

Meeting report

Task Force iCAROS

Date	21/10/2024
Organiser	iCAROS team (ELIA)

Participants	Attended	Excused
--------------	----------	---------

Elia representatives

Raphaël Dufour	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Glenn Plancke	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Giovanni Ninite	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sybille Mettens	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Viviane Illegems	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Participants

Michaël Van Bossuyt (FEBELIEC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Walter Aertsens (infrabel)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tom Waelkens (BASF)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hachem samii Omid (Ono)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Aurore Macau (Virya Energy)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Eric Verrydt (Zandvliet Power NV)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Loïc Donnay de Casteau (Engie)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Nirmala D'Souza (Parkwind NV)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Steven Harlem (Luminus)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Berenice Crabs (Belgian Offshore Platform)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Chris Celis (ODE)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pauline Mast (Luminus)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dave Vercruysse (Aspiravi nv)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Frederik Devos (Elicio)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Marion Bouchat (Edora)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maarten Dedeyne (ODE)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hans Taveniers (Tessengerlo Group)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wout Vanheusden (E.ON Power Plants Belgium BV)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jeroen Sweerts (Cargill)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dominique Hamerlinck (Alpro CVA)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jean-François Williame (Eneco)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Emma Wessel (Sweco Belgium)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tom Strosse (Eneco)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leander Achten (Storm)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Niels Van Nuffel (Fluvius)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lionel Van Buylaere (TotalEnergies)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leonard Hamann (Next Kraftwerke GmbH)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Senne Antonissen (Parkwind)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sam Van Engeland (Luminus)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jacques Cartuyvels (CREG)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Stefaan Reyniers (COGEN Vlaanderen)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Geert Meynckens (Centrica)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Jasper Vermandere (YUSO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bart Focquaert (Luminus)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hilde De Clerck (Parkwind)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kevin Garitte (Luminus)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jan-Matthijs Lantmeeters (Next Karftwerke)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Report

Author	iCAROS team		
Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Draft	<input type="checkbox"/> Final version	

1 Agenda

- Introduction
- Availability planning process - Generalities
- Evolution of availability planning process for production and storage facilities with a power higher than or equal to 25MW
- New availability planning process for production and storage facilities with a power lower than 25MW and higher than or equal to 1MW
- New availability planning process for demand sites
- Next steps

2 Introduction

The objective of the workshop is given and the agenda of the workshop is presented

3 Evolution of availability planning process for production and storage facilities with a power higher than or equal to 25MW

The design for the extension of the time horizon for the availability planning process for production and storage facilities with a power higher than or equal to 25MW is presented. The following feedbacks were collected during the meeting.

Question related to multiple BRP contract: Can you be Balance Responsible Party (BRP) and Outage Planning Agent (OPA) on one access point?

Answer: In this process there is a split of roles. The Grid User (GU) can assign this availability planning obligation to another, independent OPA. But the OPA can of course also be the BRP. (see also slide 16 of the presentation).

Question related to the delivery of information: At which level does the information need to be delivered? At the delivery point (see also slide 13)

Engie Question related to validation process: When update of the availability planning is needed, the OPA/asset owner needs to comply with three processes (REMIT, OPA, transparency). How will the validation be managed at Elia side, because during the validation time the requester is blocked and has to await your approval?

Answer: Elia will align as much as possible the OPA & transparency processes. Moreover, Elia will be clear about validation timings in the OPA contract. At the moment Elia thinks of sending information towards transparency platforms with the label 'under validation by Elia'. (out of the meeting : this option needs to be confirmed whether feasible) Elia asks to give information about changes as soon as possible.

Luminus Question: When does Elia publish information to outside world?

Answer: Elia will align OPA & transparency processes. Elia plans to publish information to the website directly, but with status "to be validated by Elia". (out of meeting : to be assessed whether this label can be added when sending in information to transparency platforms if not another work around needs to be foreseen)

Luminus Question: Will this also be the case for information received 3 years upfront?

Answer : till August Y-1 no validation of Elia is needed as such no need to add a label

Engie Question on liabilities: If Elia receives information regarding availability plan for transparency but transmits other information to the ENTSO-E platform, who is liable in this case?

Answer: Elia is still analyzing the liability aspects, together with its legal department.

Luminus comment: Also take into account article 4bis, which also requires info to be sent. So we have remit, transparency, OPA & article 4bis. These 4 information flows should be taken into consideration.

Engie requests to be flexible in the implementation of the 3 year time horizon for the OPA process. If the event goes beyond this time horizon it should be possible to enter this data.

Answer : Technically the tool will be open from Y-x, however, contractual the timing of Y-3 will be stipulated.

Question: What are the consequences if wrong or inaccurate information is provided (even up to real time)? Are there penalties, what are the consequences for the OPA?

Answer: wrong or inaccurate information is then taken into account in the operational security analyses and as such it can have negative consequences on the correct detection of operational security issues. There are no direct penalties but in case inconsistencies are detected for instance between information provided by OPA and Scheduling Agent (SA) this is reported to the parties delivering the information as well as the regulatory authority. Furthermore, if a planned unavailability is wrongly requested and an update is needed after the deadline of 1st of August Y-1 it can be that the modification is refused by Elia for operational security reasons.

Luminus question: How is the OPA process aligned with the scheduled maintenance process (Capacity Remuneration Mechanism (CRM) contract)? In particular regarding the timing, which information is taken into account for scheduled maintenance given the 1st of November is an important deadline for CRM?

Answer: Elia will align internally with the CRM design team

Febeliec question: Is it correct that validation timings are only relevant for production and storage units?

Answer: That is indeed the correct interpretation.

Febeliec question: What happens if a planned unavailability takes longer than foreseen? Is the rest of the period then an unplanned outage, or an extension of the planned outage?

Answer: Elia takes note of this point and will provide an answer to market parties (during the digital workshop of 20/11/2024) but confirms already that this can not be seen as a forced outage and that this information need to be provided to Elia as soon as possible.

Follow-up question: It is important to be REMIT compliant and the type of unavailability (planned or force outage) may make a difference as the Elia's validation process is not the same.

Answer: Elia will take this into account for the implementation. A possible solution (to be assessed internally by Elia) could be e.g. an automatic approval, but with a warning for Elia's dispatching and automatic update of information to transparency platforms.

Luminus question: when is the "to be validated" tag removed? It is important when Elia is not used as service provider for publishing on the transparency platforms.

Answer: The tag is a priori removed at the moment that the validation occurs. (out of meeting : flag can not be send to transparency platforms, another solution need to be assessed). If Elia is not the data provider used for publications on the transparency platforms clarity will be given on process as that the OPA can take this into account.

Question: Are CRM related tests included in the Testing status?

Answer: no, all Elia triggered tests are out of scope of the testing status.

4 New availability planning process for production and storage facilities with a power lower than 25MW and higher than or equal to 1MW & New availability planning process for demand sites

The design for the new availability planning process for production and storage facilities with a power lower than 25MW and higher than or equal to 1MW & New availability planning process for demand sites is presented. The following feedbacks were collected during the meeting.

Engie question: How did you define the scope of iCAROS phase 2? Why are we only talking about availability planning and not scheduling for instance?

Answer: The stepwise approach presented today is in line with what was presented during WG Grid of the 4th of October 2024 and the public consultation during the summer of 2023. Given that no information is available for Technical Facilities (TF) between 25 and 1 MW, the objective is first to have good quality input data that allows to detect congestion problems with as initial step availability plans followed by scheduling information (of which the quality can only be checked if availability plan is present) and in a later phase see how we extend the means to remediate this. Furthermore, we are still in learning phase of iCAROS phase 1 and the reported issues are linked mainly to the obligations of the scheduling agent (good quality schedules and redispatching bids). These lessons learned need to be integrated in the design before extension to smaller TFs is possible. Last element to consider is parallel on-going discussions regarding the management of congestion, such as the design foreseen in the framework of flexible connections (Guflex). Clarity regarding this is needed to avoid that implementation requested market parties need to be revoked. This is a non-existing risk for the detection of congestion issues as such the decision to proceed with availability planning.

Engie replies that he is ok, as long as the target is to reduce the congestion management costs and that the impact of congestion management should be borne by all market parties.

Luminus question: Will the information about the smaller units also be published, given that the requirements are not the same as for large units?

Answer: Indeed, the publication requirements are not the same. There is no legal obligation to publish this data. Elia is open to discuss what will be published, e.g. publication on website if useful info. What is your preference?

Luminus replies: We need to check internally, but at first sight we are rather reluctant, because publication of information comes with expectations

Febeliec replies: Also take into account that not all market parties have the means to do such publication. So if they have to start publishing because Elia publishes info, it might be overkill.

Luminus comment: an alignment with CRM design team on the availability information for smaller units is needed. Deadline for scheduled maintenance (CRM process) is November Y-1 while at this stage the information is not validated in the OPA process. This CRM deadline should be considered in the proposed OPA process.

Febeliec comment: For smaller units, in Y-3, they might still have to be built. When do they have to start providing information?

Answer: From the moment they have relevant information, but Elia will check internally on the exact moment. Thanks for raising this question.

Febeliec question: Is Elia ready to process and validate all information coming from an additional 100's up to 1000's of assets? It will be a lot of work for the owners of these assets, but also for Elia

Answer: Indeed it will be a challenge and to cope with this extension Elia will need to implement preprocessing and automatization. It needs to be assessed carefully where there could be a blocking of the process due to an overload of information and foresee the necessary automatization and preprocessing.

Question: Will the same tool and exchange possibilities be used for smaller units?

Answer : The same modalities as today will be maintained (B2B and B2C) but it will be assessed whether other means can be made available such as a dedicated application to be installed on a smart phone.

Question: How are smaller companies be incentivized to provide this information?

Answer: Elia agrees that this will be a big challenge for the iCAROS phase 2. Elia invites market parties to bring ideas on how we could reach these market parties.

Febeliec comment: We are not sure that Elia and other SOs actually have a view on all the assets that are present in the grid.

ODE question: Wouldn't it just be a possibility to assume that smaller facilities are available? Do you really see the need for unavailability info?

Answer: Depending on the info Elia gets from OPA, Elia plans the works on the grid. When facilities are indicated as unavailable, Elia can plan a maintenance while limiting the impact for grid users. The implementation as foreseen today already assumes that the facility is present by default. Only in case of an unavailability, information needs to be provided (information is as such to be sent by exception). Correct unavailability information of small facilities is considered as having a real added value for congestion detection in regional/local grids. For scheduling indeed, it needs to be assessed which information the SA can provide that has a higher quality than the forecast already available to Elia.

Febeliec comment: The net maximum available offtake information is something you will have to calculate yourself, combining all information provided by the OPA of demand sites and the OPA of production and storage facilities from 1MW. Important to keep in mind that facilities below 1 MW do not need to be reported.

Answer: Indeed Elia confirms this comment as Elia requests information on Delivery Point (DP) level.

Question: what is current process for demand facilities?

Answer: Currently when Elia plans work on connection, Elia gets in touch with grid users at the end of Y-1 and aligns with the clients when a maintenance on the Elia assets that impacts the demand facility (or technical facility) can be planned

Question: Isn't year-ahead too short for some grid-related maintenances?

Answer: That's why Elia keeps in parallel the process of contacting the GU when it is necessary to look further ahead. But this is a different process related to operational planning (of grid elements) and not the OPA process.

Febeliec comment: It would be good to indicate in the design note what will be different for the smaller units compared to the bigger units (timings, publications, etc.)

Answer: Elia requests whether it is ok that these differences will be stipulated when informally consulting the design for small units ok. This is confirmed by Febeliec.

Question regarding the extension of the availability plan for large units: when will the IT technical guide for the evolutions related to availability planning for large units be available?

Answer: Elia is aware that this need to be made available as soon as possible and hopes to deliver this at the latest in January 2025 if market parties confirm that the timing is feasible for them.

Infrabel Question: Will the design for small units also include modalities for those connected through a Close distribution System Operator (CDSO)?

Answer: Availability planning process for production and storage facilities connected to a CDS (itself connected to TSO grid) is also in the scope of the design. Specific discussions related to the CDS cases will be organized with relevant market parties.

Question on the capturing of the input of small RES on the design for small units: Have you consulted the sector, because typically they are not run by the grid user, but by a third party?

Answer: Elia is trying to activate these members, but it is indeed a challenge because these are typically not the market parties Elia usually interacts with

Febeliec comment: Timings are considered as extremely ambitious for the small technical facilities given the actors operating these facilities are typically not active in the electricity market. So it will be very challenging to reach them and to activate them.

Febeliec comment: In order to have a successful implementation of the OPA design especially with the extension towards small units it is not only important to have a common TSO-DSO design for those units but also a common regulatory framework by all 4 Belgian regulators.

This comment by Febeliec is also confirmed as a prerequisite for successful implementation by all other market parties.

Infrabel question : will the design also foresee the impact of technical parameters such as the age of the asset on the output of the asset?

Answer : the design will focus on getting as much good quality data while maintaining a simplified design in order to increase the response of operators not familiar with the electricity market.

5 Next steps

Elia will organize a digital Q&A session in order to answer questions specific for the evolution of availability planning process for production and storage facilities with a power higher than or equal to 25MW. (out of meeting : this digital Q&A session is organized on the 20 November 2024 from 9 till 10:30)

OPAs with Technical Facilities of 25 MW and more are requested by then to assess whether the implementation plan presented for the evolution of availability planning process for production and storage facilities with a power higher than or equal to 25MW is feasible.

OPAs are also invited to send in additional implementation questions regarding the evolution of availability planning process for production and storage facilities with a power higher than or equal to 25MW (out of the meeting : deadline for sending questions 12/11/2024).

Concerning the availability planning design for production and storage facilities between 1 and 25 MW and demand sites, Elia intends to write a design note that should be informally consulted in Q1 2025. Some

specific meetings with relevant market parties (grid users of demand sites, CDS grid users and CDSOs) will also be organized to finalize some elements of the design.