



Minutes of Meeting of WG Balancing on 28th of September

Meeting

Date	28/09/2022	
Organiser	James Matthys-Donnadieu	

Participants		Attended Excused
AXPO	Tops Jeremiah	
BASF	Verrydt Eric	\boxtimes
BSTOR	Bayart Pierre	\boxtimes
BSTOR	Fieuws Arthur	\boxtimes
Centrica	Benquey Romain	\boxtimes
Centrica	Gillis Jeroen	\boxtimes
Centrica	De Somer Oscar	\boxtimes
COGEN Vlaanderen	Vandersyppe Hans	\boxtimes
CREG	Betrand Gilles	\boxtimes
CREG	Maenhoudt Marijn	\boxtimes
Eneco	Van den Berg Jasper	\boxtimes
Eneco	Williame Jean-François	\boxtimes
ENGIE	Donnay de Casteau Loïc	\boxtimes
ENGIE	Laleman Ruben	\boxtimes
European Commodities	Baudson Axel	\boxtimes
FEBEG	Waignier Jean-Francois	\boxtimes
FEBELIEC	Van Bossuyt Michaël	\boxtimes
Flexcity	Van Vlaenderen Emiel	\boxtimes
Flexcity	Vanneste Aron	\boxtimes
Flexcity	De Paepe Michiel	\boxtimes
Luminus	Chafaqi Laila	\boxtimes
Luminus	Harlem Steven	\boxtimes
MFT Energy	Brandt Anders Emil	
Next Kraftwerke	Topete Juan	\boxtimes
ODE	Celis Chris	\boxtimes
RWE	Käster Lars	
Scholt	Demeyer Valentijn	
Thermovault	Brouyaux Louis	
TotalEnergies/Lampiris	Hofman Hannah	
Yuso	Vermandere Jasper	$\overline{\mathbb{N}}$



Date report Status



Final version

Participants		Attended Excused
Elia	Bosschaerts Caroline	\boxtimes
Elia	Hardy Simon	\boxtimes
Elia	Leroux Amandine	\boxtimes
Elia	Magnant Philippe	
Elia	Matthys-Donnadieu James	
Elia	Motté Arno	
Elia	Pellegrin Cécile	
Elia	Pierreux Nicolas	
Elia	Poncelet Kris	
Elia	Tsiokanos Anna	
Elia	Zenner David	
Report		
Author	Philippe Magnant	
Function	aFRR product owner	
Date report	29/09/2022	
Ctatus	D4	√ Final

Draft





- 1. Agenda
- 1. Introduction
- Market recommendation for the go/no-go decision to connect to the aFRR-Platform
 Study on the evolution of the BRP Nominations: implementation plan





2. Report

1. Introduction

Participants are welcomed to the meeting.

2. Market recommendation for the go/no-go decision to connect to the aFRR-Platform

- The proposed recommendation has been shared ahead of the meeting and is annexed to the present minutes.
- Elia clarifies that the objective is to provide a recommendation from the Working Group Balancing. It is not binding for the CREG, as the CREG is acting as observer in the Working Group Balancing.
- Febeliec thanks Elia for the hard work to find a solution. Febeliec is very worried that the costs of aFRR would explode by connecting to PICASSO. Therefore, Febeliec is strongly opposed to scenario 1 and has a preference for scenario 3. However, Febeliec supports the compromise, as it includes 3 important points for Febeliec
 - No connection before the end of the winter, which is already expected to be challenging enough
 - The implementation of temporary price cap
 - The development of liquidity in the aFRR energy market

Febeliec however insists that they are pushed outside of their comfort zone with this compromise.

- Febeg is convinced by the connection to PICASSO but acknowledges the risks and the expected situation for this winter. Therefore, Febeg considers the compromise as a right balance and supports it.
- CBS considers that the price cap entails the risk that Belgian merit-order subsidizes the German merit-order by exporting too much. In particular, if units with Limited Energy Reservoir (LER) in Belgium are depleted to export to Germany, this could increase Belgian costs as well. Therefore, it's important for CBS that the cap can be adjusted in order to keep this risk under control. Under this condition, the compromise is acceptable.
- Luminus thanks Elia for the work achieved to come to a compromise and supports it. Luminus however expresses the difficulty to position their company on this compromise and regrets the last minute addition on the volumes of aFRR energy bids offered. On the other hand, Luminus is also afraid by an isolation of Belgium with a short merit-order, which could also lead to cost increases if Belgium does not connect to PICASSO.

Luminus requests to have a confirmation of the go-live sufficiently in advance. Elia answers that this is indeed the objective, the precise modalities will be further defined.





- European Commodities appreciates the work done by Elia, the simulations and the dialogue. European Commodities also sees a lot of risks considering the situation of the Belgian market and the upcoming winter. Taking the risk of an increase in balancing costs at this moment would be very difficult. European Commodities supports the compromise and appreciates the safety nets that it includes.
- BSTOR asks what is exactly meant with "adjustability" of the price cap and if any principles are already defined.
 - Elia answers that this will be discussed in the next steps.
- Febeliec asks about the next steps, for the regulatory track as well as for the operational track. Elia indicates that the recommendation, if approved, will go to the CREG that will confirm the approval or not by 11th of October. Elia then expects some discussions to concretely define the next steps. The design of the price cap and discussions on T&C amendment would then start, if relevant.

CREG reminds the process in the derogation decision: the CREG will either extend the derogation (with the date for new analysis by Elia), either provide an end date of the derogation. In the latter case, this would trigger the entry into force of the T&C, which doesn't include the price cap. Therefore, CREG would have to decide to extend the derogation and to define a new evaluation period.

Elia will discuss with CREG how to engineer the final solution.

Elia and CREG agree on the need to provide clarity to the market by the next Working Group Balancing.

The recommendation is approved by Working Group Balancing.

Febeliec asks whether this should be a recommendation from the Working Group Balancing or from the User's group. Elia has verified this and considers that a recommendation of the Working Group Balancing is sufficient.

3. Study on the evolution of the BRP Nominations: implementation plan

Luminus asks whether enabling a split between the roles of the BRP and SA does not require a change to the access contract in addition to the changes to the nomination process. Elia clarifies that there are indeed several relations between the roles of the BRP and SA that need to be addressed before different parties can take up the roles of BRP and SA, and that, considering the scope of the study is on the nomination process, the focus was put on the relations between both roles in the nomination process. Elia further indicates that other elements that need to be explored to enable a split between the roles of BRP and SA include for instance the process of designating the SA and handling the impact on the perimeter of the BRP in case of the activation of redispatch bids submitted by the SA.

3. Date for next meetings

- WG Balancing 27/10/2022 09:00 13:00
- WG Balancing 09/12/2022 09:00 13:00