



SEM Programme Managers Group

Meeting # 12

3rd April 2007

ESB Head Office

Attendees:

1. Ben Pinches (BP) – SEM Programme Office
2. Clodagh O'Neill (CON) – SEM Programme Office
3. Ken Murray (KM) - SEM Programme Office
4. Paul O'Neill (PON) - SEM Programme Office
5. Barry McCarthy (BMC) – SMO Programme Office
6. Carol McCarney (CMC) – Airtricity
7. Todd Bessemer (TB) - SMO Programme Advisor
8. Neil Bingham (NB) – VP&E
9. Bill Carey (BC) – VP&E
10. Aidan Keely (AK) - BGE
11. Brian Dowd (BD) - ESB
12. Alan Birch (AB) – NIE
13. Ciaran Doran (CD) – ESB Customer Supply
14. Brendan Barry (BB) – ESB PowerGen
15. Hugh Mullany (HM) - Regulators
16. Fergal Egan (FE) - Eirgrid
17. Terence McGovern (TMG) – Synergen
18. Deirdre Powers (DP) – Regulators
19. Ian Wright (IW) - Airtricity

1. Minutes from PMG Meeting # 11

The minutes from meeting #11 were approved without comment.

2. PMG Action List

Action 52 – On-going. The presentation of future release strategy is to be scheduled in mid-May.

Action 56 – Open action.

Action 63 – Closed. Overtaken by workshop.

Action 93 & 94 – Collate into one action

Action 95 – Closed. BP and DP taking forward.

Action 99 – Closed. Change request has been approved.

Action 100 - Closed

Action 101 – Closed

Action 102 – Closed

Action 103 – Closed. Included in the BNE Peaking Conclusion document.

Action 104 – Closed

Action 105 – Ongoing

Action 106 - Ongoing

3. TSO Programme Plan

- 3.1 Site testing is complete. All environments have been set up. Critical path activity is running to schedule.
- 3.2 Market training is going well.
- 3.3 The MPUD was issued on 30 March 2007.
- 3.4 TSOs are aiming to get CCQT scripts out on 5 April.
- 3.5 All participant data sets have been sent out for review. Most participants have signed the market trial agreements.
- 3.6 Market trial working group meetings started week commencing 26 March.
- 3.7 BC advised that the training has been well received. The next phase is for registration testing: BC explained that advance notice would be helpful as their key resources are required to go on these courses.
- 3.8 *New Action - TB to follow up on training schedule and specific dates (action 107).*
- 3.9 AK queried whether the MPUD will be re-released. TB advised this will occur on 27 April. There is some detail yet to be resolved.
- 3.10 BB advised that the FPIT testing phase is well received. He asked, however, whether there was any provision for FPIT in the period after the start of Market Trial? TB stated that there was currently no provision, as all current plans focussed on all participants being ready for the start of Market Trial, but he would look into what might be facilitated in the enduring period.
- 3.11 *New Action – TB to investigate what support could be provided for FPIT in the period, beyond the start of Market Trial (i.e. during the trial, and post-go-live). (action 108).*
- 3.12 TB advised that the FPIT will test all input interfaces, but it is not guaranteed that all reports will be available. This is discussed in the paper on FPIT distributed to PMG prior to the meeting.
- 3.13 *New Action – SEM PO to update traffic light with substituted dates tabled by TB (action 109).*

4. Traffic Light Report:

- 4.1 AK requested end dates for other testing i.e. any date that impinges on SEM Go Live (any workstreams i.e. TSO's, SIMDRACS) should be included in the traffic light report.
- 4.2 *New Action - Other end testing dates to be added to traffic light (action 110).*
- 4.3 BB asked what changes were being made to the operations scheduling and dispatch processes, and how any systems were being certified for compliance with the T&SC.

TB advised that:

- The operations scheduling and dispatch processes are not governed by the T&SC, but fall under the auspices of the Grid Code. As such, there is no need to certify compliance with T&SC.

- A Reserve Constrained Unit Commitment (RCUC) tool is being implemented, as a decision support tool for the system operators. Ultimately, however, the operators retain final discretion in the determination of the running order, and actual dispatch (as they do today)
- Any changes to these process that fall outside the TSOs' discretion would be promoted through the Grid Code Review Panels in each jurisdiction.

4.4 BB requested whether an information workshop could be organised to discuss changes to operational processes. TB advised that specific technical detail would be dealt with through the previously discussed Grid Code mechanisms. TB undertook to investigate whether a more general presentation could be provided to PMG, but noted that this wouldn't happen in time for the next meeting. He also noted that Michael Preston had already had a number of conversations with station managers in the North regarding changes to operational processes (as these stations are more heavily impacted, with the move to EDIL).

4.5 *New Action - TB to investigate whether a presentation on changes to operations scheduling and dispatch processes can be provided to PMG (action 111).*

4.6 BD queried whether the RAs have reviewed their resourcing based on slippages of some deliverables. PON advised that the programme is resourced to deliver Go Live on 1 November.

4.7 Line 194: Delivery of SEM Regulation decision. BD sought assurance around the potential issues arising out of this date. PON advised that this has been escalated internally and has key focus at present. RA's aiming for 20 April for publication.

4.8 *New Action - RAs to review and revert with any implementation issues still under consideration (action 112).*

4.9 The Directed Contracts final contract is to be published this week.

5. Participant Readiness

5.1 Audits: Deirdre Powers stated that there is agreement from TSOs on the scope and work is to begin in May.

5.2 *New Action - DP to review the possibility of the TSO audit scope being published (action 113).*

5.3 Questionnaires are being finalised and will be put out for comment prior to 17 April. Formal questionnaires will be sent out end by 31 August and monthly questionnaires will also be issued.

5.4 PRC query log: There are 45 outstanding queries. Once the APs are finalised the other outstanding issues will be closed off.

5.5 The issues on the AIP website will be resolved by 6 April.

5.6 An information note on Transition is to be published next week. This will give a list of contracts, codes and licences.

Accession documents to be signed - 25th of September
 Transition documents – 3rd of July
 Self Certification Questionnaire – 5th of October

5.7 The APs are to be finalised between mid April and mid May. HM advised that the version of the APs published on 30 March are the most up to date versions.

5.8 BD queried whether the Go / No Go criteria are clearly set out in the Transition paper and whether weightings have been allocated to the criteria. DP advised that the approach paper does set out criteria and that each set of criteria will be gauged separately. BD expressed concern that participants would get a low priority if this approach was taken.

5.9 *New Action - DP to revert to participants on how criteria are being reviewed and scored (action 114).*

6. SIMDRACS

6.1 MDP Implementation continues with no issues identified with core deliverables (requirements or dates) – subject to two risks and one issue below.

6.2 Version 1.3 has been published (legal and technical clarifications) – SIMDRACS CRs have been produced which are due for formal impact analysis today

6.3 Informally the workstream does not believe there is anything in T&SC that has a material impact other than 8 CRs which will be proposed for formal approval on 3 April.

6.4 SIMDRACS Risks and Issues:

Risk: Design for the provision of demand sites with non-firm access

- Some temporary registration workarounds have been identified, but will require some bilaterals with Market Participants for Market Trial, and potentially depending on implementation into the start of market
- Meeting with SMO on Transitional Issues such as this today

Issues: Registration on a Trading Day basis in the central market systems (in hand)

- SIMDRACS have presented a paper to SEMIT on this, both in terms of the practicality of provision of partial days data, and the wider impacts of the Trading Day registration
- SEMIT have dedicated resources to this, and awaiting feedback. Update due today at the SIMDRACS Board

Risk: Agreed Procedure 1. Details provided from Hugh Mullany in table below (*Post meeting insert*)

Area	Transitional	Impact
Intermediaries	Yes	Affects form of initial registration
Licence	Yes	Affects form of initial registration
Trading Site Rules	Yes	Affects form of initial registration
RA324 Restrictions	No	Affects form of initial registration
SoLR Process	No	Post go-live process
(Issue) Trading Day / Settlement Day registration	Yes	Affects cut-over process
Multiple Participants due to VAT invoicing	Yes	Post go-live process
Multiple Participants due to Regulatory	Yes	Affects form of initial registration
Meter Data Provider process	No	Post go-live process
Changes to registration data before cut-over	Yes	Registration data needs to be under change management for successful cut-over

6.5 Participants queried whether there are any major change requests envisaged relating to SIMDRACS expected in June 07.

6.6 *New Action: HM to follow up on potential SIMDRACS CRs arising in June 07 (action 115).*

7. Market Simulation

7.1 PON explained that he is awaiting a formal request from participants on the scenarios for the simulation exercise.

7.2 PON advised that the intention was to run the scenarios through the ABB engine and publish the results. Participants would be provided with the inputs and outputs from the ABB engine which otherwise would not be available.

7.3 PON stated it was not the RA's intention to run the scenarios through Plexos. This option is of course available to the Participants.

7.4 NB was not in agreement with this. His understanding was that at the workshop there had been an agreement that the scenarios would be run on the ABB system and Plexos. PON stated

that there had been no agreement at the workshop and that he had raised concerns at the meeting.

7.5 KM stated that the RAs are not engaging KEMA or any other firm to carry out Plexos modelling of these scenarios. This was for each participant to consider and take forward.

7.6 AK stated that the requirement to run a comparative set of scenarios in Plexos had been an evolutionary requirement during the meeting, and stemmed from advice given by Mike Wilks during the meeting, that otherwise the averaging performed by Plexos in modelling (for instance the Directed Contracts) would make comparison with results from ABB. The agreement reached on a single set of scenarios was achieved with significant compromise from Participants, in the light of advice given on approach and the likely effort to develop and run the scenarios and a desire to specify a realistically achievable workload.

7.7 AK asked KM if he could explain the RAs rationale for not supporting this work. KM then stated that the RAs did not have the manpower to manage this work without increasing risk to their programme and it had been noted earlier in the meeting that the RA programme was already under significant resource pressure. Further the RAs did not have a workpackage covering this work or a contract in place with KEMA or any other consultant for such work.

7.8 AK then questioned why the RAs could not support this while they were quite happy to support the work on the ABB software, despite the earliest indications from TB that this would increase risk to the SEM IT project. DP stated that the central systems work could not be done by participants but only by the SMO. The modelling work on Plexos could be taken forward by participants.

7.9 KM stated that the RAs had no problem with participants organising this work on Plexos themselves. AK made the point that contractually this would be very difficult for a disparate group of participants to organise, which was why Participants would look to a central organisation to support this.

7.10 AK then questioned whether the SEM programme would be able to provide the management of this effort in conjunction with managing the associated work on the ABB software. TB stated that he would be concerned that justification of outcomes and comparison work between the two sets of outputs would cause the piece of work to extend in magnitude.

7.11 TB stated that he had not yet been provided with a list of the scenarios, and requested that this be provided promptly so that his teams could begin looking at cost and schedule implications of the work. NB undertook to issue the final list.

8. Risks and Issues:

Comments to be sent to BP on risk/issue log.

8. AOB

None

9. Next Meeting date and location:

Videoconference – 10:30am Tuesday 17th of April 2007. Respective venues to be confirmed nearer the time.