

# 4<sup>th</sup> LONG TERM NETWORK DEVELOPMENT STAKEHOLDER GROUP (LTND SH GROUP)

Date: 30<sup>th</sup> September 2013

Time: 10:30h – 15:00

Place: ENTSO-E premises, Brussels

## DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

### 1. Meeting Agenda and Participants

#### a. Agenda

No	Subject	Time	Lead
1.	Welcome	10.30	Konstantin Staschus Secretary-General ENTSO-E
2.	TYNDP scenario	10.45	Jesus Mendiola Modelling Advisor ENTSO-E
	- Preliminary outcomes 2030 visions consultation		
	- TF on scenario building	11.20	Daniel Fraile Senior Policy Officer - Climate Action Network
	Discussion		ALL
3.	CBA methodology update:	11.45	Klaus Wewering Convener Drafting Team Planning Standards
	- Preliminary consultation outcomes		
	- Next steps		
	Discussion		ALL
4.	Lunch	12.30	
5.	Inclusion of the 3rd party projects in the TYNDP 2014	13.30	Maarit Uusitalo TYNDP Transparency Manager
	- Updated methodology		
	- 2 <sup>nd</sup> open window		
	Discussion		ALL
6.	How can the activity within this stakeholder group can be improved?	14.00	Konstantin Staschus Secretary-General ENTSO-E
	Discussion		ALL
7.	Next steps and the next meeting	14.15	ALL

8.	AOB	14.30	ALL
9.	Conclusions	14.45	Silvia Ibba Planning Advisor ENTSO-E  Jesus Mendiola Modelling Advisor ENTSO-E
10.	End of the meeting	15.00	

## b. Participants

1	Eurelectric	Gunnar LORENZ	Present
2	EWEA	Paul Wilczek	Present
3	EPIA	Giorgia Concas	Present
	EPIA	Manoel Rekinger	Absent
4	EFET	Jerome le Page	Absent
5	IFIEC	Fernand Felzinger, Peter Claes	Present
6	RGI	Antina Sander	Absent
	RGI	Loukianos Zavolas	Present
	CAN Europe	Daniel Fraile Montoro	Present
8	GREENPEACE	Tara Connolly	Absent
9	EPPSA	Patrick Clerens	Absent
10	Europacable	Volker Wendt	Absent
11	T&D Europe	Richard Charnah	Absent
12	GEODE	Carmen Gimeno	Absent
13	CEDEC	Marc Malbrancke	Absent
14	Friends of the Supergrid (FOSG)	Ana Aguado Cornago	Present
15	Orgalime	Ulrich Fikar	Present
16	EASE	Maria Joao Durate	Absent
	EASE	Anna Turskaya	Present
17	DG ENER	Chrysoula Argyriou	Absent
18	ACER	Sascha Falahat	Absent
19	ENTSO-E	Klaus Wewering	Present
20	ENTSO-E	Chris Thackeray	Present
21	ENTSO-E	Jesus Mendiola	Present
22	ENTSO-E	Maarit Uusitalo	Present
23	ENTSO-E	Silvia Ibba	Present
24	ENTSO-E	Felix Maire	Present

## 2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minute of the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting was previously finalised and is currently available on the [ENTSO-E website](#).  
The agenda of the current meeting was approved.

## 3. Introduction

Konstantin Staschus introduced the meeting by announcing that the new System Development Committee Manager, Robert Schroeder will be appointed from 1<sup>st</sup> November. The new SDC Manager will attend future meetings of the Long Term Network Development Stakeholder Workshop. Mr Staschus reiterated the aims of this stakeholder group.

## 4. TYNDP Scenarios

Jesus Mendiola presented the preliminary first results<sup>1</sup> of the scenarios and first preview of the consultation comments. The slides of the presentation are available online and a link to them can be found at the end of this document. A discussion followed, on the location of solar generation, the possibility of varying levels of nuclear in different scenarios, the high level of electricity consumption and the validity of assumptions on the CO<sub>2</sub> price.

Discussions:

Benefits of the different locations of solar; whether it should be in the south where the physical potential is higher but where more transmission capacity would be required, or whether it should be located closer to demand centres, in which case less transmission investment might be needed in the short-medium term.

ENTSO-E noted that consideration should be given to what geographic spread of solar PV in Europe is most consistent with other elements of vision, such as RES integration, RES increased development and socio-economic welfare.

The apparent constant level of nuclear capacity and generation across the four visions was challenged, with the commission's view on nuclear cited as a possible example. The phasedown of nuclear power in Germany was discussed, as was the question of what would replace nuclear. A show of hands showed that 6/4 favoured visions with a variation in nuclear.

ENTSO-E noted that it takes a neutral view on the generation mix, although there is a possibility that a lower level of nuclear could be included in the vision with a low CO<sub>2</sub> price.

The high level of electricity consumption in Vision 3 and Vision 4 was also discussed. The levels presented in both scenarios are higher than other long term scenarios produced by the IEA and the EC. Transport and heating electrification were mentioned as possible reasons for such high demand forecast. Some members requested ENTSO to provide a more comprehensive set of data to ensure coherence across sectors.

**Decision:** Address this topic in the Task Force scenario and determine the best way to treat the Nuclear installed capacity.

Further questions (Q) and suggestions (S), with associated answers (A) from the participants:

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that these are preliminary results and not to be taken as final.

S – In order to find out cost optimisations and in order to understand the effect of certain elements in the system architecture, sensitivity analysis of at least vision 4 might be appropriate. For example CO<sub>2</sub> prices expectations vary hugely and the sensitivity of a set of values could be in the model.

A - Much uncertainty, visions cannot take into account all uncertainty. Need to strike balance between level of work and sensitivity. We do need a vision with high prices, other visions have lower prices. IPCC recent projections concur with vision 4.

Q - Is there still coal burning in Europe in all scenarios?

A – Yes but it varies across the visions; vision 4 has a much lower level with Carbon Capture and Storage.

S - Even if it is seen as difficult to achieve a given scenario, it is important to have the EU perspective and not just a sum of national ones. It can be a message for regulators and policy makers that there may be little possibility of optimising RES with an explanation of why it cannot be so European.

A – ENTSO-E is striving for better and better results for each TYNDP, which is an iterative process.

## 5. Cost-Benefit Analysis Methodology Update

Klaus Wewering presented the CBA methodology and a first preview of consultation comments. Klaus noted that there were approximately 90 comments received from around 20 participants. An estimated 70% are already "known" as issues that have either been addressed already or will be addressed in future, 20% focussed on monetisation of parameters and approximately 10% will be taken into account in the current round of consultation. An example of a comment that will be taken forward is the different opinions around storage assessment. Further improvements will be made to the CBA and it will be submitted to ACER for approval on the 16<sup>th</sup> November 2013.

Further Questions (Q) and suggestions (S), with associated answers (A);

Q – Particularly relating to storage, will any of the 10% of the recommendations be taken up?

A - The approximate 10% of comments are those that are possibly valid for changes.

Q – When will vision results be presented?

A – The visions are calculated in sequence; first of all Vision 1 and 4, which will be finalized by Spring of next year. Visions 2 and 3 will be calculated following this, although less time is available for these visions as our stakeholders have prioritised Visions 1 and 4.

Eurelectric volunteered to participate on the discussion regarding storage assessment.

## 6. Inclusion of 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Projects in TYNDP 2014

Maarit Uusitalo outlined the process and reasoning for the inclusion of third party projects in the TYNDP. Maarit also announced that there is currently a second window open and that ENTSO-E will be accepting applications throughout October from third party promoters who would like to have their project included in 2014. Inclusion in the TYNDP is sole basis for projects to be included on the Projects of Common Interest list published by the European Commission, which will make the project eligible for financial and non-financial support. A link to the material can be found at the end of this document.

## 7. Stakeholder Group Improvements

Konstantin opened a discussion on the effectiveness and improvements of the stakeholder group. The group expressed that the discussions and way of working have been valuable. It was said to be a good way to give input and that there has been development during the time that the group has existed. As is to be expected, it remains to be seen what is reflected on the final outcome that is the TYNDP 2014. It was requested by present stakeholders a major involvement of EC and ACER representatives in this Stakeholder Group.

Further questions (Q) and suggestions (S), with associated answers (A);

S - To have similar discussions on network codes and planning interrelation.

S – The group would like to know when we are to consult and what will be consulted.

A – This is another issues to be taken on-board by the Task Force.

Q - How can we deal with different concerns? How will they influence the process?

A - Issues have to be clear from stakeholder consultation. ENTSO should change how it does things in response to this. The next step is to consider how this can be made operational.

Q - How can stakeholders improve participation?

A – ENTSO-E are very pleased with the level of engagement of the stakeholders, although did call for more participation in task force and welcomed volunteers.

Q - Consultation was for 2014 process; is there enough time for comments to be included?

A - Results will be taken into account for next TYNDP (2016)

Key points from ENTSO in response to feedback:

- There will be future agendas on meetings about hot topics, topics that deserve individual attention.
- Views will be captured through different visions where possible but it was asked of the stakeholders to keep in mind that there is a two year legal mandate to deliver a TYNDP and so time is finite.

## 8. Next Steps and Next Meeting

There was a discussion around whether the next meeting of the Long Term Network Development Stakeholder Group should be before or after the next TYNDP public Workshop fixed on *26 November 2013*. The consensus was that we should have the LTND SG meeting after the TYNDP Stakeholder workshop; either on the day if schedules work. If the scheduling is not possible, a separate day could be arranged.

**Note:** All the material presented in the meeting can be accessed from the ENTSO-E website at:

<https://www.entsoe.eu/major-projects/ten-year-network-development-plan/tyndp-2014/long-term-network-development-stakeholder-group/>