

Minutes of Meeting
ENTSO-E Drafting Team on DCC
DSO Technical Expert Group

Date: 13 November 2012

Time: 09h00 – 12h00

Place: Lisbon

Participants

Name	Affiliation	present	excused
DT DCC			
Hans Abele	Transnet BW		X
Stephanie Bieth	RTE	X	
Anders Danell	Svenska Kraftnett	X	
Roberto Gnudi	Terna	X	
Edwin Haesen	ENTSO-E	X	
Bastian Homburg	Amprion	X	
Kees Jansen	Tennet	X	
Mikko Koskinen	Fingrid	X	
João Moreira	REN	X	
Mark Norton	EirGrid	X	
Sergio Pasero Ruiz	REE		X
Juergen Schmitt	swissgrid	X	
Dwayne Shann	National Grid	X	
Guillemette Smadja	Elia / LRG		X
Adam Szekely	ENTSO-E	X	
DSO TEG			
Pierre Andersson EK	E.ON Energihandel Nordic (Eurelectric DSO)	X	
Pilar Barrera	Bewag Netz (Eurelectric DSO)		X
Alberto Cerretti	Enel Distribuzione (Eurelectric DSO / EDSO-SG)		X
Florian Chapalain	EDSO-SG		X
Ivan Codd	ESB (Eurelectric DSO)		X
Falk Engelmann	VKU (CEDEC)		X
Juan Gonzalez	Endesa (Eurelectric DSO)	X	
Bruno Gouverneur	Synergrid (Eurelectric DSO)		X
Mike Kay	ENWL (Geode)		X
Riccardo Lama	Enel Distribuzione (Eurelectric DSO)		X
Mika Loukkalahti	Helen Sähköverkko Oy (Eurelectric DSO)		X
Johan Lundqvist	Svenskenergi (Geode)	X	
Marc Malbrancke	Inter-Regies (CEDEC)	X	
Pavla Mandatova	Eurelectric DSO	X	
Javier Meco	Endesa (EDSO-SG)	X	
Jacques Merley	ERDF (Eurelectric DSO)	X	
Viktoria Neimane	Vattenfall R&D (Eurelectric DSO)		X
Joachim Nilges	RWE (Eurelectric DSO)	X	
Piotr Ordyna	Tauron (EDSO-SG)		X
Allan Norsk Jensen	Danish Energy Association (Eurelectric DSO)	X	
Jesus Peco	Iberdrola (EDSO-SG)		X
Herman Poelman	Alliander (CEDEC / EDSO-SG)	X	
Graeme Vincent	Scottish Power (Eurelectric DSO)		X
Jarmo Saarinen	Fortum Oyj (Eurelectric DSO)		X
Walter Schaffer	Salzburgnetz (CEDEC)		X
Bilal Simsek	TEDAS (Eurelectric DSO)		X
Siegfried Wanzek	E.ON-Energie (Eurelectric DSO)	X	

1. Agenda

Material sent in advance of the meeting by ENTSO-E (all dated 6 November 2012):

- Draft Demand Connection Code – based on assessment of all consultation feedback
- Frequently Asked Questions
- Evaluation of Comments
- DCC Justification Outlines

Material sent in advance of the meeting by the DSO TEG

- DSO TEG Comments on draft NC DCC (version of 24 October 2012) – 9 page document
→ ENTSO-E response on all items was sent on 11 November to the coordinators of the four DSO associations.
- Proposal to amend Article 16 on Reactive Power

The objective of the meeting is to pursue a final position on the remaining DSO TEG comments as sent in advance of the meeting, as well as to capture the DSO TEG view on the final DCC and its supporting documents.

All agree on this outline.

2. Main points

Link with Operational Network Codes

The DSO TEG notes a possible overlap with the operational codes, especially on the requirements for demand disconnection for system defence (Art. 20). The article mentions several agreements, which the DSO TEG believes are to be covered by operational principles. The DT acknowledges that this concept will be covered by other NCs (e.g. on Emergency Procedures – no timeline in the 3 year work program yet). Overlap cannot be excluded, but the DT believes there is no contradiction or impediment for future emergency procedures. Overall, Art. 20 focuses on the functional capabilities of e.g. relays.

Non-compliance of users with the DCC

The DSO TEG notes a concern over the fact that the code stipulates no sanctions in case of non-compliance; would this result in disconnection? The DT notes that the consequence will be covered by national law/processes.

Equipment Certificate and Installation Document

The content of an Equipment Certificate is considered to be not clear for the DSO TEG. The DT notes that this is directly linked to the relevant DCC requirements applicable to a given user. The DSO TEG asks how capabilities not specified in the NC will be covered; more specifically, how does ENTSO-E cooperate with CENELEC on this work. The DT notes that an MoU is signed with CENELEC on the interaction of NCs and standardization work. In the past, in working level discussions on NC RfG and DCC with CENELEC, there was a common understanding that NCs provide functional capabilities for a limited number of aspects (cross-border / market integration) on which standards will have to provide further specifications as a complement. DSO TEG proposes to contribute to this co-operation for issues related to grid users connected to distribution grids.

The DSO TEG states that the use of an Installation Document on DSR connection requirements would be a bureaucratic nightmare and questions its benefit. The DSO TEG makes reference to the experience from the current enormous efforts necessary for administration of the retrofit of PV units in Germany which is cumbersome.

Also, the DSO TEG repeats its statement that DSR capability is not directly related to connection and states that as DSR services for smaller consumers connected at LV level will likely be provided by aggregators, these aggregators should be the responsible party for all administration, consumer contact and related costs, but have an obligation to provide the information to the Network Operators. The DSO TEG also states that with the proposed approach a full overview on DSR will be possible only in remote future. The DT notes that the DCC (Art. 28(2)) grants the Relevant Network Operator the right to list the needed elements of the Installation Document. The DT considers the minimum items mentioned in the DCC to be little additional information compared to present connections (location, capacity, registration/metering number, date of connection, etc...) and considers the requirement to be open enough for this registration to be captured in other customer information databases. As the DCC is forward looking, for services which are expected in the short and longer term future, it is a signal to already implement the needed processes and IT system adaptations, to prevent the huge back-log as occurred in the PV rise. Also, as the main DSO associations publicly advocate the central/facilitating role of DSOs in future smart grid scenarios, the DT questions why this registration of DSR providers should not be controlled by DSOs. DSO TEG states that building up a data base without clear focus on future usage is not efficient and repeats its proposal to include the need for registration in the electronic management systems of future Smart Grids.

DSR eligibility criteria (Art. 22(1))

The DSR asks to include in the text that possible other constraints on users should be taken into account as well. More specifically, there may be constraints for the distribution system because of which a user could not deliver a cross-border related DSR service. The DT notes that this item was discussed earlier with the DSO TEG at which time the DSO TEG took the position of not wanting to be involved in these criteria. The DT also notes, that when other constraints would have to be taken into account in the DCC, the requirements can only become more detailed or onerous.

The DSO TEG will endeavor to list the provisions in the DCC related to DSR for which DSO constraints may be relevant (to be sent by 21 November¹).

The DSO TEG asks that in general, throughout all non-exhaustive requirements in the code, DSO implications should be ensured, either by explicitly mentioning this in Art. 9(3) or by a separate clause.

Operational Notification process

The DSO TEG questions the need for a three stage process for Transmission Connected Distribution Network connections (EON/ION/FON). The DT notes, that for consistency with the NC RfG the same terms are used. However, general expectation is that the three stages can be run through much faster than with a large generation connection.

The DSO TEG agrees with the procedure, as long as existing operational notification procedures that set the same obligations on grid users and operators, can still be used as a substitute.

¹ No feedback has been received.

Definitions

The DT clarifies that in this code, and the following ones to come, definitions of earlier codes as well those of the 3rd Package, will not be repeated in the code but will remain applicable. Definitions that were used in earlier documents, but have a different meaning, will be explicitly mentioned in the code itself.

The DSO TEG states that a full list of definitions in each code, or a separate document with all definitions will add clarity. It is however understood that is quasi impossible to define future-proof definitions, i.e. to guarantee that non-final or future codes will use exactly the same definition.

Reactive power exchange

The DSO TEG asks why reactive power exchange requirements at the connection point are not set case-by-case as it is the case in a lot of countries today. A study has to be performed anyway. The DSO TEG notes that the majority of the existing substations might be captured by the present 0.9 importing to 0.9 exporting power factor range, but some may be out of the range for a limited percentage of the time.

The DSO TEG claims that the current proposal in Art 16.1.b would trigger investments in compensation for cases which do never occur or only rarely. The DT reminds of the earlier discussion with the DSO TEG in which the reference to 25% loading was agreed on, and of the agreed flexible wording to cover for specific cases where other measures could be more beneficial.

The DT notes that if the requirement is easily achievable in most cases, then no specific study should be made, which is why the need for demonstration of financial/technical benefits is imposed on the exceptions.

The DSO TEG proposes for an alternative formulation of Art 16(1)c) in which the DSO and TSO can agree on an active control mode of reactive power exchange. The DT notes that this wording is awkward as one cannot agree on a requirement to be imposed on itself. However, to clarify that a DSO may initiate the process to pursue this, an additional sentence will be added in the clause.

End of meeting.