

Minutes of Meeting
ENTSO-E Drafting Team on DCC
DSO Technical Expert Group

Date: 5 July 2012
Time: 10h00 – 13h00
Place: Brussels

Participants

Name	Affiliation	present	excused
DT DCC			
Hans Abele	Transnet BW		X
Gianluca Albanese	Terna		X
Stephanie Bieth	RTE		X
Anders Danell	Svenska Kraftnett	X	
Roberto Gnudi	Terna		X
Edwin Haesen	ENTSO-E	X	
Bastian Homburg	Amprion	X	
Kees Jansen	Tennet		X
Mikko Koskinen	Fingrid		X
João Moreira	REN		X
Mark Norton	EirGrid	X	
Sergio Pasero Ruiz	REE		X
Juergen Schmitt	swissgrid	X	
Dwayne Shann	National Grid		X
Guillemette Smadja	Elia / LRG		X
DSO TEG			
Pierre Andersson EK	E.ON Energihandel Nordic (Eurelectric DSO)	X	
Pilar Barrera	Bewag Netz (Eurelectric DSO)		X
Alberto Cerretti	Enel Distribuzione (Eurelectric DSO / EDSO-SG)		X
Florian Chapalain	EDSO-SG	X	
Ivan Codd	ESB (Eurelectric DSO)	X	
Falk Engelmann	VKU (Geode)		X
Bruno Gouverneur	Synergrid (Eurelectric DSO)	X	
Mike Kay	ENWL (Geode)	X	
Riccardo Lama	Enel Distribuzione (Eurelectric DSO)	X	
Mika Loukkalahti	Helen Sähköverkko Oy (Eurelectric DSO)		X
Johan Lundqvist	Svenskenergi (Geode)	X	
Marc Malbrancke	Inter-Regies (CEDEC)	X	
Pavla Mandatova	Eurelectric DSO	X	
Javier Meco	Endesa (EDSO-SG)		X
Jacques Merley	ERDF (Eurelectric DSO)	X	
Viktoria Neimane	Vattenfall R&D (Eurelectric DSO)		X
Joachim Nilges	RWE (Eurelectric DSO)	X	
Piotr Ordyna	Tauron (EDSO-SG)		X
Allan Norsk Jensen	DEA (Eurelectric DSO)	X	
Jesus Peco	Iberdrola (EDSO-SG)		X
Herman Poelman	Alliander (CEDEC / EDSO-SG)	X	
Graeme Vincent	Scottish Power (Eurelectric DSO)	X	
Jarmo Saarinen	Fortum Oyj (Eurelectric DSO)		X
Walter Schaffer	Salzburgnetz (CEDEC)		X
Bilal Simsek	TEDAS (Eurelectric DSO)		X
Siegfried Wanzek	E.ON-Energie (Eurelectric DSO)		X

1. Agenda

- 10:00-11:00hrs Discussion on final changes in code as a result of SDC decision, RfG and ACER comments, including:
- Changes to DSR requirements
 - Changes to legislative pieces
 - Alignment of definitions
- 11:00-11:30hrs Coffee break
- 11:30-12:00hrs Discussion on final changes in code as a result of SDC decision, RfG and ACER comments – Outstanding issues with code from DSO TEG prospective
- 12:00-13:00hrs Stage 2 Consultation period, timetable and work of DT/DSO EG/User group and DSO involvement in the upcoming workshop

Agenda is approved.

2. DSO Expert Group outstanding issues with the draft DCC

The DT DCC asks all present DSO TEG members to list and clarify three outstanding issues with the draft DCC presently under consultation, as a means for further discussion in this meeting and possible further development of the code and its supporting documents.

All issues that were mentioned and discussed are listed below, as well as a short outcome of the related discussion:

The reactive power provisions (Art 10)

- Especially the clause on compensation capability at 25% of the maximum export capacity (Art 10 (1)b) is not used in many countries nowadays. The consequences of this requirement need to be analyzed.
- Art 10 allows for possible exemptions for Demand Facilities, but not for Transmission Connected Distribution Networks. The DSO TEG asks to have a similar possible exemption as well in Art 10(1)a.1 2nd and 3rd bullet.
- It is noted that today's compliance enforcement is mostly based on measuring.

ENTSO-E notes that the 25% requirement refers to a compliance simulation, not a continuous operation. It is a static measurement. The requirement does not require a specific control system. The requirement focuses on a capability, without prejudice on how reactive power flows between transmission and distribution are managed/agreed/required.

The DSO TEG states that it is unclear what the requirement is necessary for and asks for additional information from the DT DCC. It is also stated that being capable to fulfill that requirement is a major cost driver. The DT refers to the same main arguments as the other reactive power case CBA, but will consider clarification of the rationale in the future supporting documents.

The 3rd bullet in Art 10(1)a.1 originally also had a similar possible exemption as the two other items. Its deletion is an editorial due to restructuring of the requirement. The remark on Art 10(1)b will be discussed in the DT DCC internally.

For avoidance of doubt it is emphasized that Art 10(1)c does focus on continuous control of reactive power exchange. As the requirement requires a proper justification and a case specific agreement between TSO and DSO, the DSO TEG agrees with the principles of this requirement.

Demand Side Response services

- The impact of the DCC requirements on DSR to DSOs is not completely clear yet.
- If some DSR services are only very seldom used, it appears difficult to justify the costs compared to the consequences on Security of Supply?
- Who will supervise/enforce mandatory services (DSR-SFC), especially for mass products, connections below 1000V? There is no issue with voluntary services.
- The point is raised that if a grid user is not compliant with a DSR requirement, the user should not be allowed to provide DSR services, but it should not be an argument for not granting a connection.
- What is the role of DSOs in DSR? Some countries have taken the direction that it is not the DSO who is responsible for the communication interface with customers. If so who performs the compliance enforcement?

The DT clarifies that the draft code envisages no compliance tests by the Relevant Network Operator for DSR-SFC connected above or below 1000V. Reformulation of Art 22(1) will be considered to remove doubt.

On other cases of DSR, the DT states that even if a 3rd party sets the DSR services, still the Relevant Network Operator deals with compliance of connection requirements, cfr generation.

Significant users

- Which users are significant in the context of this code and why? Especially clarification regarding domestic users is requested, (i.e. the formulation of Art 3 – scope as it appears to contradict with the definition of significant Demand Facility).

The DT will consider reformulating Art 3 and/or the definition, e.g. based on the description of the scope in the DCC Explanatory Note (Section 2.2).

Implication of simulation models for Distribution Networks (Art. 20)

- This is new for most DSOs and may be challenging, especially for dynamic models.
- The DSO TEG notes that today dynamic simulations may be performed only for specific cases in high voltage grids, not for an entire network behind the T/D connection point. Dynamic simulations in medium and low voltage grids are largely unusual.
- The notion of 'submodels' in the present requirement appears to imply a detailed representation of the entire network.

ENTSO-E notes that the requirement does not aim at a complete description of the entire network. Roughly speaking the relevant information a TSO could require would a.o. comprise aggregated production by type, aggregate dynamic demand (DSR) and average approximate impedance for all connections.

The DSO TEG generally agrees with the needed information at the connection points, but asks for clarification about the way to deliver that information. The DSO TEG states that requiring simulation models seems not to be the most effective way in this respect. Also clarification is needed on the information for aggregate production, as detailed simulation models for generation is requested by NC RfG only as of type C units.

DSO TEG requests that a FAQ on modeling requirements is provided to ensure clarity on the expectations of the TSOs as a result of the code. ENTSO-E agreed to consider supplementing the existing FAQs with this requested FAQ.

Clarification is requested on the impact in case of *modernization of equipment*.

On the general frequency requirements (Art. 7): At the moment in many countries a Distribution Network only disconnects if requested by a TSO. As such it is considered a matter of compliance of TSOs, not compliance of DSOs.

Some issues also *addressed in the NC RfG development* are reiterated for DCC, e.g. on CBAs for some requirements, the link with standardization, a supporting document clarifying the relation between Demand Facility, Distribution Network, Demand Unit.

Next steps

The draft agenda for the 9 August public DCC workshop is discussed. A joint presentation of the 4 DSO associations would be welcomed.

The DSO TEG requests to have a view on additional/updated supporting documents at an early phase for possible feedback. The DT notes the request, but will have to see this with regard to the status of review of comments post-consultation and the eventual date for submission of the final code to ACER.