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# **Agenda**

1. Feedback provided by market parties regarding the operational support during the implementation phase, go-live and after go-live
2. Feedback provided by market parties in the survey/bilateral meetings:
   1. On design
   2. On implementation (including operational feedback from Elia)
3. (anonymized) results of consistency controls
4. Next steps Introduction
5. **Feedback provided by market parties regarding the operational support during the implementation phase,**
6. **go-live and after go-live**

The idea of a dashboard for operational issues is appreciated but market parties made some suggestions to consider.

Luminus request that confidential information is not shared.

Elia confirms that not all market parties will be able to see all bilateral information only information that is generalized.

Engie gives a suggestion of a dashboard used by RTE. (Link was provided by Engie : [Préparer les évolutions liées au passage du pas de règlement des écarts à 15’ (ISP15) à venir - RTE Portail Services](https://www.services-rte.com/fr/decouvrez-nos-offres-de-service/preparer-les-evolutions-liees-au-passage-du-pas-de-reglement-des-ecarts-a-15-ISP15-a-venir.html)

Febeliec indicates that this dashboard is very ok for the current OPA/SA (big units with an installed capacity of 25 MW and more) with an experience in the energy market. For smaller non initiated parties other tools and features should be considered. The following was suggested during the meeting : a Q&A with search function available in NL,FR and EN.

Engie requests that for iCAROS phase 2 the distinction between large and small units could be something similar to the one in balancing.

Elia confirms that the design for small units will not be exactly the same as for big units for availability planning, scheduling and redispatch (RD) bids. The exact modifications are under discussion for availability planning and the design will be informally consulted in Q1 2025. Modifications regarding scheduling and RD bids for small units will be discussed later on.

1. **Feedback provided by market parties in the survey/bilateral meetings on design and on implementation.**

**OPA**

Febeliec asks to clarify that the go live foreseen for June 2025 is the release 1 and only concerns the extension of the time horizon for big units.

Engie indicates that a broader discussion regarding the value to be transmitted for PMAX across products is recommended. Febeliec adds that this is especially true for load. The technical PMAX does not make sense for load. Another value then the technical PMAX should be collected in order to create a value added for the grid maintenance planning of Elia.

Elia confirms that a schedule with values higher than PMAX are not rejected. However the RD bids are limited by the PMAX value (volume of a big cannot exceed the PMAX).

**SA**

Some market parties indicated that a PMIN should be considered for wind parks. During market situations with negative prices, it was observed that wind parks do go to zero. During the meeting it was indicated that these parks are dimensioned to cope with meteorological circumstances not curtailments. These curtailments trigger additional costs because after such curtails wind parks cannot restart necessary due to stress on the turbine. Febeliec indicates that additional costs cannot be accepted without any explicit validation by the regulator. Elia will further investigate the technical justification based on bilateral discussions.

Engie indicates that cost-based remuneration will block any voluntary participation.

Elia indicates that the current design is a package deal which contains on the one hand cost based remuneration but also freedom of dispatch till ReDispatch Gate Closure Time. When reconsidering the design different elements need to be taken into accountsuch as the risk of ind-dec gaming which increases when there is more congestion, the pool of market parties that remains limited, the complexity of an adequate monitoring of a market based design, …

Some Market parties request a review of the baseline in case of RTS for renewables (for instance using AAP (Available Active Power) validation). Febeliec stresses that a cost reimbursement is out of the question because that would open the door for gaming when providing schedules. Elia indicates that any baseline discussion needs to consider risk effects for operational security and unfair cost for society.

Febeliec asks a review of the word ‘funding’ used in question 7 on slide 14 because the assets currently impacted by the iCAROS design do not fund operational security given they do not pay any access tariff and furthermore the assets participating today have a cost recuperation. During the meeting it is clarified that the missing out of market opportunities was meant and that today this is only limited to a number of assets. Febeliec stresses that given there is no European obligation for demand to participate, it will oppose any obligation to offer RD bids. The conclusion is that the wording shall be reviewed towards ‘supporting’ the operational grid (The slides available on the Elia website contains already this modification).

Febeliec requests whether the modification for the Minimum Activation Time is also available or will be implemented for load. Elia confirms that the combination of Maximum Activation Time with Maximum Energy Level provides the necessary functionalities for load.

Market parties request whether a work around could be agreed by or suggested for the two issues for which no solution was found yet, namely Bid\_01: Conditional bid links across multiple delivery days are not fully accepted and Bid\_02: Cancellation of bid time series of energy bids after D-1 submission.

The CREG is in favour of an informal consultation in which market parties are requested to give their feedback, especially given the fact that some modifications require a modification of the T&Cs.

Market parties indicate that the statistics regarding the CRI are very appreciated. Elia indicates that the quality of the CRI very much depends on the quality of the delivered schedules and that the assessment whether a CRI high was indeed needed is in scope of a 2025 incentives regarding the quality of the CRI.

Market parties also request how the information of high CRIs is taken into account in the framework of grid planning for the LT investment plans. Elia indicates that today the CRI statistics are used for internal assessments in the framework of operational processes such as the operational process that may lead to a reorganisation of the considered electrical zones relevant for the CRI calculations. Furthermore in the process of the establishing of the investment plans, Grid Development (the Elia department in the lead of the investments plans) checks the foreseen investments with the national and regional control centres. Elia also indicates that the CRI will be extended to lower voltage levels in the framework of iCAROS phase 2.

1. **(anonymized) results of consistency controls**

No specific remarks were noted during this part.

# Next steps

Elia will organize an informal consultation to collect feedback regarding the design clarifications and implementation modifications. This will be organized in January 2025. Elia confirms to Febeliec that the formal consultation in the framework of release 1 of iCAROS phase 2 (extension of the time horizon for big units) as well as the informal consultation for the REX iCAROS phase 1 has no impact for demand sites and that the consistency check for the PMAX will be reviewed when extended towards demand sites in phase 2.

Engie formulates the request to review the timeframe for Forced Outage, given that European Regulation does not specify any timeframe. Elia replies that a Forced Outage message leads to an automatic acceptance as such it needs to be avoided that it is overused.

More information to be provided regarding the common testing in the framework of iCAROS phase 2 release 1 begin of 2025. At the moment the timing is estimated as probably starting the second half of April/beginning of May 2025.