.

Action: JN & JT to reconstruct Gwent Y Mor example suitable for inclusion within Working Group report.

3 Review of Progress Against Actions

Action: TT to draw up proposal on linking PPM configuration to BMU for discussion at next meeting.

3. Proposal circulated prior to, and presented at, meeting - see *Working Group Discussions*.

Action: TT & GS to confirm if there is a link between ownership boundary and settlement metering point

4. A note was drawn up by GS and TT discussing if there is a link between ownership boundary and settlement metering point, however, was not distributed prior to the meeting.
5. TT summarised the contents of the note to the Working Group; making reference to Section K of the BSC, with the boundary point defined as 'any flows onto the Transmission or Distribution system' and with one BMU to import/export point, he believes there is a link.
6. JL furthered the conversation by highlighting that there is a BSC mod - '236 or 237' - which determines that metering doesn't have to be on the boundary point as long as imports/exports from a particular BM Unit are distinguishable. TT added that he believed the BMU metering point was intended to be the boundary point; though this could have developed due to the BSC mod identified by JL.

Action: TT/GS to update note to reflect modification identified by JL and circulate to Working Group.

4 Working Group Discussions

Discussion of proposal on linking PPM configuration to BMU

7. The three options to capture the PPM/BMU relationship discussed in the proposal were;
 - Telemeter all of the switchgear that can affect the configuration of the site
 - Extend the PPM Matrix to include the BMU that each PMM is part of
 - Change the PPM Matrix so that it becomes a BMU Matrix
8. TT opened discussion by highlighting that Section 7.2 of the BCA specifies the plant within PPM requirements. GS queried whether, for the proposal to put in place a BMU matrix that explicitly ties PPM to BMU, whether 'we already have the required information within the PPM

matrix and BCA'. This was the case, however, the information was not held through a 'real time' document which is a proposed requirement. GS queried whether the PPM Matrix and BCA combination could be used to capture the range of possible configurations which the Working Group decided could be possible, though the number of possible configurations would have to be looked at further due to the likelihood of being too numerous.

9. GS posed the question as to whether an updated PPM/BMU Matrix would have to be submitted, by the generator, as and when PPM arrangements change. TT indicated that if telemetering was utilised, as per his proposal, then National Grid would 'see' that the PPM arrangement had changed. However, if telemetering was not in place then National Grid would expect to receive an updated PPM/BMU Matrix (for indication of available reserve levels, for example).
10. TT furthered the discussion by stating that if National Grid controlled the busbar and/or switching, then they would have all the information they required via the PPM matrix or telemetering in place - though highlighted that his proposal did not cover how National Grid would inform the Generator if they chose to reconfigure. However, if the Generator has the responsibility of controlling the switchgear, a matrix which explicitly tied PPM to BMU would be required.
11. This prompted a query from JN as to whether turbines out of service would technically require submission of a new matrix. TT responded that major changes would definitely require a resubmission and that clarification of instances when resubmissions are required should be further considered. Brief consideration was given to using TOGA as a means of capturing these restrictions and a second submission as a means of demonstrating configurations; however, the idea was set aside on the basis of identifying a simpler method (i.e. one which involved the need for only one submission). Telemetering was also briefly highlighted as a possible solution to know the active turbines per module, however, this idea was similarly set aside due to associated cost and that National Grid would prefer to know in advance of turbines becoming out of service.
12. The Working Group agreed that options 2 or 3 were currently the preferred options. Option 2 was seen as the simplest implementation by the Working Group whilst still meeting the most Working Group requirements.
13. JN voiced that seeing a draft of a possible PPM/BMU Matrix would be useful. GS volunteered National Grid to draft a proposed PPM/BMU Matrix suitable for use in the Grid Code and the subsequent code change requirements that would arise from its implementation.

Action: GS & TT to draft a proposed PPM/BMU Matrix & draft subsequent Grid Code change requirements.

Discussion of possible issues with proposed PPM/BMU Matrix

14. TT raised concern that PPMs regularly do not seem to be named in submissions at present - to be compliant, PPMs have to be named. JL asked if denoting which BMU each PPM belongs to (i.e. explicitly indicating 'belongs to BMU 1') would be enough, as opposed to giving each PPM a name, to which TT indicated he would assume so.
15. GS highlighted that currently the definition of a BMU sits purely in the BSC and not in the Grid Code - definition of BMU in Grid Code 'refer to BSC' - where a potential PPM/BMU Matrix would be placed. GS also added the original intention was to establish a PPM to BMU tie through the BCA. At present the BCA does not establish this however and the Working Group feels that referring to a BMU in the Grid Code, through the required changes as actioned in paragraph 13, would be appropriate.
16. TT queried whether knowing the number of turbines per BMU would remove the need to know per PPM, to which GS replied that in the Grid Code, the reactive requirements for example are defined per module - therefore, the number of turbines per PPM would need to be known.

17. JN stated the lack of use of the current PPM Matrix (as a means to communicate configuration changes) is a concern and that the development of a PPM/BMU Matrix may create more similar problems - i.e. the requirement of high quantities of resubmissions for minor reconfigurations would be seen as too onerous. Brief discussion was given to therefore setting limits/guidelines as to when resubmission are required - i.e. for 'major' reconfigurations.

Alteration of 'Maximum Export Limit (MEL)' field within PPM Matrix

18. JN initiated discussion as to whether it would be more useful to National Grid for the 'Maximum Export Limit (MEL)' field to be;
- Substituted for a 'Number of Turbines Available' field.
 - Altered to a 'non wind corrected' figure.
19. The reason given was that the 'wind corrected' MEL value as given in the current format would 'just track PN' and either of the above two alternatives would therefore provide more practical information. Discussion concluded with GS stating that he felt this was outside the scope of this Working Group - a separate Working Group existed for this purpose - and that the goal should be to look at a means of information exchange that contained a PPM to BMU relationship within.

Interaction with other (similar) Working Groups

20. Expanding on the previous discussion point, GS posed the question to the Working Group as to whether the PPM/BMU Matrix should capture;
- Configuration changes only
 - Configuration changes plus additional information around wind availability, MEL etc
21. GS went on to add that he felt the second option was potentially infringing on other existing Working Groups (Electricity Balancing Systems and Managing Intermittent Generation) and was possibly broader than scope. JN expressed that he would prefer there to be overlap between the Working Groups as they touch on similar areas of interest to a generator.

Clarity of, and progress against, Terms of Reference

22. Item 7 should be altered to state 'information exchanged by both NGET and Users'.
23. Item 8 should be removed as it adds no additional relevance to scope.
24. Item 10, bullet point number 2 should be altered to state 'by the NETS System Operator and Users'

Action: GS to update Terms of Reference.

25. Regarding progress towards Item 10, the first bullet has been discussed by the Working Group and bullet points 2 and 3 will be satisfied via drafting of a PPM/BMU Matrix.

For inclusion in Working Group report

26. To conclude Working Group discussions, JL summarised key items for inclusion in the draft Working Group report;
- Clearly document, via diagrams, the two types of switching which should feed into P240 legal text redrafting.
 - Gwent Y Mor example and key discussion points of Working Group around this.
 - TT's diagram showing relationships between BMU, Power Park Modules, Generating Units etc - as presented at Working Group meeting number 2.

5 Additional Notes

SG Pre Meeting Comments to TT Proposal on linking PPM configuration to BMU

27. With regards to item 3 on the agenda, when considering Tim's note I would suggest that the use of telemetered switches would be an onerous requirement considering the likely frequency of BMU configuration changes. The use of an extended PPM matrix or BMU matrix would be a more suitable approach and I think either would meet the requirements. If one of these approaches is adopted, would it be necessary for the generator to pre-register the potential BMU configurations with NGET to ensure that they were all technically/operationally acceptable? Would this be facilitated by the submission of all possible matrix configurations?

6 Agreement of Next Steps

28. Drafting of Working Group report for discussion at next meeting which includes the items described in paragraph 26.

Action: GS & TT to produce draft report.

29. Drafting of PPM/BMU Matrix and subsequent Grid Code changes for discussion at next meeting.

Action: GS & TT to produce draft matrix.

30. Completion of other individual actions identified.

7 Next Meeting

Logistics

31. Next meeting is to take place on Tuesday 14th February and is to be held at Wokingham - room booking confirmed.

General Actions to be Completed during Next Meeting

32. Discussion of draft Working Group report, identifying suitable refinements for Final Working Group report.
33. Discussion of draft PPM/BMU Matrix and subsequent Grid Code changes, identifying any required refinements.
34. Discuss and agree approach to interaction with other Working Groups.