

Minutes of Meeting
ENTSO-E Drafting Team on DCC
DCC User Group

Date: 19 April 2012
Time: 14h00 – 17h00
Place: Hotel Martins Central, Brussels

Participants

Association	Representative	Organization
CECED	Celine Herion	CECED
	Fabio Gargantini	CECED Italia
CEDEC	Herman Poelman	Alliander
CENELEC	Josef Baumeister	BSHG
EDSO-SG	Florian Chapalain	EDSO-SG
	Jesus Peco	Iberdola
Eurelectric DSO	Riccardo Lama	ENEL
	Jacques Merley	ErDF
	Pavla Mandatova	Eurelectric DSO
ESMIG	Willem Strabbing	ESMIG
IFIEC	Jean-Pierre Bécret	Solvay
	Bernd-Christian Pago	Infracor GmbH
Geode	Johan Lundqvist	Svensk Energi
Orgalime	Bertrand Deprez	Schneider Electric
SEDC	Jessica Stromback	SEDC
	Ali Haider	SEDC
ENTSO-E	Stephanie Bieth	RTE
	Roberto Gnudi	Terna
	Edwin Haesen	ENTSO-E
	Bastian Homburg	Amprion
	Mark Norton	Eirgrid
	Sergio Paseiro	REE
	Juergen Schmitt	Swissgrid
	Dwayne Shann	National Grid
	Helge Urdal	National Grid

In addition to the participants present today, expressions of interest to join this User Group were received from the following associations

- ANEC/BEUC
- EHPA
- Eurelectric WG Thermal

In addition to the associations mentioned before, ENTSO-E invites ACER and the EC DG ENER as observers to the DCC User Group meetings. Both are excused for this 1st meeting.

1. Welcome and agenda

A draft agenda was proposed by ENTSO-E and is agreed by all participants:

- 14:00-14:15hrs Welcome and introduction of participants
- 14:15-14:45hrs Feedback on workshop 18/04, status of the Network Code DCC and timeline
- 14:45-15:30hrs Open session for participants' contribution and discussion to DCC stage 1 process
- 15:30-15:45hrs Coffee break
- 15:45-16:45hrs Open session for participants' contribution and discussion to DCC stage 1 process
- 16:45-17:00hrs Agree actions and next dates.

2. General feedback on public DCC workshop 18 April & status of the Network Code DCC and timeline

A short overview is given by ENTSO-E of the state of play for those who did not attend the 18 April workshop.

Eurelectric DSO notes that for a response to some of the questions posed in the Call for Stakeholder Input, more information on critical assumptions is needed.

ESMIG notes that the questions posed raise other questions as well.

Link with standardization

ESMIG acknowledges the rationale to have a Demand Connection Code as given in the DCC - Call for Stakeholder Input. It is in line with the argumentation for other smart grid activities. ESMIG asks for more insight in the link to the work of the Smart Grid Coordination Group (M490)

GENELEC expects an overlap between DCC and the work in the Smart Grid Coordination Group (SGCG) and sees DCC as a part of the scope of all Demand Side Response (DSR) options as assessed in the SGCG.

Orgalime asks if there is a formal process how to include standardization in the DCC development.

ENTSO-E stresses that although ACER's framework guidelines state that a European Network Code (as regulation) supersedes standards, ENTSO-E will take cognizance of standards and avoid unnecessary diversions from these. The DCC aims at the level of a functional description of connection requirements for specific DSR services. This DCC User Group is seen as a means to liaise with other standardization activities as well.

ENTSO-E notes that it participates itself also in the SGCG and has analyzed a possible overlap/synergies between both. The DCC is considered to focus on a specific set of services which have a cross border impact. There is a difference in the level of detail and extent as envisaged in M490. The DCC is not planned to discuss e.g. details on communication links, information hubs, etc... The DSR options as presented in the DCC – Call for Stakeholder Input give a few very concrete services (not the technical implementation or specific types of demand) of DSR in the context of cross border power system impact, i.e. 'slow' reserves and 'fast' system frequency control.

Communication aspects

ESMIG asks for further clarification on the relation between M490 and DCC, especially considering the level (layer) of information exchange envisaged?

ENTSO-E considers the level of information exchange to be low for System Frequency Control.

Eurelectric DSO agrees that communication is not needed strictly for the DSR System Frequency Control concept itself, but that it might be useful to have more info on the load shape in general in order not to call on too many reserves or to be sure that a margin to call on is available.

EDSO-SG gives more information on a Smart Meter project in Spain where the objective is to reduce outage time and improve grid performance. No communication with the customer behind the meter is covered.

IFIEC notes that communication on ancillary services by demand cannot go via the supplier.

Envisaged DSR services

CENELEC asks whether the DCC aims at emergency situations or aims to cover more smart grid options. The DT notes that opinions on these topics are being asked for as part to the stage 1 process for the DCC.

IFIEC stresses the importance of discussion on possible new services with customers before implementing. IFIEC gives the example of present primary reserves which in many countries is frequently used for the first 50% of the available reserve, with the remaining 50% hardly ever activated and having a larger potential for industrial loads. IFIEC expects that if services are split between generation and load, the total cost will be lower as a smaller band of available capacity will be needed for generation reserves.

IFIEC notes that not all technologies might be suited for DSR services. ENTSO-E asks to provide more argumentation/data on this as part of the stage 1 DCC consultation.

SEDC notes that for a complete discussion on these topics, customers need to be included.

3. Open session for participants' contribution and discussion to DCC stage 1 process

Presentation prepared by SEDC with following key messages:

- Equitable treatment of generation and demand needs to be envisaged, not full equal treatment in DSR services.
- Residential smart grid solutions are considered to be less economical than small and large industrial solutions. SEDC stresses it represents all segments of smart grid solutions.
- The importance of communication with the customer is stressed. The reference to the Californian case (Title 4) of standardization on utility controlled thermostat (PCT: programmable communicating thermostat) is given. This concept was to be legally enforced, but experienced consumer backlash due to bad communication.
- Other references discussed
 - European ADDRESS project
 - VaasaETT pilot project in which customer option to 'opt out' was key for customer adoption.

Eurelectric DSO notes that several DSR ideas are already implemented and proposed the DCC to start from existing ideas and try to fill in the gap.

CENELEC stresses the importance of having the whole picture of possible DSR options before implementing.

CECED asks how ENTSO-E defines DSR that has a cross-border impact and which does not. ENTSO-E sees that any demand user providing DSR has the possibility to have a cross-border impact for the DSR services identified as being cross border in nature (namely Demand Side Response Active Power Control (DSR APC), Demand Side Response Reactive Power Control (DSR RPC), Demand side Response Transmission Constraint Management (DSR TCM) and Demand Side Response System Frequency Control (DSR SFC)).

For System Frequency Control aiming at Low Frequency Demand Disconnection a coordinated cross-border approach is essential; if not, one member state will take the burden of another in case of an emergency.

CECED asks for ENTSO-E's view on what is a significant user in this context. ENTSO-E expressed that depending on the number of units, its aggregated impact and type of reaction, any demand user can be significant. Proportionality and equitability is considered when setting requirements.

CECED and SEDC stress the importance of market solutions and not mandatory implementation for DSR services to create customer acceptance. ENTSO-E questioned that if societal benefit is optimised by mandatory, autonomous implementation of DSR System Frequency Control and therefore this the best method, given it lack of commercial opportunity which entity is going to propose this implementation method? Eurelectric DSO questions if customers will more easily accept markets controlling domestic appliances for DSR services. ENTSO-E pointed out that's it will provide the requirements on the basis of socio economic analysis and cost benefit analysis in line with the Grid Connection Framework Guideline July 2011, which has been provided as part of the stage 1 DCC consultation process for DSR services.

4. Next steps

As all participating associations expressed an interest for contributing in the DCC User Group, ENTSO-E looks forward to more detailed contributions by 9 May in the DCC – Call for Stakeholder Input.

A follow-up meeting is suggested shortly after 9 May. ENTSO-E will send a proposal for this.