# Meeting report

| MEETING 8th Fine Tuning workshop iCAROS – focus on design fine-tuning : focus on iCAROS phase 1 & update implementation phase 1 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Date** | 07/10/2020 | | |
| **Organiser** | Elia implementation project iCAROS | | |

**PARTICIPANTS**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Bruninx | Jolien | BASF |
| 2 | Chafaqi | Laila | Luminus |
| 3 | Curtoud | Alex | Luminus |
| 4 | Dierckxsens | Carlos | Next-Kraftwerke |
| 5 | Donnay de Casteau | Loic | Engie |
| 6 | Dubois | Pierre | |
| 7 | Harlem | Steven | Luminus |
| 8 | Hendel | Manfred | RWE |
| 9 | Huyghebaert | Yannick | Parkwind |
| 10 | Laleman | Ruben | ENGIE |
| 11 | Lazarescu | Anca Manuela | RWE |
| 12 | Leroy | Xavier | Luminus |
| 13 | Maenhoudt | Marijn | Creg |
| 14 | Steensels | Marc | Otary |
| 15 | Stubbe | Gerald | ENGIE |

| 16 | Van Nuffel | Margot | Otary | |
|----|-----------|--------|-------|---|
| 17 | Vandersyppe | Hans | COGEN | |
| 18 | Verhelst | Clara | CREG | |
| 19 | Waignier | Jean-François | Febeg | |
| 20 | Wiesé | Nadia | Next-Kraftwerke | |

**PARTICIPANTS – ELIA**

1. Caroline Bosschaerts
2. Dimitri De Peutter
3. Raphaël Dufour
4. Martin Funck
5. Amandine Leroux
6. Cécile Pellegrin
7. Benjamin Ramirez
8. Steven Tassignon
9. Arnout Van Bruwaene
10. Viviane Illegems

## 1. AGENDA

1. Introduction – agenda
2. Design fine tuning for phase 1
    A. 'real-time' activation of redispatching energy bids
    B. iCAROS terminology + Level of exchange of information for outage planning, scheduling & redispatching
    C. Schedule update in case of storm risk
3. Update implementation for phase 1
    A. Impacted exchanges with external parties & time-line implementation of phase 1
    B. Presentation of future communication concept with external parties

## 2. REPORT

**PART 1 :** introduction

The agenda of the workshop is presented.

**PART2 :** Elia presents design fine-tuning : focus on iCAROS phase 1

A. 'real-time' activation of redispatching energy bids

Elia presents the design clarification regarding this topic

The following responses were collected during the meeting regarding 'real-time' activation of redispatching energy bids:
- It is asked, how 'real-time' (RT) activation will be stopped or prolonged by Elia. What will be the leadtime? Again 15 min before? Elia indicates that RT activation will indeed by default, be maintained over the next MTU (MTU = market time unit = one given 1/4h in Belgium). The activation will then either stop, or be further prolonged by Elia, via the activation of a Redispatching Energy Bid through the process described in the iCAROS design note. This means that the SA will be informed of the prolongation before the activation deadline of the Redispatching Energy bid, which is, for Redispatching Energy Bid that can be activated through a RT activation, 15' before the start of the MTU for which the bid is activated.
- It is asked, what the exact trigger is for a curative action. Preventive action is based on forecasting of the grid; curative based on decision dispatch? Elia replies that the selection of a preventive or a curative action is linked to the respecting of the thermal limits of the grid elements. For congestion issues that are detected after an N-1 situation, it will be assessed whether an action is possible after the realization of the N-1 situation while respecting the thermal limits of all grid elements. If this is possible and there is no significant risk that the possible curative action will not be available when the situation occurs then Elia will opt for a curative action. This is explained in the coordination rules (article 11) and the explanatory note associated to these coordination rules (3.1) that were publicly consulted in September 2019.
- Beside the clarification regarding the prolongation of a RT activation, it is requested to clarify how RT activation is stopped. Elia replies that when activating a Redispatching Energy Bid the period for which it is activated is indicated. The activation stops automatically when the period ends, except if a new activation is launched in the meantime. For a RT activation the activation period is by default the MTU in which the activated Technical Facility reached the Redispatching target prolonged over the next MTU.

B. iCAROS terminology + Level of exchange of information for outage planning, scheduling & redispatching

Elia presents the design clarification regarding the iCAROS terminology + Level of exchange of information for outage planning, scheduling & redispatching:

The following responses were collected during the meeting:

- It is asked, who will define the operating modes of a Technical Facility? Elia or the BRP? Elia replies that it will be the Scheduling Agent (SA) who will define this in phase 1 given this is the party with the technical knowledge to do so. In the first phase of iCAROS it is indeed the BRP that will still perform the role of SA. Out of the meeting Elia wants to clarify that after the splitting of the roles, from phase 2 on, the operating modes will be defined in the connection agreement by the grid user and the operational attributes of the operating modes (such as costs, distribution keys, etc.) will be defined by the SA in T&C SA.
- It is asked, how a CCGT that is a CHP with a GT and ST will be classified. Elia replies it is up to SA in phase 1 to define what is relevant if the GT and ST cannot be operated separately then the Technical Facility will be equal to the Technical Unit. However if the GT and ST can be operated independently the Technical Facility will consist of 2 Technical Units. Out of the meeting Elia wants to clarify that after the splitting of the roles, from phase 2 on, the Technical Facility and the Technical Units will be defined in the connection agreement by the grid user.
- Confirmation is asked that the operation of Technical Units has priority over the fact that the Technical Facility is classified as a CHP. It is confirmed by Elia that if the CHP (GT+ST or GT)can be operated in different modes, the Technical Facility will consist of 2 Technical Units and Outage planning information and schedule information need to be exchanged at Technical Unit level.
- A clarification is requested whether setting the obligation for outage planning, scheduling and redispatching at the level of the Technical Facility impacts the CMU-definition in the CRM framework, given that the scheduling obligation determines whether a Technical Facility can have 2 CMU's if it consist of two Technical Units for which a separate schedule obligation is required. Elia indicated that if the SA in phase 1 (and the grid user from phase 2 on) indicates the relevance of splitting up the Technical Facility in two separate Technical Units then a separate schedule is required for each of the Technical Units and as such two CMU's will be allocated to this Technical Facility. As such the new proposal is aligned with the CRM framework, since the scheduling obligation will always be set on TU level.
- It is asked in case of a real-time activation starting at 6:10, how the SA needs to amend its QH schedules? Elia indicates that this is a design element that still needs to be clarified but it will be clarified during the workshop of 26 February 2021. Elia clarifies that since a real-time activation request is, by definition, sent after the scheduling deadline, the SA can no longer amend its QH schedule anyway.
- In the explanation Technical Facility and Technical Unit are specified as connected to the Elia-grid, it is requested to clarify what the rule is for CDS-connected units and to include this in the slides. Elia clarifies that the default rule is also valid for CDS-connected Technical Facilities and it will be added to the slides that will be uploaded to the elia-website.


C. Schedule update in case of storm risk

Elia presents the design clarification regarding Schedule update in case of storm risk:

The following responses were collected during the meeting:
- It is asked how accurate the storm forecast of Elia is. In the last storm event the storm forecast of the market player was much different from the one of Elia. Elia responds that the storm forecast of Elia proofed to be quite accurate during the last test phase and is based on data provided by the Royal Metrological Institute. After each storm event it is assessed whether an adjustment of the model is needed. Elia

recognizes that it can be that for an individual offshore power park module the Elia forecast is not the most accurate one, however, the BRP can decide that for its individual offshore power park module to follow its own forecast. The BRP has this responsibility given that Elia only provides its storm forecast for information.

- It is asked when the SA should send its update of the schedule for the cut-in phase. What if the SA had already sent a schedule before the storm which includes a perfect prediction of the storm and of the cut-in phase afterwards. Can the offshore power park module can come back on-line as indicated in the original schedule without sending an update or approval? Elia indicates that the exact timing of validation of the cut-in schedule is not known yet but the focus is on coordination between Elia and offshore power park modules. It is important for the security of the grid that the cut-in is coordinated with Elia. As such approval by Elia is always needed. If the schedule is correct even before Elia announces a storm risk event this does not result in priority over other offshore power park modules. Elia will need to assess all the individual offshore power park modules schedules to ensure that the announced cut-in will not result in grid security issues.

**PART2 :** Elia presents the update implementation for phase 1

A. **Impacted exchanges with external parties & time-line implementation of phase 1**

Elia presents the impact of the extension of the scope of phase 1 on the exchanges with external stakeholders. Scope includes beside ID Schedules also DA schedules to ensure that the same exchange format and channel can be used. DA and ID outage planning information needs to be included given that in the as is processes this information is exchanged together with scheduling information

The following responses were collected during the meeting:
- It is asked whether BMAP will be used for DA scheduling. Elia replies that this is not decided yet it will be communicated at the latest during the workshop of 26 February 2021.
- It is asked when explicit mFRR is mentioned, explicit free bids are meant? Elia confirms this.

B. **Presentation of future communication concept with external parties**

Elia presents the high level architecture proposal for the communication layer with external stakeholders.

The following response was collected during the meeting:
- It is asked if this new communication layer will be first applied to communicate with the new Elia iCAROS related applications, or will it also in the first phase be applied to other applications such as STAR and BMAP? Elia replies that the roll out has not been decided yet. Elia first wanted to have a feedback on the concept from external stakeholders. The exact scope for the iCAROS project will be communicated during the workshop of 26 February 2021.

Feedback, comments and suggestions on the update implementation for phase 1 were requested by sending to Viviane.Illegems@elia.be by 21 October 2020.

## 3. DATE FOR NEXT MEETING

Date next work shop 26/02/2021