

WG Belgian Grid Etat des lieux Evolutions Contrat d'accès

Meeting 26/9/2016

Access Contract Evolutions: Main points

Rights & obligations of market actors in the access contract

- Which actors ? Supplier, ACH, ARP, GU – role of supplier
- Appendices 12, 13
- Switch of designations / end of the contract

Data exchange

- Cartography of data exchanges (& delays) imposed between market actors

CDS – Evolution of several elements

Designation process

- Based on the cartography, clarification of designation delays and process (art. 8 to 11)
- Notion of complete request

Points discussed in WG BG 19/5 – Today: follow-up of the discussion

Detailed list of studied elements

1. Place du fournisseur dans le contrat d'accès
2. Timing d'échanges de données.....
3. Eléments liés aux CDS
- 3.1 Annexe 14ter.....
- 3.2 Annexe 14
- 3.2.1 Plusieurs statuts pour matérialiser le degré d'activation du rôle de gestionnaire de CDS.....
- 3.2.2 Désignation des ARP actifs dans les CDS raccordés au réseau Elia
- 3.2.3 Eviter le doublon des informations communiquées par le gestionnaire du CDS.....
- 3.2.4. Evolution des services de flexibilité
- 3.2.5. Référence au metering Manual for CDS.....
- 3.3 Définition de l'ARP chargé du suivi des énergies non allouées.....
- 3.4 Mise à disposition des ARP des données de mesure agrégées et validées.....
4. Procédures de désignation
- 4.1 Demande de désignation – Notion de demande complète.....
- 4.2 Clarification des délais et procédures de désignation
- 4.3 Résiliation des désignations / révocabilité du contrat.....
- 4.4 Annexe 2.....
- 4.5 Annexe 3.....
- 4.6 Annexes 12 et 13
5. Divers

• Elia proposals on access contract's evolutions

⇒ position of UG ?

⇒ Additional points/clarifications needed?

• Timing : to be discussed

Supplier position in Access Contract

Current position of supplier regarding access to Elia Grid :

- No contractual relationship even if current financial relation (green certificates) & reporting obligations to regulatory authorities
- Central role with Elia is done by BRP in current & future market/products design

Development of Bid Ladder design – ToE :

- Importance to know supplier for each delivery point, to communicate data regarding activation of flexibility (FDM role)
- Long term future : ToE for other products

Conclusion – Future position of the supplier :

- Need of have accurate information regarding the supplier for each delivery point* (duration of the supplier's designation; full administrative details of supplier)
- To keep information on supplier in App. 3 + additional information in App. 3bis, 3ter
- To keep signature of the supplier

**delivery point : related to the scope of access contract = access point in the Elia grid, point within a CDS connected to Elia grid & submetering point (see [BidLadder design note](#) – section 2.2.1.1)*

Data exchange

What ?

- Need of cartography of data exchange
- Based on contracts and grid codes
- For grid users, ACH, ARP, CDSO, suppliers

Why ?

- In order to evaluate pertinence/feasability of current data flows & identify the potential blocking issues (especially when several parties concerned)
- To propose more realistic alternatives/timings if needed

➤ See presentation “Data Exchange & Switching”

CDS – Evolution of several elements

Proposal of several elements to be adapted => *No revolution*

- Evolutions of ancillary services
 - Suppression of ICH reference
 - Extended notion of flexibility
- Better classification of CDS statutes – more based on reality
- Clarifications in the access & ARP contracts
 - Definition of ARP PBO
 - Article 18 ARP contrat (how to put at disposal of the ARPs aggregated and validated metering data)
 - No need to give information twice
 - Reference to Metering Manual
- No need of designation process for ARPs active in a CDS (exception App. 14bis)
- Suppression of Appendix 14ter

Suppression of Appendix 14ter

Global position :

- The nominations, given by CIPU responsible party are split by Elia

 *Hub deal needed*

- The global position of both ARP's is communicated day ahead
- The global position in Intra Day is only cross-border and hub.

No change for the intra day adaptations of production requested by Elia:

- Elia neutralizes all adjustments requested by Elia (CIPU, reserves ...) only in the perimeter of the ARP who signed the CIPU contract. That ARP must do a hub deal with the second owner of the production installation. The second owner doesn't have information to control the hub deal.

 *To improve anyway*

Intra day adaptations of production requested by the CIPU responsible party.

- Elia doesn't do the allocation, taking in account the % mentioned in annex 14 ter.

 *The CDSO can do that allocation if he receives in time the necessary metering data*

Appendices 12, 13 – To build a common proposal

- To suppress Appendices 12-13
- To keep the principle to give delegation to ACH / ARP to renew alone their designation (without signature of the GU)
 - Appendix 12: 2 in use
 - Appendix 13: >10 in use
- To insert this principle of delegation in Appendices 2-3

Input of WG BG members is needed...

Modalities ? Duration ?

- A fixed period of time for designation ? In contradiction with the essence of App. 12,13 ?
- Right for each concerned party (GU, ARP, ACH) to end the delegation of power before the end of designation with conditions
 - When switch of ARP-ACH
 - When end of access contract (article 16)
 - How ARP/ACH might end delegation without consent of GU ? Principle : an ARP cannot stop without the ACH agreement
 - How to balance interests of ARP/ACH and of GU ?

Next steps

- Note of Elia on proposals for modifications on Access Contract (+ modifications translated into textual proposals)
- Analysis and feedback from WG BG members
- Wrap-up of the discussions in WG Belgian Grid