

Edwin Haesen

From: ERIC.DEKINDEREN@ELECTRABEL.COM
Sent: Friday, January 11, 2013 12:01 PM
To: Edwin Haesen
Cc: Marcel.Cailliau@gdfsuez.com; anneberangere.sudraud@gdfsuez.com
Subject: RE: NC RfG next steps - request for views from the User Group - invitation for 16/01/2013

Dear Edwin,

First of all, my best wishes for you and your family for 2013.

Thanks for the invitation for the workshop on 16/1/2013

My comments are submitted too late, but I hope that you can still accept them:

- Item 3.a : what will be the relationship between the CENELEC standards and the RfG NC.
Stands the CENELEC standard as a pan-European industrial standard above the RfG requirements?
What is case of contradiction between CENELEC and RfG NC?
- Item 4 : "Possibilities for appeal against decisions taken" is an item to grant harmonization in each synchronous area and should be added in the NC if a consultation between TSO fails and leads to severely divergent non-exhaustive requirements.
- Item 4 : "In its Opinion ACER raises three concerns on wording and application of Article 4(3) ...".
I did not find the third one.
- Item 4 : revised wording proposed by ENTOSE :
 - The wording is difficult to understand. E.g. What is "any decision by a Network Operator"? Does this include derogations or is it related only to requirements?
 - A preceding consultation of stakeholders and justification of deviations is not described
 - What about an appeal if a stakeholder notices national deviations / distortion for an identical requirement?
 - A general reference to the article 5 of the European Directive 2009/72/EC is missing
- Item 5 : to be communicated later

The legal department of GDF-SUEZ will prepare some comments written in legal wording
I will forward those to you ASAP

Do not hesitate to contact me if you want more details.

Best regards,

Eric

From: Edwin Haesen [mailto:Edwin.Haesen@entsoe.eu]
Sent: Monday 17 December 2012 18:00
To: marc.malbranccke@inter-regies.be; herman.poelman2@alliander.com; arnaud.duvielguerbigny@cogeneurope.eu; Bob.Knowles@BDRThermea.com; m.rekinge@epia.org; Bernhard Ernst; riccardo.lama@enel.com; pmandatova@eurelectric.org; joerg.kerlen@rwe.com; luca_guenzi@turbomach.com; Paul.Wilczek@ewea.org; Frans.VanHulle@ewea.org; philippe.lebreton@edf.fr; joerg.kaiser@vgb.org; Dekinderen Eric (Electrabel); BECRET Jean-Pierre (jean-pierre.becret@solvay.com); johan.lundqvist@svenskenergi.se; Mike.Kay@enwl.co.uk; mats.ostman@wartsila.com; jose1.gomez@ge.com; Florian Chapalain (florian.chapalain@edsoforsmartgrids.eu); Gunnar Kaestle (gunnar.kaestle@tu-clausthal.de); Vancoetsem Wouter (Laborelec); johan.engstrom@vattenfall.com; reinhard.kaisinger@vattenfall.com; jacques.merley@erdfdistribution.fr; adam.green@microgen-engine.com; Bob.Knowles@BDRThermea.com; garth.graham@sse.com; gwyn.dolben@energy-uk.org.uk; maxime.buquet@ge.com; Tanya Carre (tanya.carre@cogeneurope.eu); pmandatova@eurelectric.org;

Tony.Hearne@esb.ie; ulrich.tomschi@siemens.com; Fiona Riddoch (Fiona.Riddoch@cogeneurope.eu); POPP Dana (DPOP) (dana.popp@ehi.eu); e.schwendemann@t-online.de; e.schwendemann (E.Schwendemann@es-tmc.de)
Cc: Uros GABRIJEL (ACER); Anne DE GEETER (ACER) (Anne.DEGEETER@acer.europa.eu);
Charlotte.Ramsay@ofgem.gov.uk; Reuben Aitken (Reuben.Aitken@ofgem.gov.uk) (Reuben.Aitken@ofgem.gov.uk);
Tadhg.O'BRIAIN@ec.europa.eu; matti.supponen@ec.europa.eu; Alexandre Roesch; Giorgia Concas
(g.concas@epia.org); Böger Florian (FBR); jonas.h.persson@vattenfall.com; Giuseppe LORUBIO
(glorubio@eurelectric.org); Paul.Zepf@euromot.eu; ralph.pfeiffer@amprion.net; Helge.urdal@nationalgrid.com;
Dimitrios Chaniotis; Mark.Norton@Eirgrid.com; Jacqueline.van.OverbeekdeMeyer@tennet.eu; Mark Copley; Thanh-
Thanh Le Thi; Marta Krajewska

Subject: NC RfG next steps - request for views from the User Group - invitation for 16/01/2013

Dear All,

With this message ENTSO-E wishes to inform all RfG User Group participants on the status of the Network Code on "Requirements for Generators" (NC RfG).

We appreciate the suggestions given during the previous User Group meeting of 22 November 2012 on how to proceed on the four areas identified in ACER's Opinion. Attached you can find the final minutes of this meeting.

As a follow-up of that discussion we send you attached a short briefing note indicating a set of clear and concise proposals on how these four areas can be addressed, either by amending the network code provisions and/or by providing more detailed arguments. We welcome your feedback on all topics in the briefing note that are of interest to your organizations.

We noted that several User Group members expressed an explicit interest in continuing discussions on specific items in smaller working groups. As we wish to keep the invitation for feedback on all topics in this briefing note open to all interested parties and strive for a transparent forum, we invite you for a follow-up meeting open to all RfG User Group members which will take place on **Wednesday 16 January 2013** in the ENTSO-E offices in Brussels at **10h00 – 15h00 CET**. In case you wish to participate, you are kindly asked to confirm by reply to Mrs Thanh-Thanh Le Thi (tle@entsoe.eu).

In order to set up an agenda and take sufficient time to address these issues which carry the most interest, we kindly ask you to provide your initial feedback on the proposals made and questions raised in the briefing note **by 10 January**.

We look forward to your response
Best regards

Edwin Haesen
Planning Methods Advisor

ENTSO-E
European Network of Transmission System Operators for Electricity
Avenue de Cortenbergh, 100
1000 Brussels, Belgium

Phone +32 2 7410972
Fax. +32 2 741 09 51
edwin.haesen@entsoe.eu ~ www.entsoe.eu

Electrabel sa, Boulevard Simon Bolivar 34, 1000 Brussels, Belgium
VAT BE 0403.170.701, RPM/RPR Brussels - Bank account IBAN BE42 2100 0000 9954 - BIC GEBABEBB

=====

"This message is confidential. It may also be privileged or otherwise protected by work product immunity or other legal rules.
If you have received it by mistake please let us know by reply and then delete it from your system; you should not copy it or disclose its contents to anyone.

All messages sent to and from Electrabel will be monitored to ensure compliance with internal policies, to protect our interests and to eliminate potential malware.
Emails are not secure and cannot be guaranteed to be error free as they can be intercepted, amended, lost or destroyed, or contain viruses.

Anyone who communicates with us by email is taken to accept these risks."

<https://www.electrabel.com/en/corporate/disclaimer>