



# Core Consultative Group

11/10/2024  
Conference call

## Minutes of the meeting

### 1. Welcome and introduction

Z.GAUTIER, together with R. OTTER and S. VAN CAMPENHOUT welcome everybody to the Core and Central Consultative Group and presents today's agenda.

H. KÖHLER is introduced as the new chair of the CCR Central Europe. For the time being it is planned to maintain common Core and CE CG meetings.

#### Question from market participants

J. LE PAGE suggests to replicate for the CE CG the co-chairmanship system between TSOs and MPs that exist for the Core CG. He also requests clarification as to how to avoid gaps or overlaps in the legal and governance framework between what is applicable/discussed in a CE context, and what is in a Core or Italy North context.

H. KÖHLER confirms that the TSOs are planning the same setup for the CE CG as the one existing for the Core CG (co-chairmanship TSOs-MPs). The TSOs will follow a pragmatic approach to navigating the legal/governance framework.

### 2. CE CCR

#### **CE DA CCM**

H. KÖHLER reminds on the determination of the Central Europe (CE) CCR and outlines the next steps towards the establishment of the CE CCR. On 10 October 2024, CE Steering Group approved the content and launch of the public consultation, planned for end of next week (18/10). The formal submission of the CE DA CCM to NRAs is planned for mid-January. Mid-2027 is put forward as a preliminary go-live timing, will be further evaluated towards formal submission.

F. CHIANESE presents the overview of topics where the main changes will be introduced in the CE DA CCM compared to the Core DA CCM.

It is clarified that

- CE CCR will be fully flow-based (incl. allocation) as is the case today in Core, implying that the borders between Italy North and Core will switch from NTC to flow-based allocation.
- A parallel run is part of the implementation plan.

#### CH integration

F. CHIANESE presents the two options for the Swiss integration into CE under assessment by TSOs.

For the options considered, the Swiss CNECs are considered in the FB domain, which is not the case for the concept of CH integration in Core. How to fairly 'divide' the capacities between Swiss and Central Europe borders, will need to be assessed. What will be considered is e.g. the market forecast direction, as well as further principles.

For the NTC extraction the 'Starting\_Point' is the FB domain.

It is highlighted that explicit flow-based allocation is expected to provide a more accurate picture of how the flows are distributed and could consider a feedback loop to update available capacity for Central European borders, subject to feasibility in terms of operational timings of these processes.

#### Questions to market participants

MPs are asked for feedback on the proposals, and the questions on the slide in particular. MPs indicate that they are happy to contribute to these questions, but that further explanation will be required. Insights are e.g. required into what it would mean in terms of capacities, timings, level of volatility of capacities, and for the links with the other timeframes.

Detailed market participants' questions on the two options presented:

- NTC extraction from CE FB domain for CH borders: is the NTC extraction calculated only for CH borders,



- with the risk that they absorb all the available capacity – to be clarified by TSOs
- Explicit FB allocation: what is the RAM splitting principle between CE and CH border domains? How is the sequence between the two FB processes expected to be managed to avoid high volatility in the available capacity (and not favour one process over the other) – to be clarified by TSOs

J. SCHWACHHEIM explains that the CH-EC negotiations are ongoing. In case the negotiations are successful, Switzerland would fully participate in market coupling and the Swiss consideration concept would become redundant.

#### HVDC consideration

F. CHIANESE explains the proposed consideration of HVDC in DA CE CCM.

- It is clarified that:
  - The rules in the CCM are applicable in the same manner to all HVDC interconnectors in Central Europe, implying that also for PiSa virtual hubs are defined to implement the concept of evolved flow-based.
  - The novelty is the possibility to consider the HVDC setpoint range as a non-costly RA for the NRAO step in capacity calculation

MPs request elaborate explanation on the application of ACs and what is strictly related to Italy-North, and what is related to the rest of peninsula.

#### Other considerations

J. LE PAGE requests more details on topic 5 – allocation constraints – and how will be put in place to (1) avoid a widespread use of allocation constraints in the whole of CE, (2) incentivise Terna to limit the use of allocation constraints at the borders of Italian BZs – especially by ensuring that only voltage constraints in Italy North (not the whole Italian Peninsula) are taken into account – to be clarified by TSOs.

**ACTION:** CE TSOs to explain what they have concluded and submitted to NRAs for approval on CH integration and allocation constraints (deadline: next CG meeting).

### **3. Core CCR Overall program**

#### **Key considerations and milestones**

S. VAN CAMPENHOUT presents the key considerations and milestones of the Core CCR program.

It is added that the European Court of Justice dismissed the appeal on the ROSC methodology (thus confirming the broad scope of network elements and remedial actions to coordinate), yet annulled the cost sharing methodology. Several pleas were filed against the cost sharing methodology, and the annulment is made based on lack of justification for the chosen flow decomposition methodology and the loop flow threshold

#### **Celtic interconnector**

S. VAN CAMPENHOUT explains the progress on the Celtic interconnector integration into Core. The integration will be done through evolved flow-based as Ireland will be within the Core CCR, but technically it is the same as AHC.

J. LE PAGE remarks that ensuring capacity calculation and allocation in all timeframes on the Celtic interconnector is desired. TSOs will provide further updates on the planning.

#### **ACTION**

- Core TSOs to provide a planning of the implementation of forward, DA and ID capacity calculation and allocation on the Celtic interconnector (deadline: next CG meeting)
- Core TSO to provide further explanation on the Swiss consideration after the NRA validation of the documentation (deadline: next CG meeting).



## 4. Day-Ahead

### Update on Core DA CCM 3rd amendment

R. KAISINGER informs that Core NRAs approved the Core DA CCM 3<sup>rd</sup> amendment and explains the content of the amendment. The Coordinated validation roadmap is presented.

The final document will be published on the ENTSO-E website (as part of the overall update of the contractual framework page).

### Advanced Hybrid Coupling

R. KAISINGER presents the status of AHC implementation and the computation results. The borders presented were approved through the 2<sup>nd</sup> Core DA CCM amendment and are firm.

R. KAISINGER reminds that there will be a 1-month EXT//run just before Core DA AHC go-live as this ensures that validation can be done throughout the //run. The reason of having 1 month is not related to the 15min MTU go-live. It is acknowledged that MPs would have liked a longer EXT//RUN, which is why SPAICC-like runs were introduced.

R. KAISINGER explains that Italy-North is not included through AHC in light of the upcoming CE implementation. The FR-ES bidding zone border is not included in Core DA AHC because of the limited benefit of doing so and adding additional borders puts considerable strain on EUPHEMIA. Market participants note that the contrary was said by RTE in stakeholder meetings, and request the Core TSOs to coordinate their response on this.

→ *Added by RTE after the meeting: for CE the FR-ES border will be added to CE DA implementation of AHC. For Core this border will not be added.*

R. KAISINGER explains that Core DA capacity calculation will remain on 60 minutes, even after implementation of 15min MTU on allocation side. 15min MTU will not be considered in SPAICC-like run 3 and 4.

Questions on the bids used (e.g. based on historical bids) for testing, and on the feasibility of rolling out 15min MTU and AHC together can be raised in MCCG. Queries regarding order books and EUPHEMIA performance are outside the scope of Core CCR.

SPAICC-like run #1 was experimental. Publication of a report will be done for run #2. MPs indicate that the flow-based data of run #1 would still be valuable. Core TSOs will consider this request.

A dedicated CG call will be organised on the BDs for run #3 and #4 in mid-November. MPs are requested to raise any changes to the requirements for selecting BDs for SPAICC-like runs #3 and #4 compared to #1 and #2 ahead of this CG call.

R. KAISINGER explains that the GLSKs are provided by each TSO individually, reflecting the different generation (and load) portfolios in their control area. MPs request Core TSOs to check if the public description of the GLSK approach per Core TSO are still up to date and ask this description to be updated if any changes happened since the initial publication.

### ACTIONS:

- PMO to set-up a dedicated CG call on AHC SPAICC-like runs #3 and #4 mid-November and circulate the criteria for the BDs for SPAICC-like run #1 and #2 (deadline: 17/10/2024)
- MPs to confirm whether the criteria for the selection of BDs for SPAICC-like run #2 are still applicable (deadline: 01/11/2024)
- Core TSOs to consider the publication of the flow-based domains from SPAICC-like run #1 including relevant disclaimers and without any detailed documentation (deadline: 15/11/2024)
- Core TSOs to confirm whether the GLSK methodology explanatory document is still up to date (deadline: next CG meeting)

### SPAICC Update

R. KAISINGER presents the SPAICC status update. The first half-yearly SPAICC is running, but result publication may be delayed due to the parallel planning of the AHC SPAICC-like run. Publication is foreseen for the end of 2024.

The SPAICCs will be done regardless of whether there are any expected changes in grid topology. The runs take the planned outages into account. The publication of planned outages is done by TSOs individually. MPs raise the importance of having transparent publication of planned outages.

### MP feedback on individual validation

Z. GAUTIER presents the MPs needs in terms of individual validation:



- Improved communication: communication could be improved (e.g. summary retrospective of main event); moreover, a deadline should be set to communicate towards market participants (e.g. TSOs could have a maximum time to provide in-depth explanations about the event to market participants).
- Greater clarity on justification for IVA: the IVA justifications could be improved during long lasting events (e.g. usage of IVAs during multiple days). Reasons for use of IVA may change several times leading to a lot of uncertainty on the side of market participants on the issues.
- More consistency on REMIT transmission outages across Core: The practice of REMIT transmission outages varies considerably from one TSO to another, which poses some difficulties for market participants. MPs add that TSOs should publish more outages, especially as it cannot always be known whether an outage will have an impact on the capacities.
- Improved analysis: impacts of constraints on the network should be properly assessed and anticipated for all neighbouring countries.

In reference to the challenging situation on the French eastern borders this summer, F. BASSET explains that RTE is working on improving the communication and assessment process. He underlines the importance of finding the right balance between critical maintenance and ensuring capacities for the market. This summer, communication was done e.g. via JAO and via RTE's website and RTE strived to only apply the absolute necessary limitations. RTE is welcomes suggestions from MPs on possible improvements to the communication process.

It is clarified that the requests apply to all Core TSOs, to ensure a more streamlined and harmonised process for the region as a whole. Lessons learned from RTE could be used to do so. Core TSOs take note of this feedback to improve and streamline their internal assessment and communication processes in such situations.

MPs request to have the full transmission grid in N-state to be published. MPs underline the value of having a view on both CNECs and MNECs with timely updates on changes.

Core TSOs will assess this request. R. KAISINGER explains that even for TSOs not the whole transmission grid is monitored in Core DA capacity calculation but only relevant CNECs and MNECs.

S. VAN CAMPENHOUT concludes on the requests from MPs:

- TSOs will continue improving the analysis and communication.
- TSOs will come back on the request to publish the flow-based parameters for the MNECs (highest priority) and the possibility to publish the full transmission grid in N-state,

On REMIT, TSOs will clarify the criteria used to determine whether an outage is relevant for capacity calculation

#### ACTIONS:

- Core TSOs to answer the questions on publication and transparency (deadline: Next CG meeting)
  - DA questions raised by MPs for the CG of 11/10
  - Whether TSOs reconsider publishing gain the MNECs
  - Whether TSOs could add a '5%: yes/no' flag to all published CNECs?
- Core TSOs to provide feedback on the request from MPs to publish the full grid in N-state (deadline: next CG meeting)
- Core TSOs to clarify the criteria used to determine whether an outage is relevant for capacity calculation (deadline: next CG meeting)
- Core TSOs to provide feedback on the potential impacts of Nordic FB on Core (on capacity calculation but also on expected changes in resulting DA flows, if any) (deadline: 15/11/2024)



## 5. LTCC

### LTCC implementation approach: strategy to deliver

P. BRHLIKOVA explains that All TSOs could not reach a majority to restart LT FBA implementation. In this context Core TSOs committed to deliver a scenario-based flow-based coordinated capacity calculation solution with NTC extraction – similar to what is performed in ID - by November 2025. P. BRHLIKOVA presents the next steps. The public consultation of the amended methodology is expected for Q1 2025. S. VAN CAMPENHOUT adds that simulation results can be shared as part of the public consultation, including an explanation on how the results were reached.

Z. VUJASINOVIC shares ACER's standpoint:

- ACER supports extending the flow-based domain on basis of historical values, but strongly opposes NTC extraction as it would shrink the capacities and thereby the social welfare.
- ACER shared simulations showing that by extending domains with historical values adequate capacities can be provided.
- The TSO proposal is deemed in contradiction to the current methodology.

B. HÖFLICH remarks that the TSO solution is a first step to ensure coordinated capacity calculation. In parallel a more robust solution will be sought for the allocation part, but this cannot be ensured by November 2025. Artificially increasing the capacities to resolve inherent problems with FB allocation is not deemed an adequate solution.

P. ZOLOTAREV asks market participants to provide feedback on the intended way forward. The focus is to have a robust solution that avoids major market disturbances.

J. LE PAGE explains that MPs are particularly worried about the allocation part of flow-based, and the risk this brings to forward markets. From a fundamental perspective the step-wise approach from TSOs is deemed beneficial. MPs see it as a severe risk that TSOs and NRAs/ACER may end up in a legal deadlock and urge for a constructive dialogue. Overall, the feasibility of a go-live in November 2025 is questioned. There needs to be a plan, and time, to resolve the various conflicts with clarity on the future set-up for MPs. P. ZOLOTAREV notes the importance for MPs and welcomes further feedback from them on the proposed solution.

S. VAN CAMPENHOUT reiterates that there will be no LT FB allocation by 2025. Further discussions, including NRAs and MPs, are needed on the future of FB allocation.

## 6. Intra-day

### Q&A – follow up CG 11/07

B. MALFLIET presents the answers to the questions raised in and after the CG of 11/07.

B. MALFLIET explains that LTA is part of the DA leftover, hence why it is included for IDCC(a). Discussion will be held on removing LTA inclusion in general.

MPs enquire whether quicker solutions can be sought for ensuring publications of capacities on the ENTSO-E Transparency Platform.

#### ACTION:

- Core TSOs to answer the recent ID questions raised by MPs for the CG of 11/10 (deadline: next CG meeting)
  - Are the published RAM values loaded by an hourly-aggregated AAC value (arithmetic, volume weighted mean, ... across 4\*15') for the sake of the hourly publication?
- Could the TSOs explain how they achieve quarter-hourly ATCs from hourly PTDF? Is there an additional post-processing of the published final PTDF? (deadline: 15/11/2024)
- Core TSOs to answer the more detailed question on computing the rescaled FB domain for IDCC(a) incl. LTA (deadline: 15/11/2024)

### IDCC post-go-live status

B. MALFLIET presents the summary of the IDCC(a) and (b) KPIs since go-live. Slide 35 is corrected to state 20% instead of 80%. S. VAN CAMPENHOUT explains that efforts are ongoing to improve the overall capacities, not only on specific borders.

J. LE PAGE remarks that it would be interesting to assess the impact of the new ID (IDCC & IDAs) processes on the Balkans. Core TSOs will align with MCSC on this question and ask MPs to also raise this question in the MCCG.



#### ACTION:

- Core TSOs to answer whether ACs are used in IDAs and XBID the same as in DA (deadline: 15/11/2024)

#### Identification of pre-congestions

B. MALFLIET presents the further developed KPI with insights in the pre-congestions for IDCC(b). This KPI is used to identify use cases for the capacity improvement study.

S. VAN CAMPENHOUT clarifies the reason why RAs are missing in the grid model for IDCC(b) is because the day-ahead operational security analysis process is not yet complete at the moment that IDCC(b) has to start. This limitation of parallel processes explains why RAs that were used to secure capacities during the validation step of day-ahead capacity calculation are not automatically integrated into IDCC(b). The long-term solution to fetch these "missing" RAs is the implementation of ROSC. Yet TSOs also work on short-term improvements, through the implementation of IDCC(c) and through the capacity improvement study.

Core TSOs take note of the suggestion of MPs to identify missing RAs through a feedback loop from the validation step of day-ahead capacity calculation.

#### Capacity improvement study

B. MALFLIET presents the scope and status of the capacity improvement study. Core TSOs will deliver the study by 1 April 2025, with initial results expected around the start of the year.

It is clarified that the removal of interconnectors to non-Core bidding zones from the CNEC list is not related to the implementation of AHC. AHC models the impact of exchanges over these interconnectors on the interior of the Core grid. This topic is about the CNECs at the outside borders of the Core grids. As part of the study it will be determined whether these CNECs can be 'ignored.'

#### IDCC(C)

B. MALFLIET presents the timeline for IDCC(C) towards the planned go-live in June 2025.

MPs indicate that transparency on RAs applied in the DACF/IDCF grid model used as input for IDCC(b/c) is important for them. Core TSOs clarify that it is not the IDCCM but the ROSC methodology that defines the transparency requirements for RAs.

MPs request more timely provision of the API ahead of the IDCC(c) go-live, with the data format set longer in advance. This is noted.

#### ACTION:

- Core TSOs to clarify the transparency requirements for RAs in ROSC methodology and assess the feasibility to apply them on the existing operational security analysis processes (deadline: next CG meeting)

## 7. AOB & closure

#### Core DA CC: Default Flow-Based Parameters on BD 25/06/2024

A technical report on the occurrence of default flow-based parameters in the Core day-ahead capacity calculation for BD 25/06/2024 was presented during the MESC meeting of Oct 8. This is included in the annex.

#### CEP70 action plans & derogations

Market Participants have requested whether derogation requests and action plans for 2025 can be made available. Such overview can be made with the support of Core NRAs who are consolidating and approving the derogation requests. Unlike for action plans, there is no explicit deadline in Electricity Regulation set on the application of derogations.

#### Overview of MP questions

All questions raised have been answered or noted for further answering.

#### ACTION:





- Core TSOs and NRAs to present CEP70 derogations and action plans for 2025 (deadline: next CG meeting)
- Core TSOs to review the open questions in the JAO Q&A forum and ensure questions are answered within 1 month (deadline: 15/11/2024)

Z. GAUTIER, R. OTTER and S. VAN CAMPENHOUT thank the CG for their participation

**Next Core CG**

Will be organized for HY1 2025 (around March/April).