

Independent Market Operator

System Management PSOP Working Group

Minutes

Meeting:	8/2010
Location:	IMO Board Room Level 3, Governor Stirling Tower, 197 St Georges Terrace, Perth
Date:	Tuesday, 5 October 2010
Time:	Commencing at 3.00pm until 4.20pm

Members in Attendance		
Phil Kelloway	System Management	Chair
Peter Ryan	Griffin Energy	Proxy
Clement Chan	Verve Energy	Proxy
Wesley Medrana	Synergy	
Steve Gould	Landfill Gas & Power (LGP)	
Bill Bowyer	Infigen Energy	Proxy
Debra Rizzi	Alinta	
Michael Frost	Perth Energy	Proxy
Jacinda Papps	Independent Market Operator (IMO)	
Fiona Edmonds	IMO	
Shannon Turner	IMO	Minutes
Also in Attendance		
Grace Tan	System Management	
Neil Hay	System Management	
Gavin White	System Management	
Apologies		
Rene Kuyper	Infigen Energy	Member
Shane Cremin	Griffin Energy	Member

Item	Subject	Action
1.	<p>WELCOME</p> <p>The Chair opened the System Management Power System Operation Procedure (PSOP) Working Group meeting and welcomed members.</p>	
	<p>MEETING APOLOGIES / ATTENDANCE</p> <p>Apologies were received from Rene Kuypers (Infigen Energy) and Shane Cremin (Griffin Energy)</p> <p>The following other attendees were noted:</p>	

Item	Subject	
-------------	----------------	--

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>determined tolerance ranges, with the figures presented in the document intended to aid the Working Group's discussion.</p> <p>Mr Neil Hay opened the discussion noting the current informal practice of System Management applying tolerances. Mr Hay noted the the Rule Change Proposal: The use of Tolerance Ranges by System Management (RC_2009_22) will allow System Management to apply two tolerance levels for reporting purposes:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a general level (Tolerance Range); and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">the individual Facility level (Facility Tolerance Range).</p> <p>Mr Hay noted that the requirements to setting both the Tolerance Range and Facility Tolerance Range are specified in the Amending Rules resulting from RC_2009_22 which will commence 1 December 2010. Mr Hay noted that System Management was also required to outline further details of the process it intends to follow in determining the Tolerance Range and Facility Tolerance Ranges in the Power System Operation Procedure: Monitoring and Reporting.</p> <p>It was noted that there is already a Tolerance Range in the Market Rules (for settlement purposes).</p> <p>Mrs Papps noted that the Amending Rules will not change Market Participant's compliance obligations. Mr Hay outlined the difference between the accuracy of SCADA data and Meter Data and noted that the application of the tolerances will simply remove its obligation to report non-compliance within certain tolerance levels.</p> <p>Mr Hay noted that its intention was to develop the process for determining tolerances in conjunction with the Working Group prior to submitting the Procedure Change Proposal into the formal process. In particular, Mr Hay noted that System Management wished to seek the views of Working Group members on whether two types of Tolerance Range and Facility Tolerance Range were required; one for the real time output deviations and the second for ex-post deviations. Mr Hay suggested that there should be a wider tolerance for the real-time reporting and suggested 30MW but added this may be too high.</p> <p>Discussion ensued around the issue of ramping and the difficulty in meeting Resource Plans especially around the 9.30pm-10.00pm shoulder time. In particular, Mr Michael Frost noted that the use of Tolerance Ranges appeared to be a common sense approach to the identified technical issues. Mr Hay reiterated that a Market Participant will still be required to meet its Resource Plan and that they will still be subject to UDAP and DDAP. The tolerance will simply mean that System Management will not have to notify a Market Participant each time a deviation from its Resource Plan occurs when it is within the Tolerance or Facility Tolerance Range.</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>Mr Hay noted that SCADA was not as accurate as meter data and so System Management may otherwise flood Market Participants with instructions to return to their Resource Plans where it might be the case that actual meter data would show they were following Resource Plan.</p>	
	<p>Mr Bill Bowyer suggested that there may be scope of increasing the tolerances during transitional periods. Mr Hay noted that this would require a further change to the Market Rules and was outside the scope of the working group's consideration. Additionally, Mr Hay noted that even if System Management were to apply varied tolerance to transitional periods it would not remove the Market Participant's obligation to comply with its Resource Plan.</p>	
	<p>Dr Steve Gould questioned why System Management couldn't calibrate the SCADA data and the meter data for each Facility and use this instead to determine when a Facility is not compliant with its Resource Plan. Mr Hay responded that this was why they included an individual Facility Tolerance Range which would be annually reviewed. Mr Hay noted that System Management would work with Market Participant's to get their SCADA data as accurate as it can be.</p>	
	<p>A member questioned the obligations to get accurate SCADA data. The Chair noted that he thought that the accuracy requirement was for SCADA data to be within 2 or 3%, however agreed to investigate and report back.</p>	
	<p><i>Action Point: System Management to investigate and confirm the accuracy requirements of SCADA data.</i></p>	
	<p>Mr Hay explained that in addition to making unnecessary calls to Facilities, tolerance levels will also help it prioritise by calling the Facility with the biggest deviation first.</p>	
	<p>Mr Frost questioned what tolerance would apply for new Facilities. Mr Hay responded that new Facilities could be given a two month period during which the accuracy of SCADA data could be identified. Following from this it would be decided whether a Facility Tolerance Range would be required.</p>	
	<p>Mrs Papps questioned how System Management would work out the both the Tolerance Range and any Facility Tolerance Range. In response, Mr Hay noted that they currently had two figures in mind:</p>	
	<p>10MW – which would equate to the current exemption for a Scheduled Generator to not register as a Market Participant; or</p>	
	<p>30MW - this figure may however only beuseful for real-time data. Another smaller value may be required for any ex-post tolerance.</p>	
	<p>System Management noted the need for consultation on</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	whether both a real time and an ex-post tolerance should be	

