



Core Consultative Group meeting

Minutes of meeting – DRAFT

26th of June 2018

Municon– Munich Airport

	Party	Country	
Market Participant / Association	EDF	Italy	Via phone (morning)
	Citadel	France	Via phone (morning)
	BDEW	Germany	Via phone (morning)
	TenneT Germany	Germany	
Core TSOs	TenneT Germany	Germany	

1. Welcome and introduction

C.PFLANZ, chairman of the Core TSOs SG, opens the meeting and welcomes on behalf of all Core TSOs Market Participants & Associations (MPs) and Core NRA to the meeting.

Objectives of the meeting are to:

- Inform on recent developments in the Core CCR, amongst other
 - The amendments to Day-Ahead & Intraday Flow-based Capacity Calculation Methodologies (DA & ID FB CCM) and Explanatory note
- Exchange via a workshop some parts of the methodology for coordinated redispatching and countertrading (CACM 35) before public consultation

2. Status update developments in Core CCR

C.PFLANZ presents an overview of the activities ongoing in the Core CCR, stemming from Network Codes & Guideline obligations.

3. Core Day-Ahead & Intraday Flow-based Capacity Calculation Methodologies (Core DA & ID FB CCMs)

High level overview of amended Core DA & ID FB CCMs

C.PFLANZ reminds that Core TSOs received a request for amendment (RfA) from the Core Energy Regulators Regional Forum (CERRF) for both the DA and ID FB CCM on 15/03/2018. They submitted the amended proposals and Explanatory Note within two months after the RfA from NRAs, being 04/06/2018 (last receipt of local RfA was on 04/04/2018). Core NRAs decision on the amended CCMs is expected latest by 04/08/2018.

The amended documents have been shared with market participants just prior the meeting. C. ZIMMER summarizes the main changes. The following questions are raised by MPs:

CNEC selection threshold has been fixed at a value of 5%

- Will the CNEC selection threshold apply to all market units?
 - TSOs answer: There will be a daily reassessment



- What is planned for the PTDF below 5%? Will they be considered as well or set to 0?
 - TSOs answer: it is foreseen to keep all PTDF in the matrix.
- Will the PTDF threshold of 5% be strictly applied?
 - TSOs answer: it will be possible to overrule the filter with a justification
- Do Core TSOs foresee to publish the justification?
 - TSOs answer: Core TSOs plan to schedule a workshop with NRAs and Market Parties to better identify which information is valuable to Market Parties.

Minimum RAM adjustment has been detailed to kick in when the RAM – in a situation without any commercial exchanges in the Core region (F0) – is lower than 20% of the CNEC's Fmax

- Is this point discussed with the Nordic region (as they apply something different)
 - TSOs answer: it is planned to address this question during next MESC meeting

Small zone-to-zone PTDFs & its potential impact

- At which stage the low zone-to zone PTDFs are addressed?
 - TSOs answers: this is tackled in the explanatory note

RAO

- Why is the RAMrel computed on the basis of zone-to-zone PTDFs between electrically neighboring bidding zones and not between all pairs of bidding zones?
 - TSOs answers: Core TSOs will come back to Market Participants on this point.

Transparency

- Why is it mentioned in DA CCM Art. 23 “Publication of data” that real names of CNEC may be published? This differs from the level of transparency applied in CWE.
 - TSOs answers: Core TSOs will come back to Market Participants on this point.

Core TSOs and MPs agree to organize a follow-up conference call in July in order to further discuss the amendments made to Core DA & ID CCM and the Explanatory Note (date selected after internal alignment: 17/07 from 14:00 – 16:00 CEST)

Actions:

- Core TSOs to come back during next conference call on MPs questions regarding RAO & Transparency
- MPs to send to Core TSOs their list of questions on amended Core DA & ID CCM prior the conference call

Status & next steps implementation Core DA FB CCM

C. PFLANZ informs participants on the internal parallel run, starting from 15/10/2018. By the end of the internal parallel run, Core TSOs must ensure their operational readiness to start the external parallel run (21/06/2019).

MPs raise the following questions

- How much time is foreseen for the external // parallel run?
 - TSOs answer: At least 6 months
- When is the go live date?
 - TSOs answer: It depends on the project with the NEMOs but the target date is mid-2020
- What is planned for the LT inclusion patch?
 - TSOs answer: It is included in the proposal, will be included in the DA domain (see Art.14). The LTA inclusion takes place after min RAM application.
- What is planned for the intuitive patch?
 - TSOs answer: no decision taken yet

4. Core Redispatching and Countertrading

Status update on RD & CT

C. PFLANZ presents the current status of the RD&CT developments. Core TSOs had two alignment meetings with Core NRAs, ACER and the Commission on the way forward for the further development of the Core RD&CT methodologies. It was agreed to start the Public Consultation for the methodology for coordinated RD & CT (CACM 35) in September 2018. MPs ask what is the status of the cost-sharing methodology and what are the open-issues to finalize it. C. PFLANZ informs that it will be submitted to NRAs for their Shadow Opinion in September 2018 but that it is difficult for Core TSOs to decide on the cost arrangements, especially as the experimentation has not started yet.

Workshop



A workshop is organized to discuss more in details the RD & CT topics, as it was agreed during last CCG meeting on 10/04/2018. Two round tables are organized:

- Round A: Definitions and resources of Redispatching and Countertrading
- Round B: Activation in Day-Ahead & Intraday Process, Price information exchange

Conclusions Round A

Topics discussed: Definitions and resources of Redispatching and Countertrading

TSOs propose the following definition for countertrading: "*Countertrading means an energy-balanced measure initiated by at least two TSOs in two different bidding zones to relieve a congestion where generation units/loads activated are not localized*"

Market Participants suggest to bring the following clarifications:

- Replace "initiated" by "executed" as in case on an internal congestion, there will only be one TSO to initiate the request which will then be executed by 2 TSOs.
- Replace "two TSOs in two different bidding zones to relieve a congestion" by "two TSOs in two different bidding zones in order to operate the grid without congestion" (in order to avoid a singular for congestion as there could also be a set of congestions)
- Mention that "generation units/loads are not localized within the bidding-zone"
- Countertrading is not especially an energy-balanced measure, however the RDCT process is energy balanced

TSOs proposes the following definition for redispatching: "*Redispatching means an energy-balanced measure activated by one or several system operators by altering the generation and/or load pattern in order to change physical flows in the transmission system and relieve a physical congestion*"

Market Participants suggest to bring the following clarifications:

- Mention that the units considered for redispatching are localized and specify their nature (ex: electric nodes). This will allow to follow the same logic as for countertrading definition where it was mentioned that the units are not localized.
- Redispatching is not especially an energy-balanced measure, however the redispatching and countertrading process is energy balanced.
- Mention that redispatching can be a mix of redispatching and countertrading (instead of being pairwise). Market participants raise that both countertrading and redispatching are defined as an energy-balanced measure". However, it could happen that redispatching is used in one control area to have a specific effect on a congestion and that countertrading is then used to re-balance the situation.
- Specify that resources for countertrading are bigger than the ones for redispatching

At the end of this first round, TSOs and MPs concludes that the redispatching and countertrading process is energy balanced and can be made of 100% redispatching, 100% countertrading or a mix of both. Therefore, the following three definitions could be considered in the methodology: (1) Redispatching and countertrading process, (2) countertrading, (3) redispatching.

TSOs also clarify that redispatching is a typical TSO measure while countertrading is a trader functionality used to relieve the congestion. It could be that it is the cheapest measure to use but not the most efficient one if we consider the physical impact on the grid. Countertrading depends on the bidding-zone where it takes place. In a meshed grid it has been acknowledged that RD will be much more used than CT.

Conclusions Round B

Topics discussed: Activation in Day-Ahead & Intraday Process, Price information exchange

Market Participants raise the following remarks:

- TSOs should make sure that the actions taken during the Day-Ahead security analysis are also used in the Intraday Capacity Calculation.
- Market Participants are in favor of an overall optimization for the process regarding IGM (local Operational Security Analysis) and CGM (local Operational Security Analysis). They also challenge the lack of efficiency when TSOs do not always share to RSCs the complete list of Remedial Actions.
- Redispatching and countertrading performed with Balancing Products should not have a direct impact on the imbalance price



TSOs explain that for now no harmonization is foreseen on the pricing mechanism: the pricing for activating countertrading and redispatching actions is set on a national level. It is also clarified that not all TSOs have every countertrading possibility at their disposal.

Action: Core TSOs to discuss internally the suggestions made by MPs to see if possible to incorporate them in CACM 35 methodology.

5. AOB

Participants really appreciated to discuss the RD & CT topics via a workshop. This format allows content discussion in a free and direct manner. It allows to better understand TSOs challenges and to find compromises. However, one of the participants regrets that only CWE parties are represented during today's meeting. Participants would also appreciate if another location than Munich could be chosen for future meetings.

Actions: C. PFLANZ and H. ROBAYE (co-chairs) to see how it would be possible to increase the participation from CEE parties to Core Consultative Group meetings.