

13th System Operation European Stakeholder Committee (SO ESC)

SO ESC, Wednesday, 03 June 2020 from 13:30-16:30

GotoWebinar

Draft Minutes

Participants			
Uros	GABRIJEL	ACER	Chair
Vincenzo	TROVATO	ACER	SO ESC
Marco Savino	PASQUADIBISCEGLIE	ARERA	NRA
Thomas	HOLZER	BNetzA	NRA
Alberto	BRIDI	CEDEC	SO ESC
Florentine	BENEDICT	CEDEC	SO ESC
Marc	MALBRANCKE	CEDEC	SO ESC
Thomas	NENNENING	E-Control	SO ESC
Eugenia	KOTSARI	Elpedison	?
Knud	JOHANSEN	ENTSO-E	SO ESC
Alexander	DUSOLT	ENTSO-E	SO ESC
Ioannis	THEOLOGITIS	ENTSO-E	SO ESC
Pilar	MUÑOZ-ELENA	ENTSO-E	SO ESC
Rafal	KUCZYNSKI	ENTSO-E	SO ESC
Jean-Philippe	PAUL	ENTSO-E	SO ESC
Jonas Peter	HASSELBOM JACOBSEN	ENTSO-E	SO ESC
Luca	ORTOLANO	ENTSO-E	SO ESC
Francesco	CELOZZI	ENTSO-E	SO ESC
Ana	CIGARAN	ENTSO-E	SO ESC
Derek	LAWLER	ENTSO-E	SO ESC

Freddy	ALCAZAR	EUGINE	SO ESC
Srinivasa Radju	ADDALA	EUGINE (Member GC ESC)	SO ESC
Valerie	REIF	EUIFSR	SO ESC
Markus	WATSCHER	Eurelectric	SO ESC
Yannick	PHULPIN	Eurelectric	SO ESC
Jakub	FIJALKOWSKI	European Commission	SO ESC
Luca	GUENZI	EUTurbines	SO ESC
Mike	KAY	GEODE	SO ESC
Steni	ØVSTEBØ	IFIEC	SO ESC
<u>Andreas</u>	<u>Luxa</u>	<u>Orgalim</u>	<u>SO ESC</u>
Andres	PINTO BELLO	SmartEN (Member of GC ESC)	SO ESC
Anneli	TEELAHKT	The European Association for Storage of Energy - EASE	SO ESC
Klaus	OBERHAUSER	VGB Powertech	SO ESC
Eric	DEKINDEREN	VGB Powertech	SO ESC
Ton	GERAERDS	VGB Powertech	SO ESC
Vasiliki	KLONARI	WindEurope	SO ESC

13th SO ESC

1. *Opening*

1.1. *Review of the agenda*

[Agenda](#) approved

1.2. *Review and approval of minutes from December meeting*

[Minutes](#) from 12th December 2019 are approved

1.3. *Review of actions*

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) presents the status of the pending actions (slides available [here](#), topic 1.3).

Eric Dekinderen (VGB) raises a comment concerning topic 4 suggesting not to limit the analysis of low frequency behaviour only to Pump Storage Hydro but to extend it to all types of storage devices.

Jean-Philippe Paul answers that the topic will be extended to all storage devices and the topic will be added to the agenda for the SO ESC in September.

Luca Guenzi (EUTurbine) comments on topic 4 that the answer to the question could be integrated also in the work of the expert group of GC ESC as a joint topic with SO ESC. The Chair confirms that the topic will be covered also during GC ESC meeting.

Jean-Philippe Paul will write directly to Jean-Noel Marquet to clarify the pending question on CGM implementation.

2. *Update on implementation actions at pan EU level*

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) presents the slides available [here](#) (topic 2).

Marco Pasquadibisceglie (ARERA) clarifies that the legal deadline for the approval of the RCC Establishment proposal depends on the date of submission from the TSOs, and the same approach applies for the proposals on Art. 76 of SOGL. This means that for the latter the legal deadline is not the end of June for all CCRs, but for some of them it depends on the actual date of submission of the proposal to the relevant NRA.

Eric Dekinderen (VGB) raises a question on Risk Preparedness: is the topic being addressed only from the point of view of the TSOs or it is planned to include the views of generating companies? Knud Johansen and Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) confirm the generators are included in the approach for dealing with the Risk Preparedness topic.

3. *System Operation Guideline*

3.1. *Cost Benefit Analysis for FCR providers by Limited Energy Reservoirs: status update*

Luca Ortolano (ENTSO-E) presents the slides available [here](#) (topic 3.1).

Andres Pinto (SmartEN) asks if it is possible to share the assumptions made in the development of the cost benefit analysis. Luca clarifies that there has been a dedicated webinar with focus on the input data and the slides are [here](#). Luca asked to check if the available material already answer do the doubts and if not it would be appreciated if the comments can be sent in written form, so that **ENTSO-E can update the webinar slides and make those clarification publicly available at the same weblink.**

3.2. *Information on exchange/sharing of the reserves*

Jonas Peter Hasselbom Jacobsen (ENTSO-E) presents slides available [here](#) (topic 3.2).

Marco Pasquadibisceglie (ARERA) and Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) exchanged on the importance to clarify the responses « no » to the survey. A further check up will be ensured to confirm the differences between the SO GL application and the interpretation of the survey in emergency situations.

Jonas Peter Hasselbom Jacobsen (ENTSO-E) agrees to reach out to the TSOs who answered 'no' and ask the background of the answer.

Yannick Phulpin (Eurelectric) asks a clarification concerning the type of reserves considered in the survey, since FCR is already shared and exchanged and to highlight the difference considered between shared and exchanged reserves and by last what has been considered for “shared reserves” and “exchanged reserves”. On the latter, have the cases of a reserve procured and contracted by one TSO and activated by another or joint contracting and sizing of reserve by multiple TSOs been considered?

Jean-Philippe Paul clarifies that according to SOGL, an exchange of reserves means that a TSO who is obliged by its LFC block to guarantee a certain amount of capacity for a given type of reserve, is able to ensure the availability through a certain amount of that reserve located in a different control block from the one of its own. A contract between the TSOs of the two control blocks will be put in place to ensure the operational activation under the request of the TSO in need and under payment from it. The sharing of reserves is similar to the case of exchange, but it is based on the principle that the bigger is the zone on which the reserve is sized, and the proportionally smaller its sizing may be. This of course has to be addressed through precise probabilistic computations and in that case the sharing of reserves can lead to a smaller amount of reserve contracted and procured. Concerning the first question raised, the total amount of FCR in Continental Europe is shared and it is equal to 3000 MW, but when each TSO has to ensure the available capacity in its control area, it has the possibility to exchange the reserves with other TSOs and this is the case also for FCR.

Jonas Peter Hasselbom Jacobsen (ENTSO-E) agrees to update the slides presented with the references to the Art 3 of SOGL including the definitions for “exchange of reserves” and sharing of reserves”.

Yannick Phulpin (Eurelectric) adds that it would make sense to differentiate the graphs included in the slides with the detail of the type of reserves. Jonas Peter Hasselbom Jacobsen (ENTSO-E) clarifies that ENTSO-E does not always have that kind of detail in the answer delivered by the TSOs. In the question sent to the TSOs, it was not asked to specify the type of reserve. Some TSO specified it nonetheless (FCR, aFRR, mFRR etc.). Jean-Philippe Paul- comments that in regard to sharing and exchange of reserves there are also requirements in SOGL to make the data available on the Transparency Platform (TP). The data gathering is ongoing and additional visibility will be made available on the TP.

Eric Dekinderen (VGB) raises a question on slide 18. Based on the big difference between the maximum and the minimum amount of reserves exchanged/shared, are those data coming from the contract between TSOs and not globalized among all the contracts between the TSO in one country exchanging/sharing the reserves with other countries. Jonas Peter Hasselbom Jacobsen (ENTSO-E) clarifies that the data in the graphs are extracted from the answers to the survey and confirms that the example shows the volumes of shared reserve. After checking the data, the specific case of the 2000 MW included in slide 8 reflects the agreement between two single countries.

Jakub Fijalkowski (EC), Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) and Marco Pasquadibisceglie (ARERA) engage in discussion on the importance of the Exchange of reserves and its procurements in compliance with EB GL. To be fully clear in the results of the survey it is important to clarify the differences between FCR and FRR.

Jonas Peter Hasselbom Jacobsen (ENTSO-E) agrees to get back to Jakub with the answers to this question after having consulted the market experts.

The Chair asks if the detailed results of this survey are known to all TSOs. Jonas Peter Hasselbom Jacobsen (ENTSO-E) answers that the results are not available to all TSOs. However the data will be published on the TP.

The Chair asks if there is the intention to improve the survey with additional information (i.e. different types of reserves). Jean-Philippe Paul answers that it would require some time, but it could be something that it could be looked into based on the feedback of the TSOs. Jean-Philippe Paul adds that it would be interesting to differentiate also the exchange/sharing agreements that are in place in the framework of regular (SO GL) or Emergency (E&R NC) processes and the make clear the distinction between FCR and FRR.

The Chair asks ENTSO-E to update the survey with the required details.

4. CGM Programme Implementation Update

Derek Lawler presents slides available [here](#) (topic 4)

Yannick Phulpin (Eurelectric) raises a question about other processes and methodologies (SOGL and CACM) depending on the availability of the CGM. The last slide from the presentation partly answers the question. In addition he asks to specify the capacity calculation methodologies impacted by the CGM deliverables. Which deliverables impact the capacity calculation, and which is the timeline for these deliverables. **Derek Lawler (ENTSO-E) confirms that the answer to this question will be delivered after the meeting through a dedicated assessment.**

Yannick Phulpin (Eurelectric) remarks that there are worries about delays of CGM impacting other methodologies. It would be appreciated to have a detailed presentation in the next SO ESC about these interdependencies.

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) mentions that there is already a partial implementation in some regions where the capacity calculations are being run based on the CGMES model, but not yet on the complete CGM programme resources.

Marco Pasquadibisceglie (ARERA) asks which is the interaction between the CGM tools and the rotational basis assignation of the CGM to the RCCs. Derek confirms that the OPDE platform will be stored on ENTSO-E systems and RSCs will connect to the platform to run the tools on rotational basis.

Marco Pasquadibisceglie (ARERA) highlights that these procedures shall be clarified in the passage from RSC to RCC and it would be appreciated to have more details on this topic in the coming proposals for RCC establishment.

5. AOB –

5.1. Questions on ER NC from Eric Dekinderen (VGB)

- 1) Is it possible to repeat the presentation uploaded in March on ENTSO-E website about ER NC? Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) confirms that the slides from the cancelled March meeting are made available on the website and an updated presentation will be given in September. Eric Dekinderen adds that in particular he was curious as in those slides it was included that for some countries parts of the NC ER are not applicable. Some explanations on that point would be appreciated.
- 2) According NC ER Art 1 TSO can impose some tests. VGB has received signals from some countries that the tests imposed by the TSO are more stringent than the one described in the RfG. This does not sound right since national legislation should not be more stringent than European legislation. Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) answers that this topic cannot be covered in general, but it should be addressed case-by-case, defining the meaning of “more stringent”. **It is suggested that VGB provides two or three examples.**
- 3) Eric Dekinderen (VGB) is aware of cases where deadlines imposed by the NC ER were not respected on national level. For instance according to A 43.3 a test plan has to be developed before February 2019 and this has not been done in several countries. Jakub Fijalkowski (EC) remarks that national implementation should be enforced by the national NRA. When national implementation does not comply with the deadlines, the NRAs should be contacted. **The Chair confirms the point will be addressed in a meeting with the NRAs next Friday.**
- 4) Costs of the tests. Is it intention of the EC to develop guidelines on how to deal with these costs? Jakub Fijalkowski (EC) remarks that the Commission is not competent on this point. EC can help in coordinating this with the NRA but cannot enforce national decisions. EC cannot issue any guideline on this point.
- 5) VGB has the impression that several countries are experiencing difficulties in defining high priority SGUs. Are ENTSO-E and EC having the intention to create a European level playing field to help coordinate approaches? Jakub Fijalkowski (EC) says that TSOs and NRAs are bound by national laws but there is room for further coordination and for increase in the European coordination of the approaches. **The Chair confirms the point will be addressed in a meeting with the NRAs next Friday.**

Marco Pasquadibisceglie (ARERA) comments on the points above that on several countries NRAs are not responsible for some of the tasks highlighted by VGB, but the responsibility is on the Member States themselves. National defense plans and related test can be updated by TSOs even after the deadline included in the ER NC and according to national law. Moreover it should be taken into account that the public consultation imposed by the ER NC are not public consultations under the SO GL rules since the national defense plans are often covered by confidentiality clauses. A public consultation open to everybody could not be possible.

Jonas Peter Hasselbom Jacobsen (ENTSO-E) comments on point 1 above that in some countries there were already arrangements in place concerning the system defense plan and for this reason many of the T&C in the NC ER were considered already in the national plans.

Ton Geraerds (VGB) regarding the consultation on National Defense Plans, asks if the participants are aware that there are several countries where SGUs and generators have not been notified even after the legal deadline has expired. Moreover there were no generators consulted while developing the E&R plans. Guidance is required in this case on how to manage this situation.

Rafal Kuczynski (ENTSO-E) clarifies that as mentioned in the status report on ER NC of the 15th of February, some of the points of ER NC are not applicable in some countries given the fact that they were already implemented in the national plans and this was agreed with the NRAs. **Concerning the high priority SGU it might happen that the lists have some issues, and the topic will be clarified in the next SO ESC.**

It is suggested to send detailed questions on the NC ER to ENTSO-E (Rafal Kuczynski) in order to assess more comprehensive answers.

5.2. ENTSO-E Public Consultations

Alexander Dusolt (ENTSO-E) presents the upcoming public consultations for ENTSO-E in 2020.

5.3. Dates SO ESC 2020

Next meeting scheduled for the 16 of September 2020, in one month to be confirmed if the meeting will take place online.

6. Actions

1. ENTSO-E to extend the topic of low frequency behaviour of PSH to all possible Storage devices and deliver an answer during SO ESC in September.
 2. Jean-Philippe (ENTSO-E) will write directly to Jean-Noel Marquette to clarify the pending question on CGM implementation.
 3. ENTSO-E will update the webinar slides in order for the answer on the cost assumptions of the CBA LER to be available for everybody.
 4. ENTSO-E to check the possibility of expanding the survey on exchanging/Sharing of reserves.
 5. Jonas Peter Hasselbom Jacobsen (ENTSO-E) agrees to get back to Jakub Fijalkowski (EC) with the answers to this question after having consulted the market experts on the impact of sharing and exchanging of the reserves on the cross-border capacities.
 6. ACER to bring up the topics covered in the AOB during the meeting with the NRA on Friday 5th June.
 7. ENTSO-E will provide at next ESC SO meeting an updated overview of implementation status for E&R NC.
-