Meeting report

MEETING 1st Fine Tuning workshop iCAROS	
Date	2/4/2019
Organiser	Elia implementation project iCAROS

PARTICIPANTS
Michaël Van Bossuyt – Febeliec
Jonas Boury – Yuso
Mattijs Van Bruwaene – EDF Luminus
Dieter Jong - EIYA
Ludovic (Ludo) Platbrood – Eneco
Pauline Anciaux – FOD
Wouter Van Melkebeek – Engie
Geert Meynckens – RESTORE
Jolien Bruninx – BASF
Frank Vanwynsberghe – BASF
Harlem Steven – EDF Luminus
Romain Benquey- RESTORE
Laila Chafaqi – EDF Luminus
Valentin Parys – Lampiris
Lieven Van De Keer – T-Power
PARTICIPANTS – ELIA
Sofie Van den waeyenberg
Amandine Leroux
Steven Tassignon
Anna Bondarenko
Martin Funck
Viviane Illegems

1. AGENDA

- Introduction
- Topic 1 : Scheduled data exchange DA/ID for Energy storage
- Topic 2 : Bidding of flexibility for redispatching: bid properties

2. REPORT

- Participants request whether the open points of the previous workshop regarding outage planning can be followed up in the fine-tuning workshops.
- Participants ask whether a similar design will be implemented for DSO units. Elia representative clarifies that the objective of Elia is to propose a similar design towards DSOs. Even if a similar design is agreed between Elia and the DSOs a complete copy/past is not very likely probably some fine-tuning will be needed to capture specific features of DSO-connected units but the basics would be the same.
- Participants request information regarding a possible identification of demand facilities as cross-border relevant assets. Elia representative replies that this is a methodology set at regional European level and that this methodology is not approved yet but at the moment there are no indications that any of the Belgian demand facilities are identified as cross-border relevant. It is requested that Elia informs as soon as they have information that would contradict this indication.
- 1 or 2 separate schedules for storage?
    - Pro for 2: In case of 2 different assets (e.g. Pump and Turbine for hydro) which can also have different availability status (= 2 availability plans preferred/needed)
    - Pro for 1: In case of 1 asset (e.g. battery), although switching between charging and injecting can happen within 15 minutes, 2 schedules which provide a value per 'direction' is being questioned. Instead net MW value for the time period (quarter of an hour) seems more relevant. Also one availability status relevant.
- Market trades can be done until 5' before RT. However, the scheduling deadline needs to be respected for updating schedules and flexibility bids for congestion management. Participants points out that this could reduce market opportunities for small units focusing on capturing extreme balancing pricing only known after neutralization time but 5' before RT.
    - But a full freedom of dispatch without any neutralization time is today not possible because Elia needs to be able to take redispatch actions to compensate congestion problems triggered by the entered schedules. At the moment the portfolio of actions as well as the assessment time does not allow a full freedom of dispatch till 5' before RT without jeopardizing grid security.
- Participants ask how units will be penalized if the schedule is not respected. This is one of the remaining open points in the design.
- Request from participants that the implementation of the iCAROS design and designs in the framework of 'balancing' should be aligned. However, the focus of the fine-tuning workshops is the fine-tuning of the consulted iCAROS design and not the alignment with other products as such the representatives of Elia promise to take the comment back internally however they can not promise anything specific given these designs are out of scope of the implementation project iCAROS.
- In the current iCAROS design PGM type A doesn't need to provide flexibility for redispatch (RD). In the current iCAROS design, this type of units could offer flexibility through the voluntary bidding of demand facilities. The voluntary inclusion of this type of units could be reviewed in the future but is out of scope of the current design.
- Participants request to clarify the definition of location for demand facilities (connection point, access point, other?).

- It should be clarified what is meant with start-time of the system. How much time in advance does a provider need to be informed in order to comply with the redispatch bid. For instance 90 minutes before the 1st quarter for which a redispatch bid is called upon.
- European legislation (CEP) foresees a cost based redispatch as long as the TSO was not able to invest in the necessary grid investment to eliminate structural congestion.
- Participants request if the ramping costs of shutdown bid for redispatch (RD) will be remunerated. After RD bid period, specific assets need to ramp up again to their original schedule. This ramping will lead to BRP imbalance and depending on the balancing price at the moment of ramping the costs related to this may be very high. As such it is requested whether these costs occurring after the redispatch action of Elia can be included in the fixed cost of a redispatch bid. Participants indicate that such compensation is included in strategic demand reserve. The Elia representatives indicate that the balancing costs due to ramping after the congestion bid is today also not remunerated in the CIPU contract. As such the Elia representatives are willing to inform about the compensation given in the framework of strategic demand reserve but do not commit to change this in the framework of remuneration of redispatch bids.
- How to ensure the IT performance at customer side? What are the requirements? Clarification should be provided.

3. DATE FOR NEXT MEETING

to be confirmed