WG Adequacy #38 – Minutes of the Meeting
Friday 21st of February 2025

Meeting	
Date	21/02/2025
Organiser	Voet Jan

Participants		Attended
Baugnet Christophe	Engie	☒
Baudhuin Serge	Eneco	☒
Boustani Zackaria	FOD Economie	☒
Callaerts Ben	Luminus	☒
Celis Chris	FEBEG	☒
Coppin Xavier	Engie	☒
Debrigode Patricia	CREG	☒
Declerck Lucas	CREG	☒
Dessard Noel	Engie	☒
Delferiere Alan	FOD Economie	☒
Gerkens Benoît	CREG	☒
Gitton-Rivière Romain	YUSO	☒
Harlem Steven	Luminus	☒
Lippens Pierre	Flexcity	☒
Mast Pauline	Luminus	☒
Résimont Thibaut	CREG	☒
Reyniers Stefaan	COGEN Vlaanderen	☒
Rkiouak Laylla	FOD Economie	☒
Siborgs Joeri	Giga storage	☒
Strosse Tom	Eneco	☒
Tirez Andreas	Febeliec	☒
Van den Bosch Sven	Fluvius	☒
Van der Biest Piet	Siemens Energy	☒
Van De Keer Lieven	BSTOR	☒
Van Doorslaer Guillaume	CREG	☒
Van Gijzeghem Francies	ABDE	☒
Vandenbrande Eric	Engie	☒
Vandersyppe Hans	COGEN Vlaanderen	☒
Verrydt Eric	Zandvliet Power	☒

Report	
Author	Doan Nguyen
Function	PMO Adequacy
Date report	28/02/2025
Status	☐ Draft ☒ Final version

1. Agenda

- Welcome
- Reactions to Public Consultation of Adequacy & Flexibility 2026-2036
- Status Availability Monitoring and Payback Obligation implementation & next sessions
- AOB
- 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.

Reactions to Public Consultation of Adequacy & Flexibility 2026-2036

Regarding the new industrial electricity demand versus 2024 per scenario, Febeliec questions if the current advice on sensitivity is being considered in the AdeqFlex study 2025 or if it is only the orange lines (i.e. the three scenarios 'current commitments', 'constrained transition' and 'prosumer power') on the graph shown on slide 32. Febeliec also wonders why the trajectories on the graph are the same and requests more clarification on the high scenario. Elia replies that when communicating on the results, the three scenarios (meaning the constrained transition, the current commitments, and the prosumer power) will be used for the assumptions regarding Belgium. Those will be complemented with sensitivities to assess the impact of the change of certain assumptions. For several parameters Elia makes a high and low sensitivity to test the individual impact on Adequacy. As for why the trajectories are looking similar before 2030, this is due to delays in industry electrification, but also to new information related to data centers, DSO's, etc.

Additionally on the topic of the three scenarios, FEBEG wonders how this will be translated into Adequacy needs for the CRM. Elia explains that the AdeqFlex study is a prospective study where different scenarios and sensitivities are analyzed, while for the CRM only 1 scenario is used and it is the choice of the Minister. Indeed, after a public consultation, a proposal from the regulator, an advice from the SPF, it is up to the Minister to choose a scenario.

Next about the heat-pumps, COGEN VLAANDEREN mentions they do not understand the sentence "Elia will use CREG's COP curves and adjust ground-source heat pump source temperatures seasonally from 12°C to 2.5°C" on slide 38, and asks if it means that Elia will take ground temperature at 2.5°C as input heat. Elia answers that for ground-source temperature, the temperature is relatively constant over the year. With a heat-pump, this heat is extracted from the source and thus the temperature decreases over time. As such, Elia has implemented a curve that decreases gradually from 12°C at the beginning of the heating season to a minimum of 2.5°C at the end of the heating season. This is then repeated again the following year, starting at 12°C.

COGEN VLAANDEREN also notes that there is a typo on slide 45, it should state MW instead of GW. Elia thanks COGEN VLAANDEREN for the observation and confirms this will be corrected when publishing the final slides of this meeting.

Concerning further extension of the nuclear capacity in Belgium, Febeliec asks if the question marks on the graph of slide 53 indicate if Elia can replan the reinforcements that are already foreseen. Elia explains that it is something else and clarifies that for the moment, the assumptions for the planning of further extension follow what Elia has already communicated in the past, i.e. the extension of Tihange 1 could be possible as from end of 2031 (by means of changes in reinforcements planning but also redispatching in the region), while for Doel it is different (related to other projects, minRAM 70% at the border, etc.).

FEBELIEC then asks why the minRAM 70% would prevent new capacity to stay online or to come back online. This minRAM 70% just says that you have to bid for competition with cross-border flows, but it does not mean it is not available.
Elia clarifies that a minimum of 70% of the capacity of the grid (also the internal grid) has to be made available for cross-zonal flows. The remaining max. 30% has to cover internal flows, loop flows and uncertainty margins in capacity calculation. An increased level of nuclear production results in an increased level of internal flows. As a result virtual capacity is to be provided to the market to fulfil the min. 70% requirement. When the market uses this virtual capacity, more (costly) remedial actions are to be taken to maintain operational security.

About the sensitivity of the CHP trajectory, COGEN VLAANDEREN asks if this will be differentiated for each scenario or equal for all 3 scenarios.

Elia answers that they propose it to be equal and perform a sensitivity on the CHP trajectory independently.

For the onshore wind, ENGIE asks if there is also something on offshore and the potential impact of delay in the construction of the Princess Elisabeth Island (while for nuclear capacity, Elia already consider the 20-years extension mentioned in the federal agreement)
Elia refers to the Federal agreement in which it is stated that a decision on the Princess Elisabeth Island will be made at the end of March. Therefore, without further decision, Elia can't make any update on offshore before. ENGIE remarks that no decision has been made yet either for the 20-years extension. Elia understands the comment of ENGIE on nuclear. Given it only relates to the last year of the study, Elia will further see how to present the results for that year with the different options available including further nuclear extension.

On the topic of large scale batteries, FEBELIEC questions why there is a constraint on the potential. Elia replies that there is a limit to the physical connection of the grid and that the connection can take a lot of time (but also time to develop the different projects: permits, location, supply chain for material…). FEBELIEC shares its concern with this limit, especially as they believe it is quite low.

Regarding the climate years methodology, FEBELIEC remarks that Elia should publish results just using 30 historical years which is compliant with the methodology that ACER has approved. Elia replies that it uses the Metéo France database in order to account for climate change instead of historical climate years but which also consists of more years which is key when assessing distribution tails such as adequacy indicators, and states that doing the two in parallel is not feasible. Elia also reminds that the methodology applied by Elia is fully compliant with the ERAA methodology. FEBELIEC insists on doing this exercise with 30 historical years at least once in order to compare the different methodologies. Elia adds that 30 historical years is not significantly representative for Adequacy. As such, Elia opted for Météo France which is compliant with the ERAA. FEBELIEC points out that while that may be the case, the 30 historical years methodology has been validated in the European methodology so it is worthwhile to do it once.

Concerning the lower hurdle premiums for baseload capacities from Prof. Boudt, FEBELIEC asks if this is also for CCGT's. Elia confirms that CCGTs are considered as baseload technology by Professor Boudt, leading to a decrease of the hurdle rate for CCGTs in a qualitative way.

ENGIE comments on the sensitivity of gas-fired power plants and wonders if this includes OCGT's or only CHP's. Elia answers that in order to calculate the need for Adequacy, Elia assumes that all existing units will remain in the market. This is also the case for the EVA, which then looks at whether those units earn enough money to be in the market without the CRM, resulting in the non-viable gap. In the study, both viable gap and non-viable gap are reported.

Lastly, ENGIE also questions why the higher share of low-carbon molecules (e.g.: "blue" hydrogen or locally produced "green" hydrogen) in the energy mix was not considered. Elia replies that this study focusses on the electricity system and not the other vectors, but the current assumptions are not incompatible with different levels of share of low-carbon molecules.

AOB & Next meetings

The next meetings are currently foreseen on:

- Monday 03/03/2025: General info session (from 13:00 to 15:00)
- Tuesday 25/03/2025: Detailed info session (from 13:00 to 17:00)
- Thursday 10/04/2025: Detailed info session (from 13:00 to 17:00)
- Thursday 17/04/2025: WG Adequacy (from 13:30 to 16:30)