

Meeting report

MEETING 3th Fine Tuning workshop iCAROS	
Date	24/6/2019
Organiser	Elia implementation project iCAROS

PARTICIPANTS
Michaël Van Bossuyt – Febeliec
Valentin Parys - Lampiris
Hugo Canière – Belgian Offshore Platform
Michel Ceusters - VYNOVA-GROUP
Carlos Dierckxsens – Next-Kraftwerke.be
Lieven Van De Keer – T-Power
Wouter Van Melkebeek – Engie
Jolien Bruninx – BASF
Geert Meynkens - Restore
Laila Chafaqi - Luminus
Matthijs Van Bruwaene - Luminus
Ruben Laleman - Engie
PARTICIPANTS – ELIA
Elodie Ciciriello
Amandine Leroux
Steven Tassignon - skype
Martin Funck
Viviane Illegems

1. AGENDA

- Introduction
- overview of scheduling processes after implementation of iCAROS design

2. REPORT

- The participants stress again that a clarification for CDS is also needed in T&C SA. A similar clarification is requested for connection points where the asset is owned by someone other than the subscriber of the connection agreement.

- PGM type A and ES type A (stand-alone and embedded) it should be clear how the 2 cases should be addressed including the case where the asset is owned by a third party when it is embedded.
- Participants indicate a need to have the implications of opting for a MW schedule or ON/OFF schedule for a PGM or ES < 25 MW clarified between AS products. Elia responds that the objective of the workshops is to facilitate the translation of the iCAROS design towards implementation and that the experts of other products are not always present. Furthermore different cases (set-ups) exist as such it seems more appropriate that market parties before deciding for option MW schedule of option ON/OFF schedule consider all implications for their particular case. In case of specific questions for a specific case our customer relation department is ready to assist.
 - [Of meeting examples
 - (a) PGM of < 25 MW with real-time measurements opting for MW schedule will need to switch from aggregated bidding towards unit based bidding for aFRR
 - (b) Demand facility bidding aFRR but not redispatch can offer aggregated bidding for aFRR. However if the same demand facility would offer redispatch flexibility they need to provide a MW schedule and as a consequence they can only offer unit based bidding in aFRR]
- Participants stress the importance that when simultaneously entering multiple schedules for multiple assets that if only one schedule contains inconsistencies only that schedule should be blocked and all other should go through. Elia respondent that this comment will be noted that consistency checks will be implemented at asset level as such that every schedule will be assessed separately even if they are transferred at the same time.
- Participants request that it is clearly specified which information is considered correct if there are inconsistencies between the information provided by the OPA and SA. By default if no alignment takes place the information entered by the OPA would be considered as the correct information given this is also specified as such in the Federal Grid Code. However given the relevance of having correct information in case of Forced Outage schedules entered by SA with flag forced outage will be accepted by the system. However a warning of inconsistency will be send to all involved parties (OPA-SA-Grid User) with a request to rectify the inconsistency within a determined delay. The delay should be reasonable is the requests of the participants given the fact that the involved parties need to align.
- Regarding the intraday scheduling deadline participants indicate that the deadline may be in day-ahead. Given that the scheduling deadline – deadline after which schedules for an asset can no longer change till real time – is the combination of the neutralization time set at 30 minutes and the activation time (linked to the start-up time given as bid property for a redispatch bid) it can be that in case of cold start that the start-up time is 12 hours as such the schedules for the asset could not be altered till RT minus 12:30 hours. This means that the DA schedule deadline which is the first deadline to enter a schedule is also to final deadline for the quarter hours 00:00 am till 03:30 am. From 03:30 the deadline for the following quarter hour is shifted 15 min as long as the start-up time is maintained as 12 hours for that period.

- Participants indicate that the start-up time can alter throughout the day so a link should be foreseen between the start-up time for each quarter hour and the activation time assessed by the system.
- Participants also indicate that the implications of min down time need to be linked in the system to the availability of the offer. If a may not run is requested and the unit has min down time the system should not only take this into consideration for the running day but also for the next day even if no may not run is requested for that day. It need to be clarified how this information which requires a rolling window and not an assessment per day will be used by the system. Elia will assess whether this information can be collected through the bid properties entered by the SA.
- Participants indicate that the loss of the remuneration if Elia changes a request till Day-Ahead GCT should be reviewed. At this time market participants has no longer the opportunity to enter bids in the DA market. Participants suggest that 45 min in advance of DA GCT is more acceptable given the fact that the SA is not the one who can enter bids on DA market.
- Participants request clarification regarding the level at which the grid user can assign a OPA or SA is it at PGM level or can a grid user indicate different OPAs and SAs for the different Pus making up one asset. This needs to be clarified in T&C and if possible foreseen by the system in which data is entered. [of meeting – review of Federal Grid Code indicates that an OPA/SA is assigned at asset level so not PU level]
- Participants request that in the go-live preparation a mapping of the connection point(s) relevant per impacted asset is provided so the grid user and its third party OPA and/or SA can assess whether a split-up of an asset in different PUs is relevant and provide coherent information.
- Given the complexity of the alignment that need to be set-up between grid user, OPA and SA, participants request that a reasonable grace period is foreseen at the go-live of the iCAROS design. Elia indicates that a reasonable learning period shall be granted if it is clear that mistakes are not the result of willful conduct.
- At the moment the CIPU contract foresees a 24/7 availability of the subscriber of the contract. This availability is needed in case of emergency situations. Participants indicate that this requirement has huge implications for PGMs and ES <25 MW and demand facilities. If this constraint is set on OPA and SA this would mean that OPA and SA need to be outsourced to third party that can provide this service given that this service can not be provided by most of these grid users themselves. Elia notes down the issue and will assess whether this requirement can be limited to the SA given the default priority of OPA information over SA information that needs to be aligned within a reasonable delay (for instance 30 minutes) without jeopardizing the grid security. Participants indicate the relevance of the issue given the European guidelines explicitly split the role of OPA and SA while this requirements if set on OPA and SA would require this tasks in practice to be outsourced to the same third party.

3. DATE FOR NEXT MEETING

to be confirmed