



Core Consultative Group

23/11/2023
Conference call

Minutes of the meeting

1. Welcome and introduction

H. ROBAYE, together with R. OTTER and S. VAN CAMPENHOUT welcomes all participants to the Core Consultative Group and presents today's agenda.

H. ROBAYE informs the CG that she will be stepping down as co-chair. All market participants are invited to indicate in case they would like to take over the co-chair position. For the role, accessibility towards market participants and moderating capabilities are particularly relevant. Z. GAUTIER from Engie would in principle be available for the role. R. OTTER and S. VAN CAMPENHOUT thank H. ROBAYE for all her work.

R. OTTER presents the table reflecting the scope of, respectively, Core CCR (Core CG) and MCSC (MCCG). In case of any questions being more suitable for the other stakeholder forum they can be forwarded accordingly.

ACTION: All market participants to indicate towards Maria Klönhammer <m.klonhammer@magnus.nl> in case they are willing to take over the MP co-chair position (deadline: 24/12/2023).

2. Intraday Capacity Calculation

Update on 2nd and 3rd amendment referral

Z. VUJASINOVIC provides an update on the 2nd and 3rd amendment referral from the perspective of ACER.

Due to further compromise being sought between ACER and NRAs, the decision by the board of regulators has been postponed a second time, to the 24th of January. The hearing is planned for the first two weeks of December.

The discussion revolves around two points:

- The possibility to extend the list of CNECs with the XNECs being handled by ROSC. ACER is willing to compromise to have a transitional period where it is allowed.
- The application of the 70% requirement for the ID timeframe

Z.VUJASINOVIC presents the slides on the generally accepted topics for the amendments, which includes an additional IDCC calculation around 04:00 to streamline the ROSC-IDCC process chain. In relation to the XNEC>CNEC topic, it is clarified that:

- MNECs are a different concept, representing monitored network elements during the NRAO step of the DA capacity allocation. It is clarified that NRAO is removed on ID level
- The transitional period for defining the PTDF threshold is set to 1 year after the ROSC implementation.

F. BASSET highlights that converting all XNECs to CNEC ensures proper alignment between the ROSC and IDCC process. It is expected that a proper threshold can be found in the future to ensure that the market won't react in contradiction to re-dispatching.

Z.VUJASINOVIC remarks that for the 70% requirement, there will be a grace period, and possibilities for derogations after that, but that the implementation of the 70% requirement for ID will be a requirement. It is clarified that the preceding allocations are accounted for in the 70% requirement for ID.

P.TOURNET highlights the impact of the delay of the decision on the amendment on the go-live of IDCC.

S. VAN CAMPENHOUT explains that once ACER's decision is taken, TSOs will assess it and update the roadmap of IDCC.

S. VAN CAMPENHOUT underlines that Core TSOs shared a letter expressing their concern regarding the 70% requirement for ID. As Electricity Regulation offers Member States the policy option to use RD to reach 70%, the target model for the ROSC-IDCC process chain cannot de facto exclude the use of RD. So when expanding the 70% logic into ID it has to be understood that it can trigger significant virtual capacities whilst there is no time left to organise a CROSA after the closure of the ID market to solve the congestions. Derogations are expected to cancel out the 70% requirement in ID. Hence Core TSOs do not believe that this model will work, and therefore call for a



profound debate on how to make a target model that is both feasible and supportive for the development of the ID market.

Z. VUJASINOVIC agrees that on DA there is more time to protect virtual capacities with re-dispatching whilst on ID there may not be time for this. He underlines that ACER does not want to enforce the use of virtual capacities where there is no efficient solution with re-dispatching, and expects TSOs to consider this too when evaluating bidding zone reconfigurations and targeted investments. Z.VUJASINOVIC deems that with the increased incorporation of RES, the 70% requirement, the link with loop flows and the policy choice how to deal with it will become increasingly important.

IDCC(a) update

F.BASSET explains the foreseen IDCC processes as reflected on the screen, including the new names as introduced by ACER. The purpose of IDCC(e) is to have a recalculation of ID capacities following the final ID CROSA. This is pending discussion with ACER.

It is clarified that the go-live of the IDCC recalculation(s) (meaning IDCC(b) and further) is not a prerequisite for the IDA go-live. MPs share their concern about having IDA without capacities.

It is clarified that the EXT // run for IDCC(a) (the DA left-overs) reflects the rules of the current IDCCM. The parameters to calculate the DA left-overs are reflected on the screen. They refer to the amount of virtual capacity from DA domain that is used as starting point to calculate leftovers. The resulting capacities are obtained through ID ATC extraction. It is the best estimate that TSOs can give on the capacities that can be expected for IDA1.

Z.VUJASINOVIC confirms that ACER in its upcoming decision aims to synchronise the delivery of non-zero capacities for IDA1 to the implementation for IDAs. In case the ACER decision impacts the rules on how to calculate the DA left-overs, this may require TSOs to do a re-assessment.



3. Day-Ahead Capacity Calculation

2nd amendment: AHC implementation

NRA Update

C.VERHELST reminds Core CG of the timeline so far of the 2nd amendment. The decision from NRA side has been delayed to the end of November. The content of the Core NRA amendment as submitted to CERRF is presented.

It is explained that the readiness of Core TSOs by 31 March 2025 is deemed to be necessary as to secure a timely start of the EXT // run and thus to ensure Core TSOs are not on the critical path of the foreseen go-live date of 30 June 2025.

Market Participants deem the provision of the explanatory note by 31 March 2025 to be very late in light of the go-live planning. Core TSOs and NRAs will assess whether important scope and technical details can already be provided earlier. The technical implementation does not differ from the descriptions in the explanatory note already shared. Core NRAs highlight that:

- The Core NRA decision has ensured greater transparency on the impact of AHC-implementation on the different aspects of the methodology. In specific, the definitions and equations have been updated to prevent any unambiguity
- The content-wise changes of the Core NRA decision mainly relate to the scope of the AHC-application and the planning and implementation timeline.
- On top of these content-wise changes, the explanatory note should be updated to better describe the possible future handling of different EVH on an AHC-border in case of multiple parallel HVDC and/or AC-interconnectors.

It is explained that the EXT // run will be done with 15 min MTU data, as will be gathered after 15min MTU implementation.

C.VERHELST explains that NRAs understood that market parties are concerned about the risk of decoupling and long computation time, as well as the impact on the use of IVAs and on the number of pre-congested cases after go-live. It is noted that the concern with regard to the JAO publication tool is not included in the NRA decision though NRAs are confident that TSOs will ensure that JAO readiness is ensured through appropriate planning.

Market Participants express concern with the EXT // run only being 1 month and not including seasonal differences, which would mean there is no representative historical data.

S. VAN CAMPENHOUT summarizes there are two needs:

- A first need is to assess the impact on the capacities following the introduction of AHC in a sufficiently representative way. This need is covered via an iterative SPAICC approach, starting already in 2024, for which the details can be further defined together with Market Parties. Fulfilling this need with an extensive EXT //run would be too burdensome on TSO side and lead to a longer implementation time
- A second need is to test the performance & stability of the full process chain, including the allocation. This need is covered via the EXT // run. It can only be properly done after the 15' MTU go-live, and its concrete set-up is subject to further alignment with NEMOs and Market Parties.

Market participants indicate that if the sample size is sufficiently large to ensure a good representativity, the SPAICC approach could suffice for the first need. It is agreed that the samples could be provided in different sets as to allow market participants to make requests for the data provided. This is welcomed by market participants. C.VERHELST indicates that this is also welcomed by NRAs and that this iterative approach should ensure that market parties have a sufficient volume of representative data covering seasonal impact to prepare for the go-live.

It is explained that the existing 5% PTFD threshold for CNEC selection will implicitly also consider the PTFDs of the virtual hubs (which are introduced on every bidding zone border subject to AHC), meaning that there is no discrimination between internal/external borders in Core.

Core TSO presentation

P. BAUMANS reminds Core CG that with AHC introduction in Core only the Core methodology is changed. AHC can be introduced by each CCR independently and thus no formal coordination between CCRs is required on the implementation of AHC itself. The explanation on AHC and the timeline is presented as reflected on the slides. It is noted that in the presented timeline the NRA approval is still expected end of October, which is now expected for end of November. Some initial testing is currently being done in Euphemia with sample data but, there are no results yet.

Market participants ask for clarification about the difference between AHC introduction and a merging of CCRs. P. BAUMANNNS explains that with AHC, there is no Core CNEC in the neighbouring CCR. AHC is only meant to map the flows of exchanges with a bidding zone in the neighbouring CCR on the Core CNECs.



P. BAUMANN and S. VAN CAMPENHOUT explain that the Core CCM provides that a CNEC shall regularly only be considered in one CCR. Exceptions are subject to a sound justification. It is hence the responsibility of the respective TSO at the AHC border (which is in both concerned CCRs) to take care of a meaningful coordination. The mapping of CNECs from Core TSOs belonging both to CCR Hansa & CCR Core, and thus into which extent these CNECs will continue to influence the NTC calculations on the borders assigned to CCR Hansa will be further clarified.

ACTION:

- Core TSOs and NRAs to discuss whether technical details and the scope of AHC can be provided earlier than 31 March 2025 (deadline: 12/03/2024)
- Core TSOs to plan the provision of reports on the SPAICC analysis in way that allows market participants to make requests for the data to be provided, and communicate this to Core CG (deadline: H1 2024)
- Core TSOs to communicate to Core CG to which CCR respective CNECs of Core TSOs belonging to both CCR Core and CCR Hansa will be mapped (deadline H1 2024)
- Core CG co-chairs and PMOs to organise a short alignment call with market party representatives for the beginning of February on the requirements for the SPAICC sample in preparation of the March CG meeting. Core TSOs to share the initial proposal via email prior to the call (deadlines 15/02/2024):

DA CCM³ 3rd RfA status update

C.ZIMMER provides the status update on the RA CCM 3rd RfA, and an overview of the preliminary feedback. It is noted that the feedback may change and will be further detailed in the final public consultation report.

A.BENZARTI provides an explanation, as reflected on the slides, on the ALEGrO circular market flows, which was observed by Elia and Amprion operators. The possible solution, as reflected on the slides, was also included in the RfA. It is clarified that circular market flows cause a high loading of the surrounding AC grid for relatively small benefits (optimizing market exchanges far away). This leads to a higher need for coordination on and around ALEGrO, whilst the process to do this in an automated and efficient manner (ROSC) is not yet in place. In case the PTDF threshold is implemented, market parties request to continue to publish the initial PTDF values before they are set to zero as this enables them to have a consistent (historical) dataset and do better forecasting. S. VAN CAMPENHOUT concludes that the initial PTDF value (before it being set to zero) will be published to ensure clarity towards market participants.

K.PURCHALA elaborates the feedback on the PL AC. It is explained that PSE would like to extend the PL AC for a period of 2 years. Market participants request the individual components of the AC formula to be published as to enable them to forecast this in the future. This will be considered by PSE.

ACTION: PSE to indicate whether they can publish the individual components of the AC formula (deadline: 12/03/2024)

SPAICC status update

N.FARROKHSERESHT provides the status update on the SPAICC. It is clarified that SGM stands for static grid model. CGM stands for common grid model. S. VAN CAMPENHOUT adds that Core TSOs will assess how to scale up the SPAICC approach in the context of AHC. It has not yet been determined yet which changes the first SPAICC will assess.

Debrief on annual survey

J.BOYER provides a debrief of the annual survey on the quality of data published. It is noted that the filtering out of MNEC will be done on the side of the CCCT, not on the side of the JAO publication tool.

S. VAN CAMPENHOUT remarks that in the coming month Core TSOs will publish the backlog of the monthly operational KPIs since DA go-live on the JAO publication website (<https://www.jao.eu/operational-kpi-reports>).

As explained after the CG meeting in chapter 8 of the publication tool handbook [\[link\]](#) an explanation can be found on how sample codes can be retrieved from the publication tool. The action to clarify this is therefore deemed closed.

4. Core Website

Feedback provided

R.OTTER reminds Core CG that the improvement of the Core section on the ENTSO-E website was finalised last June. The Austrian Energy Agency has provided further feedback, which is presented by K.KNAUS. It is clarified that the numbering of improvements does not indicate prioritisation.



All market participants are welcomed to provide further feedback. R. OTTER underlines that this website focusses on the processes. Numerical data is published on the JAO website. The link between the two is complicated to. Furthermore, ENTSO-E is currently using the Core example for other CCRs too.

One additional feedback is provided is that the “new personnel” of market participants. It also provides a good background to explain what is happening in the market to customers e.g. to clarify the mechanisms that make up the price differences between the different bidding zones.

ACTION: market parties to send additional feedback on the Core page on the ENTSO-E website to Maria Klönhammer m.klonhammer@magnus.nl (deadline: 01/01/2024).

5. Core CCR Program Management

Update on Core CCR Roadmap

R.OTTER explains the changes in the Core roadmap since the last Core CG. It is noted that there have been limited changes, e.g. due to the pending ACER decision on IDCC.

Geographical Extensions

Consideration of Switzerland

J. SCHWACHHEIM explains the consideration of Switzerland. He notes that this consideration does not entail the full inclusion of Switzerland in Core. The consideration is increasingly important due to the 70% requirement entering into force. It is highlighted that the Core capacity calculation process will not be impacted in terms of process and timings.

Celtic Interconnector Ireland-France

P.TOURNET provides a status update on the integration of the Celtic interconnector into Core.

Merger of Core with Italy North

H. KÖHLER explains the merger of Core with Italy North. It is clarified that once implemented the DA timeframe will be governed in the Central CCR. Core and IBWT will continue to govern the other timeframes.

R.OTTER explains that regarding the integration of the Energy Community Countries Core TSOs considered the inclusion of the borders of Ukraine and Moldova into the Core CCR. It is more efficient to work focused on the implementation of the coordinated capacity calculation and allocation for Ukraine and Moldova in a dedicated cooperation (East CCR) with their neighbours. The Core integration of those countries is a long-term target.

ACTION: Core TSOs to clarify whether the CH consideration will be integrated in the SPAICC analysis (deadline: 12/03/2024)

6. AOB & closure

Next Core CG meeting

S. VAN CAMPENHOUT mentions the proposed dates for the 2024 CG meetings. Additional technical alignments, e.g. on the SPAICC, may be planned. A reminder is provided on the communication channels.

H. ROBAYE, S. VAN CAMPENHOUT and R. OTTER thank all participants for their active contribution.