

Transparency Stakeholder Expert Group (TSEG) Meeting 4 Minutes

Date: 23 April 2013

Place: ENTSO-E office, Brussels

Participants

1. Adeline Lassource	FSR	2. Jean Trzcinski	Sia
3. Alain Taccoen	ENTSO-E	4. Jean-Noël Marquet	EDF
5. Alexander Koistinen	ENTSO-E	6. John Lucas	ELEXON
7. Andy Spiceley	ENTSO-E	8. Kaija Niskala	ENTSO-E
9. Dalius Sulga	ENTSO-E	10. Karl-Henrik Nordblad	Eurelectric
11. Christian Baer	EEX	12. Josef Verner	CAO
13. Frederik Johnsen	CASC	14. Natalie Frank	EPEX SPOT
15. Dr.Eng. Ralf Uttich	Eurelectric	16. Sven Kaiser	ACER
17. Ingmar Bergsten	Vattenfall	18. Oliver Lorig	Tiroler Wasserkraft AG
19. Mark Csete	ENTSO-E		

1. Approval of Agenda and TSEG meeting 2 minutes

The meeting is opened and agenda is approved. Comments on the TSEG meeting 3 minutes from EEX, Eurelectric, EDF and IFIEC are accepted and approved.

2. Data Provider Criteria

ENTSO-E goes through the main steps of the document which was circulated within the TSEG prior to the meeting. Eurelectric asks how ENTSO-E intends to update the list of primary owners as it can be changed very often. ENTSO-E will update the list internally and it should not affect the primary owners. EEX questions if primary owners could mandate PXs to send data on their behalf. ENTSO-E indicates that it is possible for the PXs to be data provider. Several Stakeholders note that in Step 1 paragraph 2(c) “any operational or technical implementation constraints” could be interpreted in several ways that is why it is required to make it more precise or to delete it.

- **Action (ENTSO-E):** Clarify the constraints in step 1 paragraph 2(c)

3. Production Type List

ENTSO-E guides through the final production type list mentioning the changes have been made since the 3rd TSEG meeting. The aim was to comply with the transparency regulation and to take the Stakeholders' requests into account as much as possible. For that reason, steps to reduce the content to simplify the list have been made. EEX notes that nuclear is not the appropriate word to use but uranium should be used. Other Stakeholders (EDF) think uranium is not appropriate either since other fuel could be used. In order to respect the original goal – having a simple list – everybody finally agrees to leave nuclear type. The majority of the Stakeholders share the view that having the possibility of changing the production type often could result in distorted data published on the platform. EDF recommends amending the Hydro Run-of-river type with “pondage” as well. After the update the final production type list is showed which can be found below:

Production Type			
Type Number	Class	Sub-Class	Complete Term
1	Biomass		Biomass
2	Fossil	Brown coal/Lignite	Fossil Brown coal/Lignite
3	Fossil	Coal-derived gas	Fossil Coal-derived gas
4	Fossil	Gas	Fossil Gas
5	Fossil	Hard coal	Fossil Hard coal
6	Fossil	Oil	Fossil Oil
7	Fossil	Oil shale	Fossil Oil shale
8	Fossil	Peat	Fossil Peat
9	Geothermal		Geothermal
10	Hydro	Pumped Storage	Hydro Pumped Storage
11	Hydro	Run-of-river	Hydro Run-of-river and pondage
12	Hydro	Water Reservoir	Hydro Water Reservoir
13	Marine		Marine
14	Nuclear		Nuclear
15	Other renewable		Other renewable
16	Solar		Solar
17	Waste		Waste
18	Wind	Offshore	Wind Offshore
19	Wind	Onshore	Wind Onshore
20	Other		Other

4. Review of Planning of TSEG/IT Project

ENTSO-E goes through the slides presented at the 3rd TSEG meeting and concludes the milestones so far met the plan, however, challenging periods are foreseen. Two key points for respecting the deadlines have to be mentioned, first the publication date of the Transparency Regulation and then the practical tests of the IT platforms with the data providers.

5. Stakeholders' comment on BRS

Due to the huge number of comments received earlier from Stakeholder on the BRS (circulated to the TSEG with the agenda), ENTSO-E had highlighted the most contentious ones, given the limited time for the review. The row numbers below refer to the excel sheet shared with TSEG prior to the meeting.

Row 11: This is a local issue between Data Owner and Data Provider and falls outside the scope of the BRS.

Row 23: Understanding of "Control Area" may diverge among stakeholders. Please refer to exact wording of draft EU transparency regulation.

Row 25/26: Related to the list of production types. It was discussed whether constraints should be introduced on the frequency of changing the production type for a given Production Unit. Currently it is not foreseen.

Row 30: It was agreed to remove the threshold.

Row 47: ENTSO-E Generation expert group will evaluate the request of EDF that double reporting should be avoided. Either negative generation should be understood as consumption and without requirement to report consumption separately, or make it possible to submit negative values.

Row 58: It was a misunderstanding and Fortum is fine with this part of the BRS.

Row 60/61/62: ENTSO-E Generation expert group will elaborate a finite list of permitted values for the voltage connection levels.

Row 63: It was agreed that Generation Unit does not have to be located in the same Bidding Zone or Control Area as the Production Unit. A given Production or Generation Unit may not be associated with more than one Bidding Zone or Control Area at a time though. Note also that these associations are effective dated and hence are permitted to change over time.

Row 74: The comment refers to the distinction between Market Balance Area and Control Area. The topic is still being assessed by the ENTSO-E Balancing Subgroup. TIWAG highlights that they would like to have as much as possible information published.

Further comments discussed in the meeting but not highlighted by ENTSO-E:

Row 13: It could be feasible to publish the partially aggregated value with a clear indication that further data submissions are pending. ENTSO-E will reconsider its position on this comment.

Row 6: EPEXSPOT notes to precise “matching algorithm” in the proposed definition of “gate closure time of day-ahead market”. ENTSO-E transmission expert group will consider the proposal and if accepted include it in the Detailed Data Description.

There was discussion about the "fall back mode". The BRS describe the normal mode to implement and exchange data. How it is possible to manage the exchange and the transmission of data when the nominal mode is out? For instance, how to alert the data owners and the data providers when it is impossible to publish data? Who is responsible? It could useful to define a process to alert and a "fall back mode".

The parameter "Production type" is applied to a "Production unit" and not a "Generation unit". Sometimes, different fuels can be used in a production unit. It was mentioned "It is fully permitted to split production units".

- **Action (ENTSO-E):** feedback on the raised issues at the next TSEG meeting.

6. Stakeholders' comment on IG (generation and load)

ENTSO-E goes through each row of the Excel sheet circulated prior to the meeting which contains all the comments were given by Stakeholders. Below the list of comments where discussion/clarification takes place:

Row 9: EDF highlights that MAW the proper measure for energy but it should be MW. ENTSO-E explains MAW is used only for communication purpose, it will be showed in MW on the platform.

Row 15: ENTSO-E EDI group is to reconsider the proposal of EDF on the usage of Business type.

Row 27: the comment is “missing of pumping as a part of generation” by TIWAG which first should be reviewed by Generation and Load subgroup and once the result is available EDI to reconsider.

Row 31: TIWAG notes that APG has a unique code for metering point and they would like to use these existing codes with the platform Within ENTSO-E, discussion and analysis are still under way regarding how to provide a convenient solution for those data providers that rely on local coding schemes.

- **Action (ENTSO-E):** feedback on the raised issues at the next TSEG meeting.

7. Next Steps and AOB

- further comments on IG outages will be given by EDF by 28 April.

- ENTSO-E will present the MoP at the next TSEG meeting which has been scheduled for 23 May
- Replying to the question on how satisfied the TSEG member with the work/achievement of the group, each Stakeholder expresses their satisfaction with the work has been done so far. Creation of the document which contains all questions and decisions which have been made is recommended. It would ease the work of other groups on similar topic.

- **Action (All):** Send further comments on IG outages – if any.

Dates for the next TSEG meetings:

	Date	Location
Meeting 1	31 January	Brussels
Meeting 2	28 February	Brussels
Meeting 3	21 March	Brussels
Meeting 4	23 April	Brussels
Meeting 5	23 May	Brussels

You can view the slides from the meeting at:

<https://www.entsoe.eu/data/entso-e-transparency-platform/>