

Operational Planning and Scheduling Issues Log

Last updated: 8 January 2012

ID	Issues	NGET View
<p>The following issues (IDs 4-12) were captured at the Technical Workshop on 17 December. They represent a summary of the key themes which were discussed with the Network Code.</p>		
4.	<p>Data Provision/harmonisation of dates. Relevant Users may need to provide additional data to support the planning and scheduling requirements of this Network Code. Moreover, as the European planning year-ahead is based on a calendar year, data submission may be required at a different time from that currently required for GB purposes (where the year starts in April) and covering a different period.</p>	<p>The GB calendar for scheduling is a minority in Europe, so it is almost certain we must align with the European calendar.</p> <p>The provisions of the code only apply to users and elements defined as relevant for cross-border system operation issues.</p>
5.	<p>Timescales for determining methodologies. Various methodologies, platforms and processes need to be determined once the Network Code has entered into force. Each of these requirements has a timescale, which varies between 3 and 24 months and is often contingent, without any clear rationale for this timing. For example, Article 21 must be completed within 3 months, but is based on the methodology determined in Article 18 which has a 24 month period for completion.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. The timescales in the document can be improved.</p>
6.	<p>Role of ACER & ENTSO-E. The Network Code places obligations and requirements on ACER and ENTSO-E. This is change to previous Network Codes where obligations have not previously been placed on ACER and ENTSO-E which are beyond their legal competencies established in the Regulations.</p>	<p>This construction is based on the latest legal advice from ENTSO-E</p>
7.	<p>NRA Approval. There is no reference to approval of anything by NRAs. Article 3(3) and within the Network Code the term <i>consult</i> is used instead.</p>	<p>This construction is based on the latest legal advice from ENTSO-E</p>
8.	<p>Interaction with CACM. The CACM Network Code requires Common Grid Models to be determined at specific times for the purposes of operating the market. Although the output of the OP&S Network Code deals with System Security, there is a clear interaction between the models devised under the OP&S (Article 14) and those required for the CACM Network Code.</p>	<p>This is likely to be a matter for individual member states when they implement the OP&S and CACM Network Codes.</p>
9.	<p>Relevant Users. Users who are identified as impacting upon cross-border planning and scheduling will face additional obligations under this Network Code. Due to these obligations, their ability to operate in the market may be affected, causing a distortion to the market. An example would be if a generator completed a planned outage early; the user would only be able to reconnect if their 'request' for the adaption of the validated outage plan is approved in line with the change procedure in Article 24. The current arrangements in GB are less stringent.</p>	<p>It is not the intent to distort the market by the Network Code.</p> <p>Please provide specific comments where you feel this may occur.</p>

ID	Issues	NGET View
10.	Overlap with REMIT¹. Market parities have obligations to publish data relating to outages under REMIT. It is not clear how these REMIT obligations match with the requirements in the OP&S, or how changes to the outage plan due to the requirements of the OP&S need to be reported under REMIT obligations.	This has now been considered.
11.	Forced Outages. The definition of Forced Outages currently only covers emergency events rather than any 'unplanned' situation. The wording and requirements need to be expanded to cope with the various types of unplanned outages such as those found in the GB framework.	Please submit appropriate comments to clarify your issues and suggest alternative wordings based on GB examples, e.g. Grid Code and CUSC.
12.	Actions to Achieve/Restore Operational Security. For example in article 23 (5). These need to either be broader than load-shedding or clarify that load-shedding is only to occur after all other possibilities have been exhausted. Who arbitrates in the case of disputes should be indicated	There will be a general economic & efficient argument to be followed here as in the current GB NETS SQSS. Please submit comments as appropriate.
The following issues (IDs 1-3) were captured prior to the Technical Workshop on 17 December.		
1.	Can NGET provide an indicative list of Power Stations in GB which may be impacted by this code?	The code discusses what information will be required and from whom but gives a deadline of 3 months after the code comes into force. Therefore at present it is not possible to provide an indicative list.
2.	What is the definition of 'Scheduling' within the Network Code?	Provides TSO with information on the market position prior to real time to allow TSOs to take action(s) if necessary to balance the system in real time
3.	How can planned outages be changed, after they have been submitted at 'year ahead'?	This is still under discussion but most likely there will be no change for GB from how it is carried out at the moment.

¹ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:326:0001:0001:EN:PDF>