WG Adequacy #6 - Meeting report
Thursday 10th March 2022

Meeting	
Date	10.03.2022
Organiser	James Matthys-Donnadieu

Participants		Attended
Baudhuin Serge	ENECO	☒
Boucquey Pascal	CREG	☒
Bruninx Jolien	BASF	☒
Catrycke Mathilde	ENGIE Benelux	☒
Chafaqi Laïla	LUMINUS	☒
Claes Peter	FEBELIEC	☒
Coppin Xavier	ENGIE	☒
Debaere Elias	YUSO	☒
Debrigode Patricia	CREG	☒
De Radiguès Philippine	Federal Planning Bureau	☒
De Waele Bart	CREG	☒
Gerkens Benoît	CREG	☒
Harlem Steven	LUMINUS	☒
Kormoss Aymeric	EOLY Energy	☒
Labar Christophe	Federal Planning Bureau	☒
Strosse Tom	ENECO	☒
Van Bossuyt Michaël	FEBELIEC	☒
Van de Keer Lieven	T-POWER	☒
Van den Bosch Sven	FLUVIUS	☒
Van der Biest Piet	SIEMENS	☒
Vandersyppe Hans	COGEN Vlaanderen	☒
Verrydt Eric	BASF	☒
Waignier Jean-François	FEBEG	☒
Walravens Guy	CREG	☒

Report			
Author	Pauline Munten		
Function	PMO Adequacy		
Date report	10.03.2022		
Status		☐ Draft	☒ Final version

1. Agenda

- Welcome
- Approval Minutes of Meeting WG Adequacy #5 (17.02.2022)
- Launch Public Consultation Contract 11.03.2022
- Session on Availability Monitoring
- Next meetings

2. Minutes of Meetings

Disclaimer: The slides used as a support of the presentation are available online. The minutes of meetings only cover the discussions that took place during the Working Group.

Approval Minutes of Meeting WG Adequacy #5 (17.02.2022)

The Minutes of Meeting of the WG6 (17.02.2022) are approved. Elia has not received any comments either during WG7 (10.03.2022) or before by email.

Launch Public Consultation Contract 11.03.2022

Elia presents the small modifications that have been adapted to the capacity contract. Elia announces that a public consultation will be launched on March 11, on this updated contract version (FR/NL/EN); remarks and/or comments are expected to be received by April 8.
No questions were raised about this topic.

Availability monitoring

Elia explains that this session on Availability monitoring is organized based on Actors' demand, following the questions that emerged end of last year about this topic. Elia committed to come back on this topic with some use cases examples.

Elia starts this session by recalling the general principle behind the concept of availability monitoring; ensuring the availability of the CMU's Contracted Capacity during the Transaction Period by using 4 specific concepts (available capacity, obligated capacity, AMT hour and AMT moments), explained on slide 7.

Then, Elia presents 4 use cases varying in terms of Energy constrained (yes/no) and Daily Schedule obligation (yes/no). Elia highlights that the data taken in this presentation are hypothetical (only for the purpose of case illustration). Also, Elia explains that the use cases are constructed in alignment with the most recent proposal of the Functioning Rules by Elia submitted to the CREG. The approved functioning rules shall always prevails in case of inconsistencies.

Some specific questions are asked regarding the different use cases presented.

The first set of questions relates to case B (Slides 12-15). On slide 13, it is shown that only the second AMT moment has Obligated Capacity for SLA hours, as the Measured Power was the highest. T-Power therefore asks whether it always should be at the highest. Elia responds that injection should not always be injected at the maximum nominal power, but Elia looks throughout the day and takes the hours that have the highest injection.

In reference to slide 13, YUSO also asks why the available capacity is not coinciding with measured power. Elia responds that Elia does not determine available capacity outside the AMT hours; it can thus be considered that the capacity is available outside AMT hour but there is no obligation.

T-Power also comes back - later in the presentation - on the example given on slide 15 where the first AMT moment is 3 hours and the second is 2 hours, asking whether Elia should not better always check for the longest period for a unit with SLA 4 hours. Elia explains that this question should be approached from a market situation perspective where it could be that an actor might have a larger selling opportunity on a shorter period than a longer period (e.g. due to higher prices). In fact, it is relevant here as the price are very high in the second period. We consider that the price reflects the demand and so that in the day ahead market we have larger need between 4 and 6. It is thus good behavior of this unit to sell and provide energy to the market for this time period. In conclusion, Elia tries to establish a standard to allow normal market behavior.

The next questions concern case C (slides 16-18) for which available capacity is determined based on the comparison between the Day-Ahead Market Price and the Declared Market Price. COGEN Vlaanderen relates to current situation on the market where Day Ahead Market Price is now generally always above the Declared Market Price and asks whether it means that the actors should always be available. Elia explains that, although not detailed in the slides presented, the rules allow the Actors to update their Declared market price if it respects the basic principles: it remains within the “zone of acceptance” (notably below the market cap), it is notified sufficiently in advance (before day ahead clearing), Elia also specifies that no particular motivation or explanation note is expected in the context of the modification of the declared market price.

COGEN Vlaanderen also asks some details about the value of the missing capacity presented on slide 18. Elia explains that the missing capacity is represented by the arrow and equals to the Total Contracted Capacity (7.44MW). However, the announced unavailable capacity is at 12 MW (basically because of other obligations that the Actor would have somehow).

T-Power also remarks that the actors *“have at several occasions requested a review of the strike price indexation mechanism (update of the formula; take into account of the clean spark spread etc...) Maybe there should also be a system that updates the AMT trigger in case something extreme occurs like we see in today's markets*”. ENGIE Benelux tends to agree that: “*there also should be some kind of dynamic mechanism to define the AMT price during the DP in case of sudden and long lasting market evolutions; else there is a risk that all control moments will happen close to each other*”. As an answer to T-Power, Elia refers to its reaction in the public consultation. Elia also mentions that regarding the strike price, what is important is written in the ministerial decree. Besides, ELIA highlights the importance to remember that they deliberately postponed the AMT Price calibration and try to take the most relevant market situation as it is only calibrated after the Y-1 Auction.

The last question focuses on case D (slides 19-21). In particular, ENGIE asks whether the associated volume with DDAP should not always equal to NRP. Elia responds that it is as the NRP of CMU D is 5MW.

CREG stipulates that they will further examine the presentation of Elia. An absence of an immediate reaction of CREG does not imply an agreement with all elements presented.

Finally, COGEN Vlaanderen asks to adapt the slides presented during the working group session with the small corrections highlighted during the session. Elia notes that the small corrections will be done on the slides before being published on Elia's website.

3. Minutes of Meetings

The next meeting is currently foreseen on April 21st, 2022.