

### 3<sup>rd</sup> Grid Connection European Stakeholder Committee (GC ESC)

Thursday, 8 September 2016

12:45h – 17:00h

ENTSO-E, 100 avenue de Cortenbergh, Brussels

## DRAFT MINUTES

### List of Participants

Last Name	First Name	Company
Gabrijel	Uros	ACER
Mihaela Minciuna	Irina	ENTSO-E
Paquel	Jean-Baptiste	ENTSO-E
Guenzi	Luca	EUTurbines
Pineda	Ivan	WindEurope
Ufert	Achim	VGB Power Tech
Serafim	Sofia	Orgalime
Tudoroiu-Lakavice	Alexandra	COGEN Europe
Feliu	Paloma	GEODE
Graham	Garth	SSE
Pfeiffer	Ralph	ENTSO-E
Fikar	Ulrich	Orgalime
Malbrancke	Marc	CEDEC
Addala	Srinivasa Raju	EUGINE , Wärtsilä
Oberhauser	Klaus	VGB Power Tech
Francis	Will	European Commission
Grenard	Sebastien	EURELECTRIC
Ikram	Rabia	EURELECTRIC
Dekinderen	Eric	EURELECTRIC
Luijten	René	CEDEC
Becker	Brittney	EASE
Van Bossuyt	Michaël	IFIEC Europe
Pielken	Sebastian	Bundesnetzagentur (NRA) (via telco)
Wilch	Michael	EDSO for smart grids (via telco)
Poplawski-Stephens	Paulina	ACER (via telco)

## **1. Opening**

Uros Gabrijel (ACER), Chair of the GC ESC, welcomed the participants to the third GC ESC meeting. After a quick tour de table, the draft agenda was approved without additional comments.

All actions points from last meeting will be followed-up over the course of the meeting.

## **2. Responses from ENTSO-E**

ENTSO-E answered questions asked by stakeholders at the previous GC ESC meeting on the DCC.

Responses to the following SEDC and EURELECTRIC questions were provided in a Powerpoint presentation, available on ENTSO-E's [GC ESC webpage](#).

### **SEDC**

- Should an aggregator update the TSO about any change to his portfolio?
- Do templates exist for 'installation documents' and 'demand response unit document' (DRUD)?

### **EURELECTRIC**

- Demand Response of small demand units - How do make sure that such small units respect the DCC requirements?
- Demand Response of small demand units - What is an 'equipment certificate' for these units (Art. 32 & 33)? How do we collect them without leading to an extremely complex and expensive solution?
- Demand Response of small demand units - The requirements apply to new demand units (Art. 3.1.d) only. What is a new demand unit at this level? What if an aggregator has a portfolio of demand units, some being new and some others being old: does the code apply only to the new ones?
- Demand Response of small demand units -Which type of equipment/devices does ENTSO-E think would volunteer to participate in DSR? We understood that fridges were one of the main targets. But does it include light bulbs, heat pumps, etc? Is there a list?

## **3. Planning the adoption of the Grid Connection Network Codes (Commission)**

Will Francis, representing the European Commission, provided an update on Connection Codes adoption: RfG and DCC have entered into force. The HVDC code was published on the Official Journal on 8 September 2016. To date, all GC NCs have entered into force.

Will Francis stated that the EC is not in a position to give formal interpretation of European legislation without a formal inquiry to the EC legal services on the matter. All statements in this area shall therefore be considered as informal and non-binding.

Will Francis answered the questions presented at the previous GC ESC meeting, below. The Commission's Powerpoint presentation is available on ENTSO-E's [GC ESC webpage](#).

- Can a Member State impose more stringent requirements by a separate legislation than imposed by the network code Requirements for Generators (RfG NC)?
- What about derogations granted according to national legislation before the RfG NC came into force? Should those derogations be maintained at any moment in time after entering into force of the RfG NC or are those derogations also subjected to Art. 4 of the RfG NC?
- Is it allowed that Member States define a dedicated classification for Synchronous PGMs (SPGMs) and a different one for PPMs, each classification with its own thresholds?
  - Not explicitly prevented – but, was this the intention?
  - Art 5(2) – e.g. "connection point below 110k and maximum capacity at or above a threshold proposed..." can be understood, that *one* threshold per category shall be defined without distinction between SPGMs and PPMs

- Articles 17-19 and 20-22 have provide dedicated requirements for SPGMs and PPMs.
- Procedure in case of differences between English and translated version?
  - A corrigendum can be issued correcting inconsistencies resulting from translation errors.
  - Please inform in writing to [ENER-ELEC-CROSS-BORDER-COMMITTEE@ec.europa.eu](mailto:ENER-ELEC-CROSS-BORDER-COMMITTEE@ec.europa.eu)
- Art 3(2)(d) - Why are storage devices excluded?

Eric Dekinderen (Eurelectric) underlines the onerous requirements on information exchange applicable to Type B PGMs originating from the System Operation Guideline, and the vast difference between countries due to different classification of type A generators. He suggests a European harmonisation of generators classification.

Marc Malbranke mentions a power point Belgian document (from Elia) which explains the different types of power generating modules and assesment of the categories based on aggregated capacity. The document is already available on the GC ESC website. See final document under 06/06/2016 Grid Connection Network Codes European Stakeholder Committee.

#### **4. VGB Powertech Presentation: Public Consultation on Grid Connection IGDs**

VGB regrets that the consultation period was too short and the documents, even draft, were not circulated before the consultation. VGB also regrets that a common consultation for all connection codes was not organised, and the the GC ESC was not involved in the consultation. VGB suggests that the GC ESC should discuss the consultation results with ENTSO-E, and issue recommendations.

VGB sees the RfG consultation as a pre-consultation, to prepare the following DCC and HVDC consultations which should present a final set of IGDs. VGB looks forward to a good collaboration with the TSOs.

#### **5. ENTSO-E feedback on IGDs: first evaluation and results of the public consultation**

ENTSO-E received answers from 16 organisations for the consultation organised until 15 August 2016. Wind Europe mentions that they have also sent comments to the consultation, because it is not quoted in the ENTSO-E presentation.

The Powerpoint presentation on the IGD consultation is available on ENTSO-E's [GC ESC webpage](#).

General remarks:

- earlier and more intense stakeholder involvement in national implementation processes
- need of similar structure/level of content for all the IGDs;
- more technical details and values for parameters of non-exhaustive requirements required
- to promote harmonisation of non-exhaustive requirements at European level

Garth Graham mentions that the GC ESC does not effectively have a formal role in all documents related to implementation, including the IGDs.

- ENTSO-E replies that the GC ESC was the first to be informed on the implementation guidance schedule, and had the possibility to discuss at early stages the upcoming IGDs.

Eric Dekinderen: what is the meaning of the word “support”, which is opposed to “prescribe” for the IGDs? What about smaller countries which may not have sufficient resoures to conduct a proper implementation process?

Eric Dekinderen mentions (supported by Garth Graham and Ivan Pineda) that the operational codes define some values of parameters defined in the connection codes, which will be the ones which shall apply at operational

timescales. WindEurope states that they observe overlaps between the requirements in the connection codes and the operational codes/guidelines.

The EC would appreciate some improvements on harmonisation across Europe.

ACER considers margin for IGD improvement by demonstrating best practices in order to help countries on specifications of requirements that are not in place yet.

The Chair asked ENTSO-E to develop a proposal on TSO-TSO and TSO-DSO coordination in the implementation of GC NCs and SOGL for the next meeting.

ENTSO-E responded to propose at the next ESC (09. December, Ljubljana) how to elaborate recommendations for frequency stability criteria taking into account the interdependencies between connection and operation code with a particular focus on TSO-TSO cooperation and stakeholder involvement

ENTSO-E announces to have break-out sessions in the public stakeholder workshop (13. September) on:

- Stakeholder involvement during national implementation
- CBA
- Compliance monitoring
- Fast fault current contribution

These break-out sessions may conclude whether to establish expert groups in these areas to support the further development of implementation guidance.

Luca Guenzi asked what will be the scope of the future expert groups, and how they will be able to work on IGDs which were already consulted on.

- ENTSO-E replies that expert groups will focus on selected items which may impact one or several IGDs, covering one or several codes, rather than on IGDs themselves. Furthermore, the Connection Codes mention that the IGDs should be published “no later” than 6 months after entry into force and updated at least every 2 years. This does not prejudice the intention of ENTSO-E to publish or update IGDs as often as deemed necessary or reasonable. Expert group discussions and results are considered to be a source for IGD enhancement.

## **6. ENTSO-E presentation on the Active Library**

Active Library is ready, in a test environment, already accessible to GC ESC members but not yet published formally on ENTSO-E website. ENTSO-E will update the national information as soon as it is accessible, and will add a “key documents” to highlight documents of cross national relevance.

Garth Graham suggests that MS should add a mapping of network codes and national codes, and submit it to publication.

Any stakeholder is encouraged to send relevant documents, they will be uploaded by ENTSO-E.

Stakeholders request a clear way (e.g. colouring, numbering...) to identify the status of each document: e.g. draft/for consultation/submitted for approval/approved.

## **7. ENTSO-E feedback regarding CENELEC progress on standards**

The Powerpoint presentation on CENELEC progress is available on ENTSO-E's [GC ESC webpage](#).

Garth Graham requests that ENTSO-E shares with stakeholders a full table matching standards to individual requirements.

## **8. AOB**

Michael Van Bossuyt requests a formal clarification on several definitions in the codes, e.g. there are several instances of mentioning of CDSOs, in particular whether the DCC and the question is if mentioning of DSOs notion includes CDSOs (meaning: all requirements applicable to DSOs also apply to CDSOs?). Uros Gabrijel asks to circulate detailed question with example(s) in writing.

Members (Garth Graham + Marc Malbrancke + Eric Dekinderen) request a clarification about the definition of “substantial changes” and criteria for assessment by the relevant network operator on this matter. The European Commission will be asked to provide clarification at the next meeting.

Marc Malbrancke asked for an interpretation of Article 15 of the NC DCC for which he agreed to circulate questions in written after the meeting.

Proposed dates for the 2017 meetings: ENTSO-E to circulate a proposal as soon as possible for 2017.

### **Follow-up actions**

- ENTSO-E regular report on progress on the CENELEC development of standards;
- ENTSO-E proposal on TSO-TSO and TSO-DSO coordination in the implementation of GC NCs and SOGL to be presented at the next meeting;
- Michael Van Bossuyt was asked to provide before the next meeting instances in the DCC where mentioning of DSOs is not clear to include CDSOs;
- Members (Garth Graham + Marc Malbrancke + Eric Dekinderen) request a clarification about the definition of “substantial changes”. The European Commission will be asked to provide clarification at the next meeting.
- Marc Malbrancke asked for an interpretation of Article 15 of the NC DCC for which he agreed to circulate questions in written format after the meeting. The European Commission will be asked to provide clarification at the next meeting.