

Minutes from SFT Customer Debrief Workshop – 18 November 2010

18th November 2010, Transpower House
9.00am – 12noon

Present:

Industry: James Collinson-Smith, Angus Walker, Peter Osborne, Rowan Maxwell, Jon Spiller, Asher Habib, Ben Priest, Robert Ewens, Trevor Lapham, Nigel East, Tristan Maunsell, Adam Dustin

Transpower: Peter Monney, Lynette Bell, Dominic O'Grady, Barry Orme, Chris Callaghan, Fiona Abbott, Doug Goodwin, Dean Eagle, Megan O'Sullivan, David Smith

Apologies: Andrew Anderson, Vince Smart, Chris Ewers

1. Introduction

Doug Goodwin welcomed participants

2. SFT Timeline

Fiona Abbott gave an update of the SFT Project timeline. Implementation date in Operations Planning is 14 February 2010 with final go-live on 28 March 2010.

3. Test Outcomes

Peter Monney provided a summary of the test process, results, findings and issues.

4. Operational Management

Peter Monney and Dominic O Grady provided a summary of the SFT usage in Operations Planning and in real time, including any updated processes that will apply with SFT switched on.

Dean Eagle provided some information to participants on the post processing undertaken by the System Operator and, in particular, final pricing process. There are no process changes for final pricing with SFT.

5. Results from parallel operations and scenario testing

Peter Monney then presented the results of parallel operations and scenario testing.

Fiona Abbott presented the SFT sign-off criteria for information and comment. No comments were received on the day.

The following questions and actions arose:

	Item	Action / response	
1.	[Meridian] Will Operations Planning still do manual assessments on outages?	We will still run scenarios and model outages but SFT will build the constraints.	N/A
2.	[Meridian] Will we still see the constraints associated with the outages in planning time?	You will still see the DSS but you will not see a constraint equation. You will not see the constraint build until the WDS but previous similar outages are likely to give you an idea as to what is the build of the constraint.	N/A
3.	[CEL] Can the System Operator provide the constraints as it does currently on POCP?	This issue was raised for resolution between participants and the System Operator in the December 09 workshop. Lynette Bell will establish a working group with interested generators (CEL, MRPL, Genesis, Meridian to date) to identify and scope a piece of work which will address the issue of the imminent removal of DSS constraints from POCP. Process to be started by end of December	Lynette Bell
4.	[Meridian] Will we see when SFT constraints have been 'locked' in schedules by the System Operator?	Constraints may be locked when there is a mis-match between actual flows and predicted flow that results in a constraint binding where it shouldn't or not binding when it should. It also may be locked when a constraint oscillates in and out of the schedule between adjacent trading periods. Whilst participants will not receive a specific 'locked' indication, you will know it has been locked for the latter situation because it will be exactly the same as the constraint for the adjacent trading period(s) and constraints identify the case / schedule that they originated from.	N/A
5	[Meridian] Will this be more likely during periods between the peaks and troughs?	No. Not much constraint activity occurs at this time.	N/A
6	[Genesis] Is coordinator workload likely to reduce on the desk with SFT on?	No. SFT may slightly increase the workload on the desk, particularly during emergency or unusual situations. However, we have built good processes around turning SFT off if the situation requires (e.g Auckland outage)	N/A

6. Discussion

Participants were asked to comment on the parallel operations results from their perspective and raise any concerns they had with the outcomes. Comments as follows:

	Issue	Action/Response	
7.	[CEL] The main issue for CEL is receiving constraint information during the planning period.	Refer to action for item 3	Refer to item 3
8.	[Genesis] Genesis had concerns about constraint stability going into the project. However, the results look stable and there appear to be no issues	The System Operator agrees. Testing has not demonstrated this to be a concern to date.	NFA
9.	[Genesis] Would like to be included on discussions with Lynette about outages and constraints.	Genesis has already been added to the list of names for discussion about outage constraints.	N/A
10.	[Genesis] Requested confirmation that the change to SFT in Operations Planning was essentially irrevocable decision to go-live in the control room.	There is little ability to run two systems in parallel once we go live in Operations Planning. Obviously if a risk manifests such that the software cannot be used then the transition would have to be halted. However, there are a number of ramifications from doing so. As such, it would have to be an insurmountable issue that would cause a halt.	N/A
11.	[Meridian] Meridian had some concerns about constraint sensitivity. Whilst the coefficients do not change overly much, there is a residual concern about constraints that may be very sensitive to demand changes. Believe this could be more effectively addressed through a lower NBT or different NBT for each schedule.	<p>The following options may be able to be progressed if there is an issue after go live:</p> <p>1) modifying the NBT to allow customers to identify sensitive constraints in earlier schedules</p> <p>2) generating two SFT runs with modified demands to allow the calculation and publishing of the sensitivity of the constraint to demand</p> <p>3) using the difference in the demand schedule between runs to approximate and publish the sensitivity of the constraint to demand</p>	<p>SO to check SFT functionality at a very high level for feasibility of options</p> <p>SO and participants to monitor after go live.</p>

12.	[Meridian] Trading was monitoring the South Island constraints for generation effects. Seems to be no issues		N/A
13.	[Meridian] Trading was concerned about the effect of Block Security Constraints on generation with SFT on	The process for identifying and issuing block security constraints remains unchanged with SFT	N/A
14.	[MRP] No issues with the results. Constraint stability seems fine. Would like to be included on discussions with Lynette about outages and constraints.	MRP has already been added to the list of names for discussion about outage constraints.	N/A
15.	[Todd Energy] Specifically interested in any trading and generation risk. Passive participation in the parallel operations. Local constraints are the primary interest. Will 'wait and see'.		N/A
16.	[Trustpower] Concerned about price effect. Will SWS use the SFT constraints and publish?	The SWS is based on the SDS. SFT constraints will be published from the SWS.	N/A

The meeting closed at 11.30am.