

Minutes 2nd ENTSO-E Stakeholders Workshop on Operational Planning and Scheduling Network Code (OPS NC)

25 July 2012
13:00 h – 17:00 h
Avenue de Cortenbergh 100 - 1000 Brussels

The workshop attracted about 40 attendees. List of participants is attached to the minutes

Programme

12:00 – 13:00	Registration/Lunch	
13:00 – 13:15	Welcome	Olivier Bronckart <i>ENTSO-E Manager System Operations</i>
13:15 – 14:00	Integration of Results After the 1 st Workshop	Yves Harmand <i>ENTSO-E Convenor of OS NC Drafting Team</i>
14:00 – 14:20	OP&S NC Supporting Document	Louise Overvad Jensen <i>ENTSO-E Member of OP&S NC Drafting Team</i>
14:20 – 14:35	Coffee break	
14:35 – 16:45	Stakeholders' view, Discussions	Workshop participants
16:45 – 17:00	Conclusions	Yves Harmand <i>ENTSO-E Convenor of OP&S NC Drafting Team</i>
17:00	End of Workshop	

Presentations are accessible at the ENTSO-E website <https://www.entsoe.eu/events/ops-nc2/>.

Welcome

Olivier Bronckart, ENTSO-E Manager System Operations, welcomed the participants and shortly introduced the background and transversal issues of the OPS and other codes under development by ENTSO-E.

Integration of Results after the 1st Workshop

Yves Harmand welcomed the participants and introduced the changes made in the draft OPS code after the 1st Workshop with the DSOs TEG for OPS code, 1st stakeholders' workshop and comments from the Regulators and ACER. Presentation is accessible on the ENTSO-E website <https://www.entsoe.eu/events/ops-nc2/>.

He stressed that the legal review is not performed and the participants should treat the draft OPS code as not legally validated.

OP&S NC Supporting Document

Louise Overvad Jensen presented the Supporting document of the draft OPS code. Presentation is accessible on the ENTSO-E website <https://www.entsoe.eu/events/ops-nc2/>.

Stakeholders' view, Discussions

Pavla Mandatova presented preliminary comments from the DSOs TEG and recommendations for further development of the code:

- Relevant DSOs are also in charge of security of supply and perform security analysis, so the same kind of information should be accessible by them to run the distribution system in secure manner.
- Relevance of DSOs should be stressed. They have a huge impact on cross borders because of DER.
- Clarification of definitions is needed, e.g. observability area, relevant TSO/DSO.
- Cost recovery issue for DSOs. All regulated operators should be considered in chapter 4.

TSO and DSO cooperation is key and therefore TSO/DSO interface should be specified in case of significant grid users connected to DSO network, but having influence on cross borders. Cross borders in this code mean the cross borders among TSOs.

Belgium, GDF SUEZ Energy Europe

Comment. Article 16.6 in Regulation refers to costs and redispatch. Article 19 on costs recovery in CACM also under discussion and could be relevant for this code.

Germany, ELPEC

Question. Still it is not clear if there is binding obligation of TSO to assist in case if the neighbouring TSO asks for assistance and not clear assignment of responsibilities – who handles the congestions?

Answer. Operational Security NC covers responsibilities of TSOs in system operation.

Question. Article 29(4) prioritization of remedial actions on economical and technical basis is very conflicting and leads to not transparent decisions by TSO?

Answer. ENTSO-E asks for the better wording from the stakeholders in their detailed comments.

Question. Planning platform is entering into force in 24 months, but the code is entering into force in 3 years. Is it mean totally 5 years? Are there 2 years not enough to run the new pan European platform? Also role of ACER is not clear. Article 8 in CACM is good advice. If TSOs do not respect obligations, what is procedure to deal with?

Answer. The compliance monitoring will deal with the issue of applying the codes and is not included in codes.

Belgium, GDF SUEZ Energy Europe

Question. Security analysis on pan European level is not harmonized – data and processed are harmonized by codes, but types of failures are not, e.g. bus bar faults, N-1. The impact to capacities is different, if different criteria for contingencies apply in different countries.

Answer. The code refers to methodology to be developed later. Description of contingencies is in Operational Security NC. The main focus in this code is done on coordination and to have coordinated processes (we should not underestimate the

value of coordination). Coordination is the first step to solve the issue of harmonization, which depends on national issues – system design, probability of events and national security requirements differ in different countries.

Belgium, EWEA

Question. Chapter 6 on Ancillary Services doesn't cover technical aspects of ancillary services. What are technical requirements of ancillary services and where is procurement process? No explicitly mentioned that DSOs can buy ancillary services (e.g. for voltage control), because they act as system operators and have big amount of DER in their grid. Procurement of ancillary services by DSOs should be in this code.

Answer. Issues of procurement of ancillary services are in other codes, e.g. Balancing, Load Frequency Control and Reserves.

Question. Article 27(2) and 27(5) should not refer to Article 3(3) on Regulatory Aspects, but to Balancing code or other codes prescribing ancillary services procurement procedures and technical requirements for ancillary services.

Answer. Procurement issues are already in the Balancing FG.

Question. Is Adequacy methodology in Article 5(24) common and harmonized on pan European level, or each TSO provides information based on his own adequacy methodology?

Answer. It is one harmonized methodology.

Germany, RWE

Question. Coordinated outage planning is challenging. It is restrictive on competences of Generators to optimise their assets and business. Generators have many decisions taken on spot. Transparency platforms already exist to announce the outages for 3 years. Is it not enough?

Question. Scheduling is more market issue and described in CACM. It is not clear finally what market is and what system operation is?

Question. Redispatch should be market based and cover the gaps of market performance. No free options should be left for TSOs.

Question. TSOs are already doing adequacy reports, including generation adequacy. Do we need more legislation on that issue?

Answer. TSOs shall have to tackle consequences and to take right decisions and on time based on information available, to have scenarios and be transparent on risks. The task of TSOs is to coordinate among the market participants, but not to run generation.

Comment. The proposal is not to plan a system at all and let the system to be run by the market participants on real time, solving all issues on real time and being responsible for their balances.

Answer. To run the system is not only to keep the balance. More explanation will be in supporting paper.

UK, SSE Generation

Question. What is outage?

Answer. Outage will be defined in the code and explained in supporting paper.

Germany, ELPEC

Comment. Article 1(2) in draft Balancing FG covers Load Frequency Control (LFC) and redispatch, so LFC and redispatch should be in balancing code.

Answer. Draft Balancing FG will not cover redispatch, technical aspects of load frequency control, frequency quality, etc.

Belgium, EDF Luminus

Comment. Mainly TSOs are mentioned in the code, e.g. chapter of outage planning, but not other players. It is not clear what means "pan European" – regional or synchronous area. There is no possibility of negotiations in outage planning chart.

Answer. All affected parties are mentioned in the code – DSOs, generators, demand. The text in the code is more detailed and describes the process.

Question. What means availability of generators? Is it physical availability or economical availability? Unit can be physically available, but economically not reasonable to be run. Could availability be defined in the code?

Answer. The reasoning of the code is a technical (physical) availability. The economical treatment to run the plant or not is a market issue.

Comment. Cross border capacity should be ensured. Procurement of ancillary services of reactive power is not mentioned in the code any more.

Comment. A lot of data is shared among TSOs, but it is not clear why it is necessary and who is using it. The concern is related to data security, so the purpose of data and parties who need the data should be clarified.

UK, SSE Generation

Question. Do we need so many "areas" – "market area", "control area", "responsibility area", "market balanced area", etc.?

Answer. The supporting paper for Operational Security NC describes the "areas" for system operation and the difference among them.

Comment. Could information for system operation among the participants in areas be shared in one platform?

Belgium, EDF Luminus

Question. In case of RES the reference is always made to DSOs. Could other concepts of aggregators be considered (smart grids)?

Answer. Scheduling agent is left open for all forms of aggregators of RES, but the operation of TSO and DSO grid should be consistent.

Comment. EU legislation requires a lot of information on transparency platforms. It is difficult to provide the same information to all IT platforms.

France, EDF

Question. If alternatives for outage plan are proposed by TSO, how the costs are taken into account? Why it is not explicitly told that the costs recovery issues are local market based and should be solved on national level?

Question. Planning modification allows changing of outage plans until real time. What kind of modification is in mind? Clarification is needed for foreseen and unforeseen events.

Answer. Under real time modification of the outage plan a delay of the end the outage is in mind.

Question. Is year-ahead plan prepared once per year?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What are criteria for Generator to be involved in outage planning?

Answer. The criteria are not in the code, but this issue should be solved on national level after proposal by TSO and approval by NRA.

France, EDF

Comment. The costs recovery issue for Generators should be tackled in code, not to leave TSOs to act as it wants. E.g. the common principle should be in the code that the costs of Generators will be covered according to national legislation.

Answer. Agree, that costs of Generators should be covered according to national legislation.

Question. There is not the same procedure in Article 20 for modification of the plans for planned and unplanned outages.

Answer. Procedures of planned and unplanned outages are close, but not the same.

Germany, RWE

Comment. By allowing modification of the plans generators are not motivated to plan the outages precisely.

Germany, ELPEC

Comment. If TSOs cannot handle the Generators outage plans – it is possible to change the practice and to charge the planning of outages. This will encourage generators to plan the outages carefully and avoid changing of plans.

Answer. Now it is too late to start discussion on changing the current practices of outage planning in this code, but in future this proposal could be considered.

Belgium, EDF Luminus

Comment. Generators should inform TSOs when information on outage plan is available, but not to force the planning in advance. Generators publish their outage plans in transparency platforms for coming 3 years.

Answer. Generators plan only their own assets and not care about the other participants in the market, including operators. But TSOs and DSOs shall handle the system and this process should be coordinated, because the outage plans influence each other. If there are any other ways to coordinate the system and to ensure the security, ENTSO-E will discuss the proposals.

France, EDF

Comment. Article 9(15) TSOs publish outage plan of the region and give only 2 weeks to react. The regions are quite large so 2 weeks are too short.

Question. Do you intend to change the regions? Why do you need a process of changing regions?

Answer. No

France, EDF

Question. Is there any regional planning today and regions are defined?

Answer. Yes.

UK, SSE Generation

Comment. In Article 31 of Scheduling chapter the schedules can be in different timeframes. Gate closure shall be harmonized.

Answer. Day ahead and intraday codes are harmonising the gate closure. This issue is related to the market codes.

Conclusions

The final comments will be sent to Ramunas Bikulcius (ramunas.bikulcius@entsoe.eu) by 6 August 2012.

Olivier Bronckart and Yves Harmand thanked all the participants for active contributions, constructive discussion and many valuable suggestions closed the 2nd Stakeholders' Workshop on the Operational Planning and Scheduling Network Code.