

DSO TEG on Network Code on Emergency and Restoration

Date: 10 September 2014

Time: 14h00 – 17h00

Place: ENTSO-E premises, Brussels

MINUTES

Nr.	Surname	Name	E-mail	DSO	Association
1.	Abreu	Joana	jaj@edsoforsmartgrids.eu		EDSO for Smart Grids
2.	Alvarez	Jacobo	j Alvarez@eurelectric.org		Eurelectric
3.	Chapalain	Florian	florian.chapalain@edsoforsmartgrids.eu		EDSO for Smart Grids
4.	De Neuville	Benoit	benoit.deneuille@sibelga.be	Sibelga	CEDEC
5.	Grenard	Sebastian	sebastien.grenard@erdf.fr	ERDF	Eurelectric
6.	Heise	Gerald	gerald.heise@enercity-netz.de	enercity Netzgesellschaft mbH	CEDEC
7.	Malbrancke	Marc	marc.malbrancke@cedec.com		CEDEC
8.	Vincent	Graeme	Graeme.Vincent@ScottishPower.com	SP Energy Networks	
9.	Wilch	Michael	michael.wilch@rwe.com	RWE Deutschland AG	

ENTSO-E – NC ER Drafting team:

Chairman	Laurent Lamy	ENTSO-E
	Jens Jacobs	ENTSO-E
	Tudal Loqx	ENTSO-E
	Fabian Heus	ENTSO-E
	Lukas Guertler	ENTSO-E
	Jaka Žvab	ENTSO-E
	Emmanouil Styvaktakis	ENTSO-E

1. Welcome and NC ER status

Laurent Lamy welcomed the participants, explaining that the aim of the meeting is to exchange views with DSO representatives on topics from the network code on Emergency and Restoration.

2. General comments

DSOs would appreciate newer versions of the NC ER to be also provided in track changes format to make comparison with previous published version easier. ENTSO-E warns that those types of documents might be ‘unreadable’.

DSO remarks and questions on 2nd version of 5/09/2014 are listed in a document, which has been circulated after the meeting. The main topics discussed during the meeting are synthesised below.

DSOs comments:

- Comment: Term “Demand” is defined differently from what is currently stated in the EMR tool. ENTSO-E defends its definition in the NC ER. This should be checked and made consistent with the other NCs (NC DCC) and at least coherent with art. 20..
- Comment: Article 20 – Manual demand disconnection procedure, provision should be consistent with other codes.
- Comment: “SGU” is differently defined in the NC OS compared to the NC ER at the moment (where HVDC systems are included). ENTSO-E to consider having only one definition in NC OS and not repeat it in this code.
- Comment: Not clear in the code whether “New Type A and Type A PGM” capabilities are addressed intentionally. “New” probably refers to ‘new’ according to RfG.
- Comment: Article 6 Coordination - (2) not clear what this sentence means. To be clarified.

3. System defence plan principles

DSOs remarks on the code:

- Article 9 - Design of the System Defence Plan
 Comment:., paragraph (4) provision is not clear as it is confusing who is addressed exactly. Could be read that SGUs is a new Type A PGM, but this is not the intention probably.
- Q: Behaviour and capabilities of new type A PGM are addressed in NC ER and in the 1st WS, ENTSO-E could not provide clear explanation on how TSOs will take these into account. If new type A PGMs are addressed in NC ER it should be clear how data will be exchanged.
 A: NC ER provides only the possibility to use Type A PGM in an aggregated way if it is necessary for the system defence and restoration plans.

- Article 10(2)(a) - Implementation of the System Defence Plan

Comment: Coordination with DSOs for the implementations of measures would be needed as there might be issues on DSO side otherwise. ENTSO-E to bear in mind there are also some DSOs connected to other DSO, maybe not to address all DSOs in such a case.

A: Drafting team states that the coordination is already part of the design.

- Article 10 - Implementation of the System Defence Plan

Q: (3)(a) how is this going to be done for type A, especially for notification? To be reformulated for more clarity.

A: Only the ones that are part of defence or restoration plan will have to comply with this requirement.

- Article 11 - Activation of the System Defence Plan

Comment: wording doesn't include "collaboration/coordination" with DSO anymore, but it was used in the previous version.

A: Drafting team considers it is better to put a more detailed description of collaboration in each specific procedure of the Defence Plan instead of in this general paragraph.

- Article 11(1)b

Comment: second sentence is not readable.

A: drafting team will consider reformulation.

- Article 12 - TSO coordination in Emergency situations

Comment: How come there are no more Multi Party Agreements in the article?

A: ENTSO-E suppressed referring to Multi Party Agreements according to the guidance by EC.

- Article 13 Frequency management procedure

Comment: Double communications channels should be avoided. This remark has already been made in the NC OS, and should therefore be resolved in that code probably.

- Article 14 - Automatic Low Frequency Demand Disconnection scheme

Q: Where are the figures in the table taken from? DSOs suggest that ranges should be defined instead of fixed values.

A: At the moment the figures are taken from what is written in the Operational Handbook (not mandatory today). An LFDD study is pending within ENTSO-E; the results of the study will be put used as input for the draft.

Comment: CENELEC should have been approached earlier especially for the questions and figures regarding frequency accuracy and maximum demand disconnection per step. DSO should also have been implicated in the study.

A: CENELEC will be asked to provide further input to ENTSO-E on this topic in order to take inputs into consideration for the study.

- Article 14(3)(b) -Wording "Geographically evenly spread" could be rephrased to "with aim to minimize the risk of congestions..."

- Article 16 Voltage deviation management procedure

Comment: DSOs ask to limit the mentioned SGUs in this paragraph to those connected to the transmission network.

A: ENTSO-E does not intend to introduce this amendment here, (nor anywhere else in the code). The TSO will be able to act directly on SGUs connected to the distribution networks.

-(3) Wording “reactive power range” preferred instead of “set-point”

- Article 17 - Automatic scheme against voltage collapse

Comment: paragraph (1) seems to go further than is allowed for in the NC DCC.

Remark: paragraph (2) is in contradiction with DCC, to consider redrafting.

DSOs will give more input on those points.

- Article 20 - Manual Demand Disconnection procedure

Comment: in paragraph (3) DSOs can’t minimise impact on grid users when disconnecting Demand.

A: Idea is to rotate the areas which are to be shed, provision will be reworded in the next release for better clarity.

4. System Restoration plan design principles

DSOs remarks on the code:

- Article 22 - Implementation of the Restoration Plan

Comment: There is no derogation mechanism foreseen for the implementation of the restoration plan. The implementation of the measures might put overshooting burden to single DSOs or Significant Grid Users. A derogation would be a proper solution to handle this problem.

A: Derogation are not included as not sure derogation to what.

- Article 25 Re-energisation strategy

Comment: paragraph (2) last sentence, DSOs propose to amend the wording and add: “in coordination and in cooperation with DSOs”. To make their point they refer to art. 6(2).

A: Drafting team will amend this provision.

5. Information exchange, communication tools and facilities

DSOs remarks on the code:

- Article 33 Information exchange

Q: (2)(a) what do you mean by “real-time” information?

A: Only the information needed on request at the given time

Comment: DSO should also be able to request information from TSO, like informing DSO before reenergising etc. in order to have information exchange in both directions. More specific description of information exchange to be provided to ENTSO-E for consideration how to include it in the code.

- Article 33 Information exchange

-(2)(b) wording “via aggregated”

Q: why aggregators are addressed only in this provision?

Comment: Direct communication concern between TSO and SGUs. To consider including DSOs in this provision.

- Article 34 Communication channels

Comment: not clear if both channels need to be prioritised communication channels (meaning of ‘redundant’). This is much more than the current status in the EU and would be costly to establish (for all type A PGMs for instance).

A: Provision is meant to address only the ones that are actively involved in defence and restoration plans. ENTSO-E confirms that one of the channels can be a public network.

ENTSO-E will reformulate the paragraph.

- Article 35 Facilities

Backup of DSO control centres

Participants agreed to include a paragraph obliging DSOs (only the ones actively involved in restoration...) to have backup of control centres for XX hours (to be later defined coherently with other figures regarding backup).

6. COMPLIANCE AND REVIEW chapter

DSOs remarks on the code:

- Article 37 - Compliance testing of PGMs

Q: Why is the time period for frequency of testing in the NC, it would be more suitable to be decided on a National basis. Periodicity of testing - maintenance of relay might be only every 10 years, therefore 5 years doesn't make sense in such a case. DSOs ask for a justification of this period.

A: We cannot let this open to every operator as the EC and ACER expectation is to ensure that the system defence and restoration plans work correctly.

DSOs will provide what is the current state of play for German DSOs as an example.

7. Conclusion

DT ER convener invited DSO to provide proposals on the concerned items. If derogation principles are needed DSOs are asked to provide comments and feedback in order to include them in the code.

8. Next meeting

Next NC ER meeting with DSO TEG to be held on 12 Nov in the morning, the invitation to be forwarded in advance.