

# Nordic CCM SHF – meeting minutes

## FINAL Version

December 11 2017, 09.30-16.30 (Copenhagen airport, Clarion hotel)

Participants		
<b>Nordic CCM project</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Ulrik Møller (Edk)</li><li>Heini Ruohosenmaa (Fingrid)</li><li>Camille Hamon (Svk)</li><li>Martin Julander (Svk)</li><li>Trond Jensen (Statnett)</li><li>Randi Kristiansen (Energinet)</li><li>Asta Sihvonon-Punkka (Fingrid)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Anders Sivertsgaard (Energi Norge)</li><li>Fredrik Kühn (Hydro)</li><li>Hilde Rosenblad (Nord Pool)</li><li>Håkon Egeland (Statkraft Energi)</li><li>Jens Mortensen (Ørsted Bioenergy and Thermal Power)</li><li>Jonas Karlsson (Vattenfall)</li><li>Kenneth Lykkedal (Energiauktion.dk)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Marja Karppinen (Nord Pool)</li><li>Matin Bagherpour (Nord Pool)</li><li>Peter Fausbøll (Energitilsynet)</li><li>Raimo Peltola (Fortum)</li><li>Reima Neva (EPV Energia Oy)</li><li>Rickard Nilsson (Nord Pool)</li><li>Sveinung Fossnes (Nord Pool)</li><li>Søren Søndergaard (Energitilsynet)</li><li>Toril Naustvoll (NVE)</li><li>Vidar Hansen (E-CO Energi AS)</li></ul>
<b>Nordic RSC Project</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Viktor Johansson (Statnett/NRSC)</li><li>Helene Sundheim (Statnett/NRSC)</li><li>Emmy Koefoed (NRSC)</li><li>Trine Langeland (Statnett/NRSC)</li></ul>		

### 1. Coffee (9.00-9.30)

### 2. Welcome and status update on the CCM Project (9.30 – 10.15) - Ulrik Møller (Edk)

Q: What is the difference between CACM & FCA?

A: It is different guidelines, CACM handles DA & ID, FCA relates to the long-term financial allocation of transmission rights.

Q: Financial doesn't influence the physics does it?

A: No, in essence not in the Nordics, but we need to propose a methodology. If the long-term is physical transmission rights, then it will impact capacities for DA & ID. The relevance in the Nordics is quite low though, as only DK1-DK2 has PTR. For all borders we need to publish M-1 & Y-1 capacities though, and it is relevant for market participants for forecasting purposes.

Q: Why wait 1.5 years after approval until the start of parallel-runs?

A: We need to develop IT tooling and internal processes before we can start operating the new CCM, however we are already now performing calculations in the prototype tools developed within the CCM project. If the final tools are realized earlier, we can naturally start earlier – there is no reason in itself to wait for the planned date, but we estimate that this is the time needed for IT and business development.

Q: When is the decision - whether FB is better than NTC - due?

A: It is not a formal decision; the evaluation is included in the work and the CCM proposal. As such, we have found that indeed, FB is better in terms of social welfare while maintaining the same operational security level.

Q: You state in the timeline that Xbid might be able to handle FB parameters in 2021, what are the indications that points to this?

A: We currently have no timeline for the Xbid FB development; the 2021 is only to be viewed as a "best guess".

Q: For how large area are you creating prototype CGMs?

A: The entire Nordic area (SE,NO,DK,FI) is included in the prototype CGM. The market simulations though, cover a larger area.

Q: Remedial Actions (RA), how are they included in the process?

A: For each hour, TSO operators assess which RAs can be utilized to increase the capacity, and thus provide values to increase the capacity as input.

Q: What about the Hansa region – how do you integrate the Nordic & Hansa CCR?

A: The HVDC connections are NTCs by physics. The flows are determined in the market coupling phase, and included in CCR Nordic using advanced hybrid coupling. The capacity calculation methodology for the Hansa region is developed by another project.

Q: Domain Validation – what is it?

A: It is a quality check performed by the TSO operators to validate the capacities calculated by the capacity calculator.

Q: During parallel-runs, do we use both FB plain and FB intuitive to be able to compare the two?

A: We have not yet decided on that, but it could certainly be one aspect to study in the parallel-runs.

Q: Nordpool indicates that they need a request from the TSOs to develop Euphemia further. Such to cope with the increasing performance issues foreseen with introducing FB in the Nordics.

A: We will look into this, but the discussion is most likely better facilitated through the MRC project.

Q: How are you able to perform simulations today?

A: We are using the simulation facility in Euphemia, but with a limited geographical scope.

### 3. Coffee (10.15-10.30)

### 4. NRA presentation on the CCM approval process and public consultation and discussion (10.30-12.00) - Søren Søndergaard, DERA

Søren presented the outcome from the NRA consultation and indicated that the NRAs are preparing a request for amendment.

Toril: Go-live is currently set to mid-2020, however, based on the consultation and the NRA's own considerations, the chairman of the

NordREG board has stated that the earliest go-live of Nordic CCM will be in 2021. This because it is foreseen that we need more than 6 months of parallel-runs.

Q: Will there be another consultation when the amendments have been provided?

A: No, there is not enough time to have a formal consultation, however, we still have the Stakeholder Forum/Group meetings.

Q: CNE selection – how are you treating the concerns?

A: Currently the CCM project is looking into moving away from the “15%” rule for CNE selection, and base the selection on economical efficiency and operational security tests.

## 5. Lunch (12.00-13.00)

## 6. Presentation from the Nordic RSC (13.00-14.00) – Trine Langeland, Helene Sundheim, Viktor Johansson

Q: Trade-off between capacity and SoS, also a cost issue – cost for TSO, cost for social welfare, do you have the same criteria in the Nordics for this trade-off (redispatch options)?

A: It is not really a trade-off, we view it more like that we shall provide maximum capacity while maintaining operational security.

Q: This is in the planning phase – you still have the possibility to solve problems in the operational phase – how do you expect to work with e.g. planned countertrade?

A: Currently we are not providing capacities that include planned countertrade.

Q: Will there be any back-testing on the reliability margin to ensure that it is correct?

A: We don't know what a correct margin is. We will calculate margins based on statistics, as such, they will always be 'correct'.

Q: Common Grid Model – a model representing the physical properties of the Nordic grid – how easy has it been for you to get data and formats from the TSOs?

A: The exchange standard is driven from Entso-e (CGMES), and all Nordic TSOs have implemented this exchange standard. Currently we are facing some information security challenges which have led to delays in the integration process. We have been able to asses all IGMs though.

Q: Have you discovered any direct benefits or other insights when using the CGM?

A: No, not yet.

Q: Why D-2, it is for day-ahead?

A: Yes, to be able to calculate DA capacities, we need to construct the common grid model in advance.

Q: When is the go-live for the pan-European CGM?

A: It is delayed, and hard to predict, but the current assumption is 2019. NRSC is creating a Nordic CGM before the pan-European one, and will develop it independent of Entso-E IT platforms.

Q: Weather forecasts – will you use the temperature forecasts to predict line ratings?

A: Yes, most likely, but this will not be implemented from the start.

Q: Recalculation of intraday capacities – what is the plan for this?

A: Initially, the ID capacities are calculated the evening before, based on D-1 CGMs; after that it might be recalculated during ID if needed.

Q: Are the CNEs not a part of the CGM?

A: The elements (lines etc) are part of the CGM, but the nomination of a line to be a CNE (and the related N-1 contingency to study) in capacity calculations is currently not part of the CGM. It is likely to be included in the IGM/CGM delivery though.

## 7. Transparency (14.30-15.00)

Q: Are you able to do an NTC extraction from the FB domain (for information purposes)?

A: Yes, but you have to be aware that the NTC domain extracted from the FB domain is arbitrary – there is actually an infinite solution space. Also, the extracted NTC domain is by default smaller than the FB domain..

With regard to CNE transparency, the CCM project stated that we will publish CNE data with asymmetric transparency; SE & NO will not publish the studied contingencies and CNE names, and SE will also not publish persistent identifiers. FI & DK will however publish at the same level as CWE.

Q: Is it planned to change this for the go-live and/or parallel-runs?

A: Not directly planned, but Svk & SN are looking into the information security risk assessment and, pending the outcome of this, the transparency level may change.

## 8. Questions and discussions (15.00 - 16.30)

Q: Base case – what is that?

A: Forecasted flows and net positions, using market outcome and weather forecasts as input.

Q: How can the stakeholders be more involved as we move closer to implementation?

A: We have Stakeholder Group (SHG) & Stakeholder Forum (SHF), but of course we are open to new suggestions.

**It was suggested that a proposal for future collaboration could be presented by the stakeholders in the next SHG.**

NordREG states that from NRA's perspective, in the post-approval period it is also very important that we continue to collaborate closely.

On the methodologies for deciding GSKs, stakeholders need to understand the different outcomes from the models.

It was stated that for the coming discussions, it would be good if the project could present the risk factors going forward with FB. Even if stakeholders do agree that, theoretically, FB is better, there is a need to discuss the actual risks with the implementation.

**It was agreed that a risk assessment should be a topic for the next SHF, and that all participants are asked to provide input.**