Core Consultative Group meeting

July 17th 2018
14h00 – 16h00 CEST
Conference call
1. Welcome and introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome and introduction</td>
<td>C.PFLANZ</td>
<td>14:00 – 14:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core DA &amp; ID FB CCMs</td>
<td>P. SCHAEMAKER W. SNOEREN</td>
<td>14:15 – 15:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amendment Core CCMs and Explanatory Note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Q &amp; A Session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOB</td>
<td>C.PFLANZ</td>
<td>15:45 – 16:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective:** During last Core Consultative Group meeting on 28/06/2018, Core TSOs and MPs agreed to organize a follow-up conference call on July 17th in order to further discuss the amendments made to Core DA & ID CCM and the Explanatory Note.
On 15/03, Core TSOs received a request for amendment (RfA) from the Core Energy Regulators Regional Forum (CERRF) for both the DA and ID FB CCM. The RfAs reflect the position of all Core NRAs.

- The amended proposals and Explanatory Note have been submitted by all Core TSOs within two months following the request from the 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 August 4th 2018.
- The amended documents can be found enclosed:

CCMs for DA and ID have been amended
- In line with the Request for Amendment received from Core NRAs
- In line with discussions during meetings with Core NRAs, Core SPoC NRAs, and Core lead NRAs

Explanatory Note
- One Explanatory Note to support both the DA and ID CCM proposal
- Explanatory Note has been improved by keeping only detailed explanations on elements not tackled in the Proposals
- Objectives are to facilitate the readability, and to limit any risk of inconsistency between the Proposal and its Explanatory Note
- A high level process flow with regard to DA FB capacity calculation has been added
Summary of changes made to the Core capacity calculation methodologies:

- Mentioning of, and references to, the “deliverable report” have been removed
- CNEC selection threshold has been fixed at a value of 5%
- 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
- The CNEC selection threshold should be assessed in conjunction with the notion of minimum RAM, that has been introduced
- Remedial action optimization has been detailed
- A reference to further study, and the potential need to adapt the values / methodology accordingly has been added for
  - CNEC selection threshold (study includes a social welfare based analysis)
  - FRM risk level
  - GSK methodology
- A process description has been added to Article 4(6)
- The power factor is set to equal 1, which means that the element is assumed to be loaded only by active power. Any significant deviation from this assumption shall be covered.
- Allocation constraints may be used by TenNet BV, ELIA, and PSE. A detailed description has been added to Annex I of the DA proposal
- The use of FRM values for CNECs and CNEs has been specified for the Core TSOs
- Core TSOs have harmonized their GSK determination methodologies while including some dedicated features to take into account specific production patterns within their grids
- Small zone-to-zone PTDFs, and its potential impact, has been addressed
- Implementation milestones have been added in Appendix 1
- Operational readiness for Advanced Hybrid Coupling has been added
During last Core Consultative Group 28/06 meeting, Core TSOs indicated that they will come back to Market Parties regarding the questions below on Transparency and RAO

**RAO**

- Why is the RAM relative computed on the basis of zone-to-zone PTDFs between electrically neighboring bidding zones and not between all pairs of bidding zones?
  - To capture the principal effect of implementing the remedial actions without market assumptions to enlarge the Flow-Based domain around the balanced net position, there is no necessity to take all combinations of bidding zones into account but only those with a commercial border as this would otherwise result in an uneven capacity distribution across all bidding zone borders. Indeed, a commercial exchange between two non-neighbouring bidding (A-D) zones can be decomposed into several commercial exchanges (A-B, B-C, C-D) between neighbouring bidding zones. The zone-to-zone PTDF of A-D can in a similar way be build up from the zone-to-zone PTDFs of A-B, B-C, and C-D. It is only the latter elements that are considered in the RAMrel.

**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.
  - This is linked to Article 25(3): “Before implementation of the CCM an analysis shall be made of information required to be published for each country, that sees a conflict of Article 23 with national as well as international regulations or directives (e.g. EU 114/2008, EU 1227/2011, EU 72/2009). The results of this conducted analysis by respective TSO(s) in cooperation with respective national regulatory authorities shall be presented to all Core NRAs and data publication (Article 23) shall be done in accordance to these national analysis.” As mentioned in Article 23(3), the target is to have at least the transparency level that is reached in the operational CWE FBMC.
3. AOB

AOB?