

Independent Market Operator  
IMO Procedure Change and Development Working Group

---

Minutes

---

Meeting No. 9

Item	Subject	Action
------	---------	--------

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>Management's Commissioning and Testing PSOP but the Chair advised that the same definition could not be applied in the IMO's procedures due to the way that System Management had defined it.. Mr Andrew Everett also questioned whether the IMO had a definition of 'upgrade'.</p> <p><i>Action Point: The IMO to consider including a definition of</i></p>	

Item	Subject	Action
------	---------	--------

the order of sub-steps (a) and (b).

*Action Point: The IMO to reiewthe wording in step 2.6.1(b) and*

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>Mr Rhodes requested that the IMO review the term 'reputable firm of solicitors' in step A3.6.</p> <p><i>Action Point: The IMO to review the term reputable firm of solicitors' in step A3.6.</i></p> <p>Mr Gould mentioned that the appendices are more general in nature and could perhaps be guidelines as opposed to being part of the specific Market Procedure. The IMO noted that it would need to review and consider whether the guidelines would be legally enforceable.</p> <p><i>Action Point: The IMO to assess whether the appendices of the Reserve Capacity Security Market Procedure could be presented as guidelines rather than part of the Market Procedure. In undertaking this assessment the IMO to consider whether the guidelines would be legally enforceable.</i></p>	<p>IMO</p> <p>IMO</p>
5.	<p>MARKET PROCEDURE FOR REGISTRATION OF DEMAND SIDE PROGRAMMES AND THE ASSOCIATION OF NON DISPATCHABLE LOADS (TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS)</p> <p>Ms Edmonds explained the reason for the transitional Market Procedure and Mr John Nguyen provided an overview of the Market Procedure. Mr Nguyen outlined the Market Procedure and invited any comments/questions from Working Group members.</p> <p>The Chair advised the Working Group that due to tight timeframes on RC_2010_29 (Curtailed Loads and Demand Side Programmes) the IMO requested out of session comments on this proposed Market Procedure by 4 April 2011.</p> <p>The Chair noted that the Market Procedure will be updated to reflect correct website URLs in steps 2.1.5, 2.2.3 and 2.3.2.</p> <p><i>Action Point: The IMO to update the Market Procedure to reflect correct website URLs in steps 2.1.5, 2.2.3 and 2.3.2.</i></p> <p>In response to a question from Mr Rohrlach Ms Edmonds explained that an NDLP can only be associated with one DSP at a time.</p> <p>In response to a question from Mr Rohrlach Ms Edmonds clarified that facilities registering prior to 1 October 2011 (not under the transitional arrangements) will have to operate under the current rules.</p> <p>Mr Geoff Down questioned whether a DSP can be split if it is currently linked to an existing DSP. Mr Nguyen informed the Working Group that this can be done, however, participants will need to notify the IMO of their intentions during the transitional period. .</p> <p>Mr Pablo Campillos questioned that whether an applicant, who is the owner of the Curtailed Load, would need to provide the IMO with evidence of a contract with themselves. Ms Edmonds responded that the IMO will need to be notified that of the owner</p>	IMO

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>but this is something the IMO should take into account.</p> <p>The Chair advises the Working Group to review this Market Procedure in detail and discuss with operational staff if necessary and respond to the IMO within one week.</p> <p><i>Action Point: Working Group members to provide anyout of session comments on the Market Procedure for Registration of Demand Side Programmes and the association of Non Dispatchable Loads to the IMO by 4 April 2011.</i></p>	Members
7	<p>GENERAL BUSINESS</p> <p>No general business was recorded at the meeting.</p>	
8	<p>NEXT MEETING</p> <p>The next Working Group meeting is to be advised.</p>	
9	<p>CLOSED</p> <p>The Chair thanked all members for attending and declared the meeting closed at 4:25pm.</p>	