

**PLANNED OUTAGE COORDINATION PROCESS (POCP)  
INDUSTRY REVIEW  
MEETING MINUTES FOR 3<sup>RD</sup> MAY 2006**

**ATTENDEES:**

Mark Pearce (Chair)  
Rick Liew (Contact)  
Greg Salmon (Meridian)  
James Denham (Genesis)  
Brendan Olsen (Grid Owner)  
Greg Spence (System Operator)  
Alan Jenkins (ENA)  
Chris Sadler (Vector)  
Evan Boyt (Trustpower)  
Richard Clark (RedSpider)  
Stephanie Wenman (Project Manager)

**APOLOGIES:**

Grant Tuffery (System Operator)  
Ray Basher (Grid Owner)  
Tim Dobbs (Mighty River)

**MINUTES**

1. The Review Team noted that Evan Boyt is now representing Trustpower.
2. The minutes of the previous meeting were reviewed and accepted.
3. Greg Spence reported back on action point 3 from the previous meeting, relating to options for additional information to be included in the POCP database. Following further discussion, the following action points were noted:
  - a) **Stephanie Wenman** to update the POCP Users Guide to include information about all changes to the POCP database and Business Rules that have been agreed by the Review Team;
  - b) **Greg Spence** to arrange for the constraints information which is currently held on the System Operator website to be updated to the POCP database on a weekly basis;
4. The Review Team discussed the possibility of including an additional database field to publish which options from the System Operator "toolbox" were required to ensure that a particular outage did not become a "potential EGR issue". The toolbox options are:
  - a) Outage timing
  - b) Constraints requirements
  - c) Generation availability agreement
  - d) Load management agreement
  - e) Grid reconfiguration
  - f) Special protection schemes

Points noted from discussion on this issue included:

- 4.1 If the information is to be published, it should only state which option(s) are required, and would not include any further details.

- 4.2 If the information is to be published, it would be published for all asset owner outages i.e. not just for the Grid Owner.
- 4.3 The SO expressed strong concerns about the potential extra demand on SO resources that would result from publishing this information, both in responding to enquiries for further information or clarification, and in maintaining the additional information required in the database. However it was considered that no further information could be disclosed by the SO, to ensure a level playing field, so that enquiries need not be responded to. The SO remained concerned that its priority needed to be assessing achievement of the PPOs and that this was becoming an increasingly challenging task with most outages now requiring constraints and/or other measures to mitigate potential impacts.
- 4.4 It was also noted that most of the “tool-box” arrangements were being made by the Grid Owner and the analysis to identify requirements for these arrangements was fully funded by the Grid Owner and not carried out by the SO. The SO role is to review the arrangements once notified by the Grid Owner and to assess if the outage and any advised arrangements allowed the PPOs to be met.
- 4.5 The Grid Owner's view is that asset owners who are able to mitigate the effect of a transmission outage are already consulted by the Grid Owner, and therefore it is not clear what additional benefit would be gained by providing the additional information.
- 4.6 It was noted that in a constrained area of the grid, potential purchasers who have not been part of the consultation with the Grid Owner would not be aware of any commercial risk relating to a particular outage. The Grid Owner response was that the Grid Owner is concerned with security, not pricing.
- 4.7 Some Asset Owners were concerned that if the Grid Owner consults with individual participants about potential arrangements, that will give those participants a potential market advantage. Also concerns that the Grid Owner may not necessarily be consulting with all participants who could help to mitigate the effects of the outage.
- 4.8 Concerns were also voiced about the ability of smaller participants to access and understand information (and therefore risks) about a particular outage. Response was that it's not part of the role of POCP to help market participants identify and manage their commercial risks, rather to allow market participants to coordinate their planned outages to avoid unnecessary and avoidable security risk. The Chair noted that the risks and mitigation measures were generally complex and smaller parties needed to ensure they had the capability, or advice, to identify and manage any risks that may arise for them. It was also noted that the level of risk would depend on what form of contract small parties chose.
- 4.9 Asset Owners were concerned that if the toolbox information is not published, there are potential issues re transparency and even-ness of information.
- 4.10 General summary was that the discussion started from a security perspective, but the issue is a much broader one from a pricing and market perspective and the review group had not reached consensus on the issue. It may require a Rules change if any Review team member wants to pursue this option. The SO re-iterated its concern to prioritise resources to security management as required by the POCP Rules.

5. Richard Clark from RedSpider reported back on action point 11 from the previous meeting relating to enhancements and fixes to the POCP database. Points noted from this discussion were:
  - a) The database is now being hosted on a separate server rather than a shared server. This is expected to immediately resolve previous concerns about the ability to manage any longer term growth in the volume of users and/or outages.
  - b) The previous request to have a mechanism for advising users that an upload has been successful has now been implemented. **Interested users** need to advise Richard Clark of the email address to be used for confirmation messages.
  - c) **Richard Clark** will send a technical update to users within the next week about the display of the Assessment Status for historical outages.
  - d) Noted that it is not technically possible to link specific outages within the current architecture.
  - e) The request (from Meridian) to provide a URL link within downloads to provide access to the View Outage page will be implemented.
  - f) **Richard Clark** will update documentation regarding the use of the SOAP search/download system to include details on the Last Modified search parameter and notify technical contacts.
  - g) Richard noted that he had received no further suggestions for possible enhancements/fixes following the previous meeting.
  - h) Discussion on Richard's report identified a user need to be able to filter outages based on a regional split. The Grid Owner advised that its outages can be split based on the four regions as per the NIPS and SIPS maps. Grid Owner is willing to publish this information. **Other Asset Owners** are to investigate their ability to tag outages with the same regional split, and to advise the result to Richard Clark. **Richard** to then identify any technical issues relating to including a regional split, and to refer the outcome to Greg Spence for a decision on whether to implement the enhancement. Noted that if this enhancement were implemented, POCP Business Rule 6 should be updated to reflect the requirement for regional split information.
6. Following the discussion on database enhancements, it was agreed that the following issues that had originally been identified by the Review Team could now be closed, with no further action beyond the specific action points noted in these minutes:
  - The sustainability of the existing database.
  - Need for additional information fields in the database.
  - Focus on users and usability.
7. The Review Team further discussed the issue of POCP and the proposed Operational Communications Rules change. Mark Pearce tabled a draft letter to the Electricity Commission. The draft letter was discussed and some amendments noted. The discussion also noted that Grid Owner communications outages could affect other participants ability to comply with the Rules, and therefore Grid Owner notification of these outages was important for those parties. **Mark Pearce** to revise the draft letter and email it to Review Team members by 5 May. **All Review Team** members are to consult internally on the draft letter, and provide any feedback to Mark by 19 May. Based on the feedback received, Mark will then either do a final version and send to the EC on behalf of the Review Team, or alternatively advise the Review Team of any significant issues resulting from the feedback received.
8. The Review Team then considered the draft revised Business Rules. The Review Team approved the proposed changes, and made one further change to BR 6 to include the Asset Owner's unique ID. The final revised Business Rules are included with these minutes and will be included in the updated POCP Users Guide.

9. The Review Team discussed whether there was a need for an additional Business Rule relating to the frequency, format and quality of outage data uploaded to the POCP database. It was agreed that there were no current significant issues around data quality etc, and therefore there was no need for an additional Business Rule.
10. During discussion on the Business Rules, it was noted that the POCP actually has a limited active coordination role. The process requires outage notification and SO identification of impacts on the PPOs. Coordination activities were by Asset Owners, responding to the information available from SO publication of outage notifications and SO PPO assessments made public by security notice.
11. The Review Team agreed that the issue of “Interpretation of the POCP business rules” was now closed.
12. The Review Team discussed the issue of “Routine governance and operational meetings”. It was agreed that the status quo of voluntary industry participation, with the System Operator taking the lead in initiating consultation and meetings about any proposed changes to the POCP process, database or business rules, should continue. It was noted that the POCP database is owned and managed by the System Operator, and that the System Operator should continue its current approach of ensuring appropriate user consultation about any proposed database changes. It was also noted that all users have the ability to propose changes to the POCP database, and/or to request a user meeting to consider specific proposed changes. **Greg Spence** to ensure that the System Operator initiates an annual POCP users meeting to discuss the current status of the POCP and to consider any potential changes to the process, database or business rules.
13. Following discussion on the possibility of operational meetings to better coordinate planned outages, the Review Team agreed that the current POCP provided sufficient opportunity for interested participants to identify outages in which they might have an interest, and that there was no immediate need to progress this issue further. Participants are able to request further consideration of these meetings at any stage. The Review Team then closed the issue of “routine governance and operational meetings”.
14. The Review Team then discussed the issue of “Stakeholder management”. Points noted from the discussion were:
  - The key purpose of the POCP is to provide a mechanism by which the System Operator and Asset Owners can meet their obligations under the Rules.
  - The POCP is voluntary, and it is up to individual Asset Owners to decide whether they will use the POCP.
  - Options for presenting simplified or summarised outage information were discussed. However no consensus was reached about the potential audiences for this information, or what their specific information requirements might be.
  - There were no specific recommendations or actions points resulting from the discussion, and the issue was therefore closed by the Review Team.
15. The next meeting of the Review Team is tentatively scheduled for Wed 14 June. **Mark Pearce** will communicate if a further meeting is required after feedback has been received on these minutes.

Stephanie Wenman  
POCP Review Project Manager