

Minutes of Meeting of WG Balancing on 28th of October

Meeting

Date	28/10/2021
Organiser	James Matthys-Donnadieu

Participants		Attended	Excused
Axpo	Limpens Tanguy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
BASF	Verrydt Eric	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
BASF	Waelkens Tom	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
BOP	Carnière Hugo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Centrica	Adigbli Patrick	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Centrica	Meynckens Geert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Cogen Vlaanderen	Reyniers Stefaan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
CREG	Bertrand Gilles	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
CREG	Fils Jean-François	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
CREG	Marijn Maenhoudt	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Eneco	van den Berg Jasper	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Eneco	Williame Jean-François	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
ENGIE	Donnay de Casteau Loïc	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
ENGIE	Laleman Ruben	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
ENGIE	Stubbe Gerald	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Eoly Energy	Kormoss Aymeric	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
European Commodities	Baudson Axel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
FEPEG	Wagnier Jean-Francois	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Febeliec	Van Bossuyt Michael	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Flexcity	Potvlieghe Harold	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Flexcity	Vanneste Aron	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Fluvius	Van den Bosch Sven	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Luminus	Chaqafi Laila	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Luminus	Harlem Steven	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Next Kraftwerke	Dierckxsens Carlos	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
ODE	Celis Chris	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Otary	Van Nuffel Margot	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
RAP-Green	Fieuws Arthur	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
RWE	Hendel Manfred	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
RWE	Lazarescu Anca Manuela	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
RWE	Schulz Johannes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Scholt Energy	Demeyer Valentijn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Smart Vision	Langer Yves	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Tessenderlo	Van De Keer Lieven	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

TotalEnergies/Lampiris	Pirard Sacha	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
TotalEnergies/Lampiris	Vandamme Nicolas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Yuso	Debaere Elias	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Yuso	Pycke Bart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Participants		Attended	Excused
Elia	Aparicio Manuel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Elia	Arnaud Attanasi	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Elia	Chim Didier	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Elia	De Wilde Vanessa	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Elia	Etienne Gilles	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Elia	Hardy Simon	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Elia	Illegems Viviane	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Elia	Leroux Amandine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Elia	Magnant Philippe	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Elia	Matthys-Donnadieu James	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Elia	Mertens Steven	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Elia	Motté Arno	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Elia	Oldenhove Thomas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Elia	Pellegrin Cécile	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Elia	Pierreux Nicolas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Elia	Poncelet Kris	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Elia	Tsiokanos Anna	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Report

Author	Didier Chim		
Function	WG Balancing Secretary		
Date report	29/10/2021		
Status	<input type="checkbox"/> Draft	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Final version	

1. Agenda

1. Introduction and minutes
2. Implementation of Simplify
3. Review of sub-metering and power measurement device specifications
4. Results of public consultation of the Study on a technology-neutral framework for slow units
5. Roadmap 2021-2022: Update
6. aFRR: balancing publications
7. a/mFRR: activation of contracted bids for redispatching purposes
8. PICASSO: Imbalance price
9. Workshop on Imbalance: Conclusions and next steps
10. Request for feedback on imbalance behaviour on 21/04

AOB

- Study on baseline methodologies – update public consultation and next steps
- T&C BRP – Status update
- T&C VSP public consultation
- Multiple BRPs per Access Point
- aFRR Capacity: Application of Cap Adjustment Variable (CAV)
- Open Data Platform : feedback on questions from stakeholders
- Elia Group IIP: feedback on questions from stakeholders

2. Report

1. Introduction and minutes

Febeliec requests to have an overview of all upcoming meetings. Elia indicates that all [WG Balancing meetings](#) should be available on the Elia website related to the calendar of [Users' Groups](#).

Febeliec asks Elia to facilitate the reading of the slides by people which are not deeply in the topics by clarifying the abbreviations used in each slide. Elia takes note of the request.

Eneco asks that for the future meetings, some breaks are foreseen. Elia takes note of the request.

2. Implementation of Simplify

Febeliec asks to clarify the methodology to calculate of the System Imbalance (SI) forecast; as a Forced Outage (FO) cannot be forecasted, the published SI forecast may create a risk to mislead the stakeholders. Febeliec questions therefore why the publication of RES forecasts is not sufficient. Elia agrees that per definition a Forced Outage cannot be forecasted (although the risk can be predicted depending on maintenances) but explains that other elements can be forecasted reliably, which can improve the quality of reactive balancing.

Febeliec insists that a clear disclaimer should be displayed on the fact FO are not foreseen by the model. Elia indicates that the impact of the FOs on the SI is not significant most of the time. However, Elia agrees that the methodology for the SI forecast should be clear and that the tool should be evaluated after the 6 months trial period.

Stakeholders are invited to provide feedback on implementation plan by 15/11.

3. Review of sub-metering and power measurement device specifications

Eneco asks to clarify the context of the review. Elia indicates that sub-metering was initially introduced for the Strategic Reserve so that asset behind the headmeter can also participate. Elia also allows through the submetering options the usage of private meter.

BOP asks whether the stakeholders will be informed by their Key Account Manager (KAM) if changes are required on their assets. Elia confirms that an impact assessment is on-going and that the stakeholders will be informed in due time via their KAM.

Febeliec asks whether impacted Closed Distribution System (CDS) will also be informed. Elia clarifies that CDS should not be impacted as submetering option is not available for CDS as such.

4. Results of public consultation of the Study on a technology-neutral framework for slow units

Febeliec asks the reasons to not implement a technology neutral framework for slow start units immediately. Elia explains that there is a need to prioritize implementations. Elia agrees on the

principle to make the mechanism technology neutral and that it will have to consider it in the context of further integration of offshore wind, for example. However, Elia suggests to not implement the new framework immediately due to other priorities. Elia reminds that it is not the only party impacted, the implementation of a product requires also the collaboration of the stakeholders as well as the CREG.

Febeliec expresses concerns on balancing market liquidity for both capacity and energy and indicates that if one of the major player has an issue, Elia will not be able to find the necessary volumes. In their view, PICASSO may be of help but not MARI. Febeliec takes the winter product of 2018-19 as an example to indicate that when the product will be necessary, it will be implemented too late and that the consequences will be greater than the cost of implementation. Elia does not see a risk in the short term. Elia agrees on the need to anticipate and is monitoring the liquidity, but indicates once again that based on pre-qualifications, more liquidity is available that what is offered in the daily mFRR capacity auctions.

Febeliec doubts that Elia could start implementation immediately when the need occurs as it considers that the design is not sufficiently developed yet. Elia welcomes all additional inputs from stakeholders on specific design points and is proposing bilateral contacts to ensure that the concerns are sufficiently addressed. Elia adds that it is proactively taking measures with its IT colleagues to ensure a swift implementation (also considering a light implementation).

Febeliec indicates that if the product is not clearly defined, it cannot provide indication on the potential volumes. However, if there is a need for the system Febeliec is confident that its members will participate. The absence of response to the consultation should not be perceived as a lack of interest for the mechanism. Elia notes Febeliec's point of view, and remarks that this is a good illustration of the fact that when asking people to work on something for which there is not an immediate need, it is difficult to get the necessary resources prioritized on this.

5. Roadmap 2021-2022: Update

After reminding the context of the roadmap re-assessment, Elia indicates that, in order to support market parties further, Elia looked which functionalities could be possibly offered as optional "Bidding Assistance Services".

Febeliec asks to clarify whether the BSP facilitation features would be implemented by Elia. Elia confirms and adds that the functionalities are optional and are developed to support the BSPs. The responsibility, in case of use of this optional functionalities, remains with the market parties.

Febeliec asks if the proposed "Maximum Activation Time" functionality will allow to change the price of a bid if there is a second activation of the same bid. Elia indicates that the possibility to change bid price has not been considered. Supporting facilities will have to stay sufficiently simple. Elia will also need feedback from stakeholders on whether the proposed functionalities are useful and is addressing a need for a lot of market parties. Hence, the objective is of course not to spent time and resources on custom or useless solutions.

Febeliec indicates that the neutralization time functionality is the most important for its members. Based on a first analysis, the operations for market parties with Flex product is complex without such functionality. Elia indicates that the proposed functionalities constitute Elia's initial proposal based on Elia's analyses and understanding, in order to determine priorities. Elia welcomes any feedback from the stakeholders and the CREG to ensure that they are fit for purposes. The implementation details will come along in a second step with an assessment of a more detailed feasibility from a time, workload and budget points of view. Febeliec indicates that it is willing to support Elia in discussions with CREG to obtain a budget for this functionality.

Elia then presents the readiness check feedbacks and the two resulting possible scenarios in order to update the roadmap.

Yuso asks to clarify the timing for the aFRR/PICASSO testing. Elia explains that the BSP testing environment preparation is being finalized with the last internal tests. The stakeholders will be informed of the effective availability of the environment and receive their access via their KAM, most probably in the second week of November.

Engie thanks Elia for asking the opinion of the stakeholders on the roadmap update and indicates that more than the scenario the most important is having 12 months for implementation as of the finalization of the design. Engie also notes the link between aFRR and mFRR: any delay on aFRR would result in a delay on mFRR (MARI).

Yuso indicates that it has no strong view and a slight preference for scenario 1.

Eneco asks which countries will be connected to PICASSO at the same time as Belgium. Elia indicates that based on current planning, the only neighboring country which will be connected is Germany.

Eneco indicates that there is not much difference between the two scenarios. Elia indicates that the difference is roughly a shift of 3 months, given that the first scenario aims for a local go-live at the latest in mid-November, as after this date, it would not allow sufficient time for after care before the end of the year holidays. The local go-live is the critical step as it encompasses all the changes on BSP side. The proposals are the results of the feedback provided by stakeholders. The second scenario covers the remaining uncertainties. Both scenarios are still quite ambitious in order to move forward with the projects.

Febeliec indicates that in its view, more time would allow the development of the additional BSP facilitation functionalities for Neutralization Time. In terms of liquidity, the scenarios should be assessed together with the connection of other TSOs. However, Febeliec agrees with Elia to move forward and indicates that being ambitious may not be bad, once the design is known and stabilized.

Engie indicates that it has a preference for a simultaneous go-live of aFRR capacity and PICASSO. Elia indicates that the connection to PICASSO is still scheduled for late April/early May but may be subject to change if the connection of other TSOs (namely German TSOs) is to change. In such a case, discussions on the impact of a change will need to take place. However, Elia does not intend to delay the go-live of aFRR capacity. Febeliec supports to not delay the go-live of aFRR capacity.

RWE indicates that German TSOs have published that they will postpone their connection to PICASSO.

Elia indicates that it will convene an additional WG Balancing to discuss and confirm aFRR Capacity and PICASSO planning.

Engie asks to consider having the go-live of aFRR capacity and energy together, and leave the connection to PICASSO at a later stage. Elia indicates that it will consider the proposal and come back to the stakeholders at the next ad hoc WG Balancing.

Febeliec asks whether there is a minimum time required between the connection to PICASSO and MARI. Elia indicates that a least of couple of months between the go-lives would be necessary. In the proposed scenarios, the time between the go-lives is roughly 6 months and 9 months.

Elia concludes from the feedback of all stakeholders that there is a slight preference for the second scenario and proposes to reconfirm it after the discussion on the aFRR Capacity and PICASSO planning during the ad hoc WG Balancing.

Luminus asks whether the test environment for MARI will also be available. Elia indicates that it foresees that stakeholders will not focus on mFRR during the months preceding the go-live of PICASSO. Therefore, MARI and iCAROS BSP test environment will be foreseen from April 2022 on. Elia adds that the processes of PICASSO, MARI and iCAROS have been aligned as much as possible and therefore, tests performed in the context of aFRR will also help gain experience for mFRR and redispatching.

Centrica asks whether there is an expected date for the consultation of the mFRR T&Cs in 2022. Elia indicates that the consultation planning for mFRR T&C will be updated based on the updated roadmap.

6. aFRR: balancing publications

Febeliec asks whether the total volume to which Elia has access will be published. Elia explains that this value would vary every 4 sec for aFRR, as it depends i.a. on other TSOs' demand.

Luminus asks to clarify the link between satisfied demand and selected bids volume. Elia gives the following example: Elia has a demand of 100 MW and will have a satisfied demand of 100 MW if volumes (local or foreign) are activated for Belgium. The selected bid may not be in Belgium, if cheaper bids are available abroad. Similarly, if Elia has no demand and the bids are the cheapest in Belgium, then the selected bids will be in Belgium.

Febeliec asks whether additional information on Cross-Zonal Capacity (CZC) could give more indication on the available volumes. Elia indicates that it can indeed provide more information but may still not meaningful enough to predict prices.

Yuso asks whether a tool similar to the Cross Border Intraday market (XBID) is available to provide transparency to the stakeholders. Elia indicates that XBID is a continuous market based on first come first served access to the bids and CZC, while the balancing market is based on auctions and closer to the Day Ahead Market. Elia adds that from a transparency point of view,

the Common Merit Order List (CMOL) will be published ex-post on Entso-E Transparency Platform. However, it is acknowledged that this will provide only little information given that the access to the CMOL depends on the CZC and the demand of other TSOs.

Yuso indicates that if the market evolves towards real-time, then it is necessary also to have close to real-time information. European Commodities supports the remarks of Yuso and indicates that it welcomes the transparency culture of Elia compared to other TSOs. However, it stresses that “old news” is not news anymore. Elia agrees and will provide an overview of what is foreseen to be published on Entso-E Transparency Platform for the next WG Balancing.

Febeliec asks whether there are KPIs to measure the added value of PICASSO in terms of liquidity and ask to reflect on this. Elia notes the request and invites all stakeholders to provide their insights. European Commodities suggests to have a KPI to reflect the percentage of the time the price is set by a local bid or a cross-border bid.

7. a/mFRR: activation of contracted bids for redispatching purposes

Eneco asks to clarify the context of the topic. Elia indicates that in very specific situations, Elia could need to use contracted balancing energy bids for redispatching purposes, as those volumes are not offered as redispatching bids. It is a last resort means.

Febeliec remarks that the remuneration price of those bids for redispatching purposes is the maximum of the Cross Border Marginal Price (CBMP) and the offered bid price. Febeliec understands that the mechanism aims to shield the BSPs but may become costly and deviates from the “at cost” philosophy of redispatching bids’ remuneration. Elia indicates that it has incentives to reduce as much as possible the redispatching costs and adds that the depicted use of contracted balancing energy bids shall be used only as a last resort means. It has never been used until now.

8. PICASSO: Imbalance price

Febeliec indicates that a comprehensible price signal is important. Yuso supports Febeliec and adds that it is important also to harmonize the imbalance price calculation with other markets. According to Yuso, the imbalance price should not only take into account the situation in Belgium but also in other countries. Febeliec disagrees with Yuso on the harmonization, indicating that the price signal should reflect the situation in Belgium. Elia adds that balancing philosophies differ between TSOs, and that differences in imbalance price formation are therefore justified. Elia notes also that the imbalance price should provide incentives for BRPs to reduce the Belgian system imbalance, and is therefore local in essence.

Febeliec asks whether a specific workshop on imbalance price calculation is foreseen. Elia indicates that it is currently not foreseen but invites stakeholders to provide feedback on this topic. If provided before the start of the public consultation on the Balancing Rules, Elia will as much as possible take it into account in the proposed amendment.

9. Workshop on Imbalance: Conclusions and next steps

Febeliec indicates that it supports the alpha.

Elia indicates that considering the importance of the alpha topic for some stakeholders it aims to provide ahead of the next workshop on imbalance an analysis and concrete proposal, if relevant, which has been discussed with the CREG. The modification of the alpha, if necessary, needs to follow a formal process.

10. Request for feedback on imbalance behaviour on 21/04

Febeliec asks whether the reserve sharing with RTE can be easily modulated. Elia explains that the volume can generally vary for inter-TSO. For RTE inter-TSO, the volume is determined at the request and cannot be changed for the duration of one hour. Febeliec indicates that if there were more volumes of mFRR Flex the modulation of mFRR activation could have been more finely tuned. Elia notes the remark and reiterates that BSPs capable of offering mFRR Flex capacity are very welcome to offer mFRR balancing energy bids.

Eneco asks to clarify why the mFRR Standard product (slide 68) is not activated anymore after 15:30. Elia explains that first of all, the need was not there anymore and secondly, part of the mFRR Standard product was used by a market party himself.

AOB - Study on baseline methodologies – update public consultation and next steps

Eneco asks whether changes in baselines are foreseen in 2022. Elia indicates that an implementation plan proposal is foreseen by the end of 2021, to be discussed with stakeholders and the CREG. The general conclusion of the study is that the current baselining methodologies are relatively good when compared to other countries. The proposal of Elia however is to have more baselining options implemented for some products.

AOB - T&C BRP – Status update

Febeliec asks to have an assessment of the performance of the BRPs under the new rules on day-ahead balance obligation. Elia indicates that two types of monitoring are foreseen. Firstly, after each trial period, Elia looks at the potential negative impact of the relaxation of the obligation. Secondly, if any issue has been detected after the go-live, it will be reported on an ad-hoc basis in the WG Balancing.

Engie asks what the plan is if the go-live of the 1st of December is not reached and indicates that a postponement should ideally not take place the 1st of January. Elia indicates that for the time being, there is no regulatory sign which indicates that the go-live will not take place on the 1st of December. Elia takes note of the remark and will inform the stakeholders accordingly, if such case arises.

T&C VSP public consultation

No comment or question from stakeholders.

Multiple BRPs per Access Point

No comment or question from stakeholders.

aFRR Capacity: Application of Cap Adjustment Variable (CAV)

No comment or question from stakeholders.

Open Data Platform: feedback on questions from stakeholders

Febeliec indicates that it is not always clear what the data represents. In general the balancing section is well defined but this is not the case for all. Elia indicates that there should be a description for all data. Elia will revert back to the stakeholders via email.

Elia Group IIP: feedback on questions from stakeholders

No comment or question from stakeholders.

3. Date for next meetings

- WG Balancing – focus on aFRR and PICASSO Go-Live: 22/11/2021 – 15:30-17:30
- WG Balancing: 08/12/2021 – 13:00-16:00
- Workshop on the future of Imbalance: 13/12/2021 – 9:30-12:30