

Planned Outage Co-ordination Process (POCP) Industry Review

Purpose

Further to the industry letter sent out on the 19 December 2005, the purpose of this document is to provide a summary of how the Planned Outage Co-ordination Process (POCP) was developed and some of the issues the upcoming review will need to consider.

It is proposed that a review be conducted by an industry working group, through a series of workshops beginning March 8 2006.

The review may result in changes being proposed. These may include, but are not limited to the following:

- the POCP business rules and processes being revised
- additional requirements being placed on the System Operator through changes to the Policy Statement in Part C of the rules.
- placing additional requirements on participants through recommended rule changes
- a recommendation being made for database upgrade/replacement.

Background:

The System Operator hosts the Planned Outage Co-ordination Process (POCP) where participants can upload and view planned outages of power system assets.

The industry POCP process and associated business rules were developed in 2003 to meet the outage co-ordination requirements of the industry's (then) Common Quality Obligations (CQOs). The CQO's were superseded by technical Code D in Part C of the Electricity Governance Rules introduced in March 2004.

The process and associated database have been working successfully since 1 September 2003. The database currently has 329 registered users, attracts on average 3,000 hits per month and at any given time provides notification of 2,500 outages.

Due to ongoing industry change, and informal feedback received, the System Operator believes it is an appropriate time to review the POCP process, and determine what, if any changes may be required to the POCP process.

The underlying seven business rules developed for POCP in 2003 are still a key part of the processes for notifying outages. The business rules and user guide can be downloaded from the POCP website at: (<http://pocp.redspider.co.nz>)

It is recommended that forum members are familiar with these documents prior to attending the workshop on the 8th March.

Scope of Review:

The feedback on issues received by the System Operator is summarised in the following table. While the scope of the review is not limited to these issues, these will be included. The full scope of the review, and the process that the review will follow, will be determined by the forum at the first workshop.

The broad areas that the forum will need to consider include:

Environmental and regulatory change:

The POCP process was established in 2003 to provide a means for asset owners and the System Operator to meet their obligations to Section 8 of the CQOs. The requirements are now captured under Technical Code D of part C of the EGR's, introduced in March 2004. The forum will need to consider if the existing process still allows participants to fulfil their obligations to the EGR's. Participants may wish to identify if there are any issues with the current rules requirements that they believe need to be raised.

Business Purpose:

The POCP process was designed to add value to participants by allowing asset owners to manage business risk through co-ordinating outage plans. An open approach to the notification of outages was voluntarily adopted, which was subsequently adopted by the rules. Participants will need to consider if the process is still adding value, or if they would like to add further value in some way – for example, by making enhancements to the process or the database.

Role of the System Operator:

The SO uses the information presented in POCP to assess its' ability to maintain the PPO's, and to identify, and provide notification of outage situations where SPD constraints may be invoked. For situations where additional security measures may be required, the respective participants are notified and further information is provided. The forum will need to consider if the role of the System Operator, and the information that it currently provides is still appropriate and adds value to the industry.

Technology Changes:

The POCP database was developed as a prototype in 2003 and is maintained on a public domain hosting service. The primary reason for web based hosting was to facilitate ease of access to participants and interested parties. Other than a change to remove open public access to view the database in 2004, the database remains largely unchanged.

Participants will need to consider what changes or updates may be required, and whether the existing database would support any proposed changes.

Specific feedback from participants that the System Operator has received to date is summarised overleaf.

POCP: Participant suggested scope for forum review and points for consideration.

<p>The role of POCP in anticipating pricing outcomes and assessing risk in the energy market.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should POCP have a role in providing further information to assist in anticipating pricing outcomes. • Is this achievable with current market design? Overall, what net benefits would be gained, and how would they be achieved. • If so, then how would the current process need to be altered/enhanced? • How would this conflict with/complement other mechanisms that contribute to anticipating pricing outcomes • What enhancements would be required for the POCP database?
<p>Timeliness and content of assessment information.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should POCP provide detailed assessment information for situations other than when PPO's may be at risk. If so what information would be provided, what would be the overall net benefit and to who. • How would the current process need to be altered/enhanced. Would this require changes to the POCP database. • Is the timeliness of notification of PPO security issues sufficient? If not what would be considered appropriate, what net benefits would be gained and what process changes would be required.
<p>Certainty and variability of outage plans</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the variation of outage plans create issues for POCP users? If greater certainty was required what process or rule changes would be required and what implications would this have.
<p>Sustainability of the existing database.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing database is now three years old and would limit development of any additional functionality. If users require further enhancements what would they be, what net benefits would justify the suggested changes, and what would be the likely cost. Who would fund any development?
<p>Provision of additional information fields in the POCP database.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should POCP have extra fields to show: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the nature of the outage ie: commissioning, maintenance, projects, re-configuration. ○ maximum generation capacity of a station during a machine outage. • If so what benefits would arise, what process changes would be required. Would the cost of database changes justify the benefit. Would this be a mandatory or voluntary requirement.
<p>Interpretation of the business rules for notifying outages.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently some asset owners do not notify outages for routine servicing. • Are the business rules clear in their intent, if not do they need to be revised. Are any suggested changes consistent with the rules. • Should the requirement of asset owners to notify of outages be mandated more strongly in the Rules.
<p>The role of POCP in relation to the proposed Technical Code C.- Operational Communications</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Code C –Operational Communications, is currently being revised. The proposed draft requires asset owners to notify of communications outages through POCP. Is this an appropriate use of the POCP process, if so what business rules would need changing. If not what alternatives or rule changes would be proposed.

Forum members:

To date the following nominations have been received for the POCP forum. Both the Electricity Commission and the Major Electricity Users Group have expressed an interest in being informed of progress.

Mark Pearce –Independent Chair
Stephanie Wenman –Project Manager
Chris Sadler –Vector Networks
Rick Liew –Contact
Greg Salmon –Meridian
James Denham –Genesis
Tim Dodds –Mighty River
Richard Smith –Trustpower
Alan Jenkins –Electricity Networks Association
Ray Basher –Transpower Grid Owner
Brendan Olsen –Transpower Grid Owner
Greg Spence –Transpower System Operator
Grant Tuffrey –Transpower System Operator

POCP Contacts:

Should you have any queries with the proposed review or require further information, please contact either:

Greg Spence
Operations Planning Manager
04 495 6923
greg-spence@transpower.co.nz

Stephanie Wenman
POCP Project Manager
steph@xtra.co.nz
0274 816464