

4th Meeting of Ad-hoc Expert Group for Electricity System operation

14-02-2011 from 10:30 to 17:00 hours

CEER Offices, Brussels

(Rue le Titien 28, B-1000)

DRAFT MINUTES (V1)

Participants			
Tahir	Kapetanovic	E-Control (AT)	Chair
Christine	Materazzi-Wagner	E-Control (AT)	Project Lead FG SO
Lena	Jaakonantti	EI (SE)	
Timo	Partanen	EMV (FI)	
Vegard	Willumsen	NVE (NO)	
Cristian	Lanfranconi	AEEG (IT)	
Alain	Marien	CREG (BE)	
Jose Antonio	Castro	CNE (ES)	
Carlo	Sabelli	Expert	
Christoph	Schneiders	Expert	Excused
Guido	Cervigni	Expert	No longer available
Javier	Paradinas	Expert	
Juan Manuel	Rodriguez	Expert	
Marek	Zima	Expert	Excused
Michael	Zoglauer	Expert	
Peter	Rasch	Expert	No longer available
Steve	Drummond	Expert	
Rudolf	Baumann	Expert	Excused
Eckart	Lindwedel	Expert	Excused
Jörg	Teupen	Expert	
Natalie	McCoy	CEER Secretariat	

1. Opening

The meeting opened at 10h39 Christine Materazzi-Wagner (E-Control, AT) in the Chair.

Tahir Kapetanovic welcomed the experts to the meeting and thanked them again for their contributions, commitment and expertise.

The work to be done involved re-adjusting the work already completed and to align it with the scoping discussions undertaken with the European Commission.

1.1. Approval of the agenda

The Agenda was approved in the form shown in these minutes.

2. Review of last year's work

ERGEG presented a summary table illustrating the issues which were discussed by the expert group in previous meetings – covering who is affected, on what aspects and to what extent in terms of the various elements of system operation.

Overall, the focus is on technical aspects, although there is a heading for adverse market consequences, where the affect on consumers (including costs) can be considered.

Regarding 'problems', an additional issue relates to potential challenges which could emerge as a result of operating closer to real-time (with renewables and distributed generation). The system is not necessarily less secure, but the potential for this could be recognised.

The members discussed the 'depth' of the network codes – which would need to undergo a lengthy process for revisions. However, following discussions with the European Commission and given the technical aspects of system operation, the aim is to provide detailed framework guidelines. The framework guideline and corresponding network codes in this area will be the first legally binding rules on system operation – hence the desire to provide detailed legal certainty.

Mr. Drummond underlined that there is a lot of concern in the sector about the level of detail (and degree of harmonisation) in the future rules, which appeared to be going further than cross-border issues.

ERGEG remarked that this issue is also part of the impact assessment process – what is needed/to what extent/and what are the implications (costs, etc.). The details themselves would be left to the network code.

Mr. Drummond warned that the national codes must also be considered in this overall picture. If the rules are too prescriptive, this can also limit the evolution and development of new practices.

ERGEG reminded the members of the objectives identified for the initial impact assessment.

- To operate the electrical system within defined limits
- To apply same principles for different systems
- To enable the integration of innovative technologies
- To make full use of information and communication technologies

The experts provided some further clarifications and considerations to be included under each objective – taking into account technical aspects. (See the attached presentation for details.)

3. Information on scoping process

The Commission requested a scoping discussion with ENTSO-E and ERGEG to fine tune the scope and depth of the framework guideline on system operation. The Commission indicated an interest in a high degree of detail and scope – drawing from ERGEG's previous guidelines of good practice on operational security.

The Commission would like more prescriptive, wider and prioritised framework guidelines.

The initial impact assessment should also provide a justification of the possible costs/consequences of not undertaking the proposals. One key concern is to minimise any risk of black outs, which has tangible costs.

Overall, the scoping discussions have been rather about the structure and detail of the framework guideline, rather than a re-design of the issues.

Internally, the regulators have done a round up of previous work – from the GGP to the analysis of the 2006 blackout.

The Commission has given ERGEG the official mandate (with the 6 month deadline) to prepare the draft framework guideline. The 6 months began on 1st January 2011.

The members briefly discussed the overall process for the development of framework guidelines – including the public consultation of stakeholders.

4. Discussion on NCs, timeline and priorities

The framework guideline will in principle result in a set of network codes –subdivided by issue (and order of priority):

Operational security

Scheduling and operational planning

Staff training and certification

Data exchange (not necessarily a separate NC, issues could be included in the other NCs)

Load frequency control

Emergency and restoration

Intersynchronous areas

Supergrid aspects

Manually activated reserves interaction

In addition, there are several governance aspects which should be addressed:

Change management process

Compliance monitoring and enforcement process.

These are proposals for corresponding network codes – in reality, we will not know which codes will be prepared until the process for the framework guideline is finalised by ACER.

Regarding the issue of training and certification, the experts expressed concern that the code should not seek to standardise all professional qualifications in this area and rather should provide a high level framework for ensuring qualified staff.

5. Discussion on cost/benefit expectations

ERGEG explained that it will include a consideration of costs and benefits in its initial impact assessment for the system operation framework guidelines.

The experts were invited to provide their initial thoughts and views regarding the implications of the framework guidelines.

While it is difficult to specify costs without knowing the precise content of the provisions, the members illustrated the types of issues relating to system operation.

For example, there are 'benefits' of ensuring system adequacy (avoiding loss of load costs, optimising overall network adequacy, etc.). They feel it would be possible to provide a rough estimate of the cost of a blackout in Europe – but assessing the probability of a major disturbance would be tricky.

Some positive effects include optimisation of resource planning and operation. Meanwhile, the impact on running costs and implementation costs (both OpEx and CapEx aspects) should be considered. Overall, there should be a total system benefit.

6. Next steps

For those members who were not able to attend the meeting, ERGEG welcomes in particular any further comments they may have both in relation to the presentation and as a consequence of the discussion summarised in these minutes.

The IIA document and the FG itself should be ready by beginning of April. ERGEG will send the documents to the members for information before the public consultation.

The experts' participation in the public workshop (during the consultation phase) will be highly welcomed. The date is not yet fixed.

7. Any other business

The meeting adjourned at 16h45.