Stakeholder Workshop: ERAA 2022 Assumptions, principles and scenarios



17 March 2022



Agenda

- 1. Welcome & introduction
- 2. Stakeholder views/suggestions for the next ERAA
 - key takeaways from ERAA 2021 consultation
 - views from PLEF, Eurelectric, SmartEn
- 3. Overview of ERAA 2022 principles:
 - Main assumptions & scenarios
 - Modelling improvements
 - Economic Viability Assessment (EVA) principles
- 4. Conclusions & next steps



Introduction



Gerald Kaendler, Chair, System Development Committee, ENTSO-E





Background

ERAA is an ENTSO-E legal mandate, which aims to understand how the rapid changes to our energy system will affect security of supply.

It is a full pan-European monitoring assessment of power system resource adequacy, based on a state-of-the-art, globally unparalleled probabilistic analysis looking up to a decade ahead.

Stepwise implementation of the ACER methodology already began with ERAA 2021, and aims for a full target methodology to be applied as of ERAA 2024.

ERAA 2022 aims to be an effective tool to identify adequacy risks, and includes an **enhanced Economic Viability Assessment**, **more specific representation of demand response**, and **Flow-Based market coupling** incorporated in the central reference scenarios.

By proactively and factually identifying any system adequacy challenges, ERAA supports decision-makers in ensuring secure, affordable and sustainable energy to citizens and industries.

entso@ 6

Our Shared Objective is Net-Zero



Role of ERAA 2022

The comprehensive techno-economic assessment provided by ERAA helps understand how system changes interact, will inform decision makers and strengthens Europe's trajectory to net-zero.

rational reserves Decarbonization Policy ambitionsMarket desi Reliability of the capacities Building renovation Firm capacities Smart homes Maintenance Interconnection levels Cold Climate change Maintenance Deep electrification Smart homesCold spells Weather dependent supply Policy ambitions Flexibility of all energy carriers Resilience in other energy infrastructures Planned and unplanned outages Market design aves design Flexibility of all energy carriers Heat waves Consumer participation Weather dependent supply Extreme eventsPolicy ambitionsCold spells ience in other energy infrastructures Maintenance Cold spells Market design Firm capacities Operational reservesExtr m capacities Climate change lanned and unplanned outa Extreme events



Dedicated assessments for different timeframes Adequacy assessments Seasonal Week TYNDP ERAA Outlook ahead 10 years 1 year **5** years 6 months week years Mid term Short term Long term Policy Decisions **Real Time Operational Decisions Investment Decisions** UNCERTAINTY INCREASES WITH TIMESPAN entsoe

8

2. Stakeholder views/suggestions for the next ERAA



Kristof Sleurs, Convenor, ERAA Steering Group, ENTSO-E



Main stakeholder feedback following ERAA 2021



*UCED: Unit commitment and economic dispatch

entsoe 10

ERAA 2021 consultation: stakeholders' priorities for improvements









Support for research on methodological improvements of Resource Adequacy Assessments prepared by the Pentalateral Energy Forum

Presentation of the WP3: Economic Viability Assessment methodologies for Resource Adequacy Assessments

17 March 2022

Dmitri Perekhodtsev

The work package overview





Work Package 3 tasks and workshop objectives

		3	Evaluate approaches Economic Viability Asse of power plants, storage and flexibilities in the fra of Resource Adequa Assessments	for ssment facilities mework icy					
3 Step 1		3.1 Analysis of the main gaps in the existing Economic Viability Assessment (EVA) approaches							
3 Step 2		3.2 Address Economic V	3.2 Addressing practical constraints of the Economic Viability modelling						
3 Step 3		3.3 Account targets and	3.3 Accounting for market signals as well as policy targets and subsidy programs						
3 Step 4		3.4 Modellin risks	ng of strategic decisions consid	ering					
Guidehouse	research to busi energy consult		MPASS (ECON ©202	20 Guidehouse Inc					

Two expert workshops organised in June 2021

- Focus on industry perspective on the drivers of the capacity entry/exit decisions:
 - Revenues across markets
 - Role of market regulation and non-market drivers
 - Specificity of the entry/exist decisions for DSR and storage
 - Impact of the hedging strategies
 - Entry/exit decision under uncertainty

Two expert workshops organised in March 2022

- Focus on specific modelling issues of EVA and the industry perspective on the specific elements of entry/exit decisions:
 - The choice between the two EVA options proposed by ACER
 - Consistency of the EVA framework with the overall RAA
 - Assessment of the market risk in the EVA

Conclusions from the first workshops

AGuidehouse

Revenue sources and risk appetite can greatly differ by asset type

	Conventional plants	Flexibility development				
Wholesale market	 Main source of revenue Highly sensitive to scarcity pricing for peak- load plants 	 Relatively low revenues from wholesale markets Market access is important 				
Ancillary service and balancing markets	Considered more conservatively	 Highly sensitive on market design parameters defining market access reservoir size 				
Capacity markets	Can be a key factor for entry/exit	network tariffsderating factors				
Revenues outside of the electricity sector	Relevant for CHP power plants	Explicit and implicit subsidies relevant				
Assessment of the risk in the entry/exit decisions	 Entry decision needs to be justified by a solid business case in the central scenario A form of risk aversion approach is applied in assessing forward scenarios 	 Can be mobilized quicker and at lower investment costs → investors are more risk seeking 				
Guidehouse reservice to building LEXECON	©2020 Guidehouse Inc. All Rights Reserved	15				

The choice between the two EVA options proposed by ACER

Option 1: EVA of individual capacity resources	Option 2: EVA through minimisation of the system cost					
Soft link between dispatch and entry/exit modelling	Integrated solution of dispatch and entry/exit modelling					
 Focus on market revenues and decisions to enter/exit from the point of view of capacity providers aims to estimate revenues with high precision 	 Considers the system from the central planner perspective Potentially simplifying the calculation of the revenue streams 					
 May be limited in how many combinations of investment/retirement options are tested 	 Inherently accounts for all combination of all investment/retirement options (including interdependencies between resources and bidding zones) 					
Discussions results: A more appropriate approach to assess the medium-term market disequilibrium situations	 Discussions results: A more appropriate approach to assess long-term market equilibrium, potentially to be used in combination with Option 1 					





©2020 Guidehouse Inc. All Rights Reserved

Consistency of the EVA framework with the overall RAA

EVA has a different focus while needs to be consistent with ED

	Economic Viability Assessment (EVA)	Economic Dispatch (ED)		
Objective	 Assess investment/retirement decisions each year driven by <u>future</u> revenues and costs expected in each modeled year Informs the RAA regarding installed capacities → Underlying assumptions of EVA and RAA must be consistent 	• Estimate the adequacy indicators LOLE and EENS for RAA in the modeled year accounting for the main uncertainties and drivers of adequacy in the main scenario		
Time horizon	 EVA must analyze economic viability across multiple years beyond each target year Must account for the capacity resource economic lifetime 	 Modeled years over 10 future years 		
Main uncertainty drivers	 Commodity prices Long-term market development Weather-related drivers might be less important 	 Weather-related demand and RES profiles Outage patterns 		
Guidehouse restricts buildings	©2020 Guidehouse Inc. All Rights Reserved			

CURPERTIC Views on ENTSO-E ERAA 2021 & Economic Viability

Assessment

Yvan Hachez – Vice-Chair of Market & Investment Committee

ENTSO-E ERAA 2022 workshop – 17th March 2022





ERAA 2021 is a step in the right direction but sensitivity scenarios should be strengthened

Assumptions on realisation of existing / new capacity should be complemented with clarification of uncertainties around economic viability

Sensitivity of the results to some key assumptions should be assessed taking into consideration Flow-Based Market Coupling

Sensitivity analysis of Low Thermal Capacity should consider the 2030 goals, the impact of the Fit for 55 package and the recent pledges for earlier phase-out of coal/lignite units.



ERAA and EVA should extend their analysis to 2030 + year by year trajectory until 2030. Limiting EVA analysis in 2025 cannot accommodate the investments/disinvestments decisions and the system needs in terms of adequacy

Assumptions around DSR & Storage potential to be considered economically viable in 2025 should be further justified/explained.

Assumptions of very high scarcity prices (15,000 €/MWh) have important impacts on the EVA outcome while their realization in practice are questionable (e.g. political sensitivity and impact on customers of high prices)

Use of a comprehensive formulation (solved by mathematical programming tools) would be more efficient than the current EVA iterative process



Demand-side flexibility in the ERAA

SmartEn

stakeholder workshop 17 March 2022

smartEn members







Andrés Pinto-Bello Gómez

Head of Research and Projects smartEn



DR participation in Resource Adequacy Mechanisms ²⁴



Main takeaways

- Reduced DR activity due to participation requirements
- Lack of participation makes it difficult to forecast potential available DR capacity
- "Hidden" DSF in industrial processes won't be visible until markets allow monetization





ERAA 2022 suggestions

Challenges

- Risk of extrapolating current participation of DR in RAMs in modelling
- Fragmented and/or incomplete available/activated capacity data sets
- Difficult to calculate available flexibility in different price bands:
 - Most potential DR providers do not know (exactly) their short-run marginal costs (SRMC)
 - They adapt their dispatch capacity based on estimations and not on market-price
 - Hidden DR that won't be visible until a market exists
- Different price structures for DR and traditional generation make them difficult to compare

Suggestions

- More ambitious targets on already available technologies (e.g., heat pumps, smart charging and V2G) and future development of DSR
- Increased information sharing on dispatched bids and the technologies behind them
- Consider DSF as an equal investment option as traditional assets (e.g., with its own ROI)
- Include a scenario that models more technology inclusive mechanisms and markets to compare to status quo



smartEn/DNV Quantification of DSF study

Challenges

- Lack of accurate DSF potential quantification
- Lack of targets for DSF (e.g., no % of peak-shaving, or amounts of GW for DR)
- No accurate economic comparison between traditional generation and DSF
- Underrepresentation of DSF in modelling exercises and network development plans

Metrics modelled in study

- the **potential DSF capacity (GW)** available in 2030 to achieve the 55% GHG reduction and the renewables targets set by the European Commission in the Fit for 55 package proposal,
- the amount of DSF that should be activated (GWh) to support those objectives,
- **system level savings (€)** and **end-user benefits (€)** that would result from the activation of DSF.
- Increased ambition to reflect EC's Repower communication and higher needs of energy independence



Example of collected metrics

Industrial load flexibility – exemplary input data overview for market model

Industry	option	Min shut down time (hours)	Max shut down time	Cooling down time	Туре	Steps	Replaceability	Current (2020)		20	30
								Capacity (MW)	Price (€/MWh)	Capacity (MW)	Price (€/MWh)
				_						2030	2030
Oil refineries	Production stop factory	504	504	504	Stepwise	5 to 10					
Ceramics	Shut down whole sector	168	504	168	Stepwise	17					
Metal industry	Shut down whole factory	168	504	168	Binary	N/A	5,6				
Metal industry	Shut down cold ironing	1	23	24	Stepwise	5	4				
Metal industry	Shut down tin production	1	23	24	Binary	N/A	4				
Aluminum	Batch processes	1	5	24	Binary	N/A	8, 9, 10				
Aluminum	Batch processes	6	23	24	Binary	N/A	7, 9, 10			j.	
Aluminum	Batch processes	24	47	24	Binary	N/A	7, 8, 10				
Aluminum	Batch processes	48	504	48	Binary	N/A	7, 8, 9				
Zinc	Shut down whole factory	168	504	168	Binary	N/A					
Paper industry	Production shift of batch processes	1	23	24	Stepwise	8					
Paper industry	Production stop of continuous processes	24	504	24	Stepwise	8					
Glass industry	Stop production line/turn down furnace	24	504	24	Stepwise	24					
Chemical industry - fertilizers	Shut down whole factory	6	23	24	Stepwise	2	16, 17, 18				
Chemical industry - fertilizers	Shut down whole factory	24	167	24	Stepwise	2	15, 17, 18		~		
Chemical industry - fertilizers	Shut down whole factory	168	503	168	Stepwise	2	15, 16, 18				8
Chemical industry - fertilizers	Shut down whole factory	504	504	504	Stepwise	2	15, 16, 17				
Chemical industry - Salt	Shut down salt factory	6	504	24	Stepwise	2					
Chemical industry - Chlorine	Shut down chlorine factory	24	504	24	Stepwise	5			1		
Chemical industry - Chlorine	Scalable flex	1	24	24	Scalable	N/A					
Chemical industry - Other	Batch processes	24	504	24	Stepwise	155					
Food industry	Full production stop	1	23	168	Stepwise	40				6	
Food industry	Continuous processes	24	504	24	Stepwise	40					



27

Technologies

- Industrial loads
- Electric vehicles
- Electric heating and cooling
- CHP plants
- Small-scale batteries
- PV curtailment

Market and system insights:

- Wholesale and adequacy benefits
- Balancing and infrastructural benefits

For further questions please contact

andres.pintobello@smarten.eu



info@smarten.eu www.smarten.eu

Q&A with the audience

Don't forget to post your questions on Sli.do:

Go to www.sli.do and enter **#781543**

or scan the following QR with your phone to login_



Audience polls

Question 1: What are your expectations for the CO2 price trajectory in the coming decade?

Question 2: What are your expectations for the gas price trajectory in the coming decade?

Question 3: What are your expectations for other fuel price trajectories in the coming decade?



entso@ 30

3.1. ERAA 2022 Main Assumptions & Scenarios



Kristof Sleurs, Convenor, ERAA Steering Group, ENTSO-E





Main assumptions

Fit-for-55 & NECPs

- Data collected from TSOs comply with the National Energy and Climate Plans (NECPs)
- Pave the way towards Fit-for-55

Climate

• Climate change accounted through temperature detrending

Interconnection

- Flow-Based in central scenarios at least for the CORE region
- Net Transfer Capacities

entso@ 32



Scenario Calculation Workflow

NATIONAL ESTIMATES

TSOs provide forecasts for capacity based on planned lifetime, new generation estimates and NECPs.

WITHOUT CM

Economic Viability Analysis carried out, factoring in forecast carbon price and market price cap. Includes already contracted CM.

WITH CM

As above, with addition of capacity needed to meet system reliability standards in countries with an approved capacity mechanism.



Q&/

Fuel and CO₂ prices

- Significant CO₂ and Fuel price increase in 2021 due to COVID rebound, political climate, etc.
- Markets remain uncertain and volatile
- ENTSO-E welcomes stakeholder input on CO₂ and fuel price assumptions



Source: Tradingeconomics.com - 16th March 2022

35



Q&A with the audience

Don't forget to post your questions on Sli.do:

Go to www.sli.do and enter **#781543**

or scan the following QR with your phone to login_



Audience polls

Question 1: Which aspects do you consider as most important regarding the modelling of implicit DSR?

Question 2: Which aspects do you consider as most important regarding the modelling of electrolysers?

Question 3: Which aspects do you consider as most important regarding the modelling of planned maintenance of generation units?



entsoe 38
3.2. ERAA 2022 Modelling Improvements



Nils Müller, ERAA modelling, ENTSO-E



Multiple improvements in ERAA 2022 for more accurate prices and results



entso_{(entso})⁴⁰

Modelling improvements in ERAA 2022: An Overview



entso_{(entso}

Implicit DSR: improved modelling approach considering the flexibility from flexible end-consumers



Modelling description for the different end-consumer types

Small-scale / household batteries



- > "Price-tariff" demand fully flexible within storage restrictions.
- Same behavior as large-scale market participating batteries.

Heat Pumps



- Base consumption is still exogenous.
- "Price-tariff" demand can be shifted within 4-6 hours time windows in case of scarcity.

Electric Vehicles

> Base consumption is still exogenous.



- "Price-tariff" demand can be shifted within 4-6 hours time windows in case of scarcity.
- > No V2G feed-in.

Modelling improvements in ERAA 2022: An overview





Q&A

New modelling will allow more realistic viability assessment of CHP units

ERAA 2021

- CHP units were marked by most TSOs as "must-run/policy units".
- Not included in the EVA.
- Electricity prices underestimated due to feed-in at zero cost.

ERAA 2022

- CHP units no longer "*must-run/policy units*" by default.
- Included in the EVA step as "*retirement* candidates".
- More accurate electricity prices with dispatching at marginal cost.

CHP Heat Revenues' modelling: assumptions for the Simplified Heat Credit Approach



entsoe

Simplifications in current modelling:

- No explicit modelling of the heat market
- No heat demand needs to be fulfilled on hourly basis

Modelling improvements in ERAA 2022: An overview



Electrolyser modelling gives further insights on flexibility

- Electrolysers' modelling is aligned with the ENTSO-E Scenario Building approach for Bottom-Up scenarios.
- Electrolysers produce if electricity price is below a threshold, e.g. 49 EUR/MWh derived from H2 2030 forecasted price (70 EUR/MWh of H2) and electrolyser efficiency (68%).



Modelling improvements in ERAA 2022: An overview





Q&/

Important pre-optimization insights based on modelling improvements

- Maintenance of thermal units is modelled considering
 - Specific constraints (e.g. work force availability)
 - o RES feed-in
- Maintenance usually scheduled in times of low residual demand, i.e. high supply margins
- TSOs may provide exogenous maintenance patterns (e.g. French nuclear fleet)



Q&A with the audience

Don't forget to post your questions on Sli.do:

Go to www.sli.do and enter **#781543**

or scan the following QR with your phone to login_



Audience polls

Question 1: What modelling improvements would you consider as priority regarding the EVA?

Question 2: Which aspects would you consider as most important regarding the use of climate years for EVA?

Question 3: Which aspects would you consider as most important regarding the modelling of price caps?



entso 😝 💈 52

3.3. EVA Principles



Yaser Tohidi, ERAA market study team, ENTSO-E



Key considerations and parameters in the EVA process & methodology

Short-term Economic Dispatch



Long-term entry/exit decisions

Computational complexity



Interconnection

Cross border capacities



National Estimates

- Installed generation resources
- Planned outages
- Capacity mechanisms, policy contracts, must-run trajectories



Climatic Conditions

- Demand
- Renewable generation



Economic Parameters

- CAPEX, FOM, Fuel/CO2 prices
- Price cap
- WACC (including risk)



Other Assumptions

- Planning horizon
- Standard technologies
- Other revenue streams



EVA Principles



entso@ 55







Q&A

EVA Principles – EVA Decision Variables

ENTSO-E welcomes stakeholder input on the costs of (de-)mothballing & life extension through the open call for evidence by 5 April

57

Technologies	Decomissioning	(De-)mothballing**	Expansion	Life-extension**
Hydro/RES				
Gas	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
Nuclear				
Lignite/Coal/Oil	\checkmark	\checkmark		\checkmark
DSR			\checkmark	
Batteries*				

Renewable installed capacities as in national estimates:

- Investments driven mostly by (existing and future) subsidies and member states' policy targets
- Investment cost & potential are site-specific and difficult to represent appropriately in a Europeanentso
 wide investment model.

EVA Principles



EVA principles – Multi-year investment

- High computational complexity
- Multiple options under investigation:

Option 1: <u>Stochastic</u> approach	Option 2: <u>Multi-year-</u> <u>Deterministic</u> approach	Fall-back: <u>Single-year</u> <u>Deterministic</u> approach
 Heavy model Limited number of climatic conditions 	 Moderate model Increased number of climatic conditions 	 Light model High number of climatic conditions
Multi-year step	Multi-year step	Single year steps
 Single result No post-processing needed 	 Results per climatic condition Post-processing (averaging) is needed 	 Results per climatic condition per target year Post-processing (averaging) is needed

> Final approach to be decided based on testing and computational feasibility

EVA Principles



EVA Principles – updated approach for climate year selection based on total system cost

L

EVA 2021

Clustering based on residual load of macro regions

- Finding the climate year combinations that has the lowest error (mean&variance) to the aggregated distribution
- Choosing the best combination with the lowest distance to k-means of each cluster



EVA 2022

Clustering based on post-EVA total system cost distances



EVA Principles





Q&A

EVA principles – Cost of new entry (CONE) assumptions

- CAPEX and FOM from VOLL/CONE studies, where available
 - Only few countries have published CONE studies (DE, BE, EE, GR, IT, SE).
 - Member States have used different technical specifications, therefore, some rationalisation and harmonisation will be needed.
 - Not all countries published the underlying CONE assumptions in sufficient detail (e.g. CAPEX and FOM not published for Germany).
 - Not all studies consider DSR and report its potential.
 - Using different CONE for different countries may affect the EVA results.
- Average values for MSs where no CONE results have been published (based on the available CONE studies)



CAPEX and FOM collected from published national CONE/VOLL methodologies

CAPEX (€/kW) Values

Ref. Tech	Belgium TY – 26/27	ltaly TY - 22/23	Greece TY -22	Estonia TY - 20	Germany TY – 23/31
CCGT	600	683	450	N/A	Underlying CAPEX
OCGT	400	475-575	350	520	ns not
DSR (industry)*	0	N/A	25	N/A	published, only total CONE _{fixed} reported
Battery**	100 (2hr)	430 (1hr)	250 (3hr)	N/A	N/A

* There are other DSR sectors reported in CONE/VOLL studies of Greece and Germany.

** Battery types are:

Belgium \rightarrow 2 hrs Italy \rightarrow 1 and 4 hrs Greece \rightarrow 3, 4 and 6 hrs

Ref. Tech	Belg. TY – 26/27	Italy TY - 22/23	Greece TY - 22	Estonia TY - 20	Germany TY – 23/31
CCGT	25	15	10	N/A	Underlying FOM
OCGT	20	13	15	18	assumptions not
DSR (industry)*	20	N/A	7	N/A	published, only total CONE _{fixed} reported
Battery**	10 (2hr)	2.3 (1hr)	5 (3hr)	N/A	N/A

FOM (€/kW/yr) Values

entso👄

EVA Principles



EVA principles and cost assumptions: explicit DSR

CONE/VOLL studies (including economic parameters and in which DSR potential is reported for the ERAA target horizon)

Other national studies

(including economic parameters and in which DSR potential is reported for the ERAA target horizon)

Simplified bottom-up approach (building on ERAA 2021) for other countries where national studies not available

entso🕒

EVA Principles





Q&A

EVA principles: Price cap assumptions

Price caps exist on markets according to the current European regulation.

- For Day Ahead, the current maximum clearing price is 3.000 €/MWh
- If the clearing price exceeds 60% of the harmonised maximum clearing price for SDAC, the latter shall be increased by 1000 EUR/MWh by NEMOs up to five weeks later.

Dynamic Price Cap is under investigation, but not part of ERAA 2022.

Proposed approach forward: Forecasted Price Cap Increase

- Simulate consecutive target years, under different CY conditions
- Post-process Day Ahead prices by applying ACER's rule on price cap increase
- Compute a new price cap for each target year in the future as the mean of the post processed price caps
- Use this new price cap as input value



EVA Principles - recap



entso₍₉₎ 69

Q&A with the audience

Don't forget to post your questions on Sli.do:

Go to www.sli.do and enter **#781543**

or scan the following QR with your phone to login_



4. Conclusions and next steps



Edwin Haesen, Head of System Development, ENTSO-E



Don't forget to join us for the next public webinars & workshops



ERAA Implementation Roadmap





- ERAA2021 views feeding into next ERAA
- Consultations and webinars on input data & assumptions
- International benchmarking

Expanded methodology

- Scenarios heading towards Fit for 55
- Enhanced EVA with four target years
- Flow-based in central reference scenarios
- Role of demand response and electrolysers
- Modelling of CHP heat revenues and maintenance



Further proof of concepts

- EVA for other sources incl. storage and renewables
- Improved climate change modelling





Thank you for your attention

Don't forget to visit <u>www.entsoe.eu/outlooks/eraa</u> for more information on the ERAAs, interactive data visuals, and stakeholder information

or

Subscribe to the ENTSO-E newsletter on <u>www.entsoe.eu</u>

GET THE MOST POWERFUL NEWSLETTER IN BRUSSELS

Your email

Subscribe