

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

Date: 18 September 2012

Time: 09h00 – 12h30

Place: Brussels

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
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
Koen Noyens	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

09h00: Overview of comments received in the public consultation

10h00: coffee break

10h30: key DSO comments

12h30: lunch

All agree on the agenda topics.

2. Comments received in the public consultation

A short overview is presented of the comments received in the web based consultation that closed on 12 September with ca. 1500 comments from 38 organizations.

Initial observations:

- Some comments were reproduced by several respondents (overlap per country or sector), resulting in a lower number of unique comments.
- Many comments referred to the five domains that were also addressed in the Call for Stakeholder Input.
- Other articles on which more respondents focused were those dealing with the scope, definitions and demand disconnection.

Some re-occurring comments address:

- Clarity
- Level of detail
- Justification
- Cooperation at European level (e.g. for DSR requirements)

Some actions the DT notes regarding DSR and for which feedback from the DSO TEG is asked:

- Examine more specific reference to Electric Vehicles;
- Examine justification and requirements for more specific inclusion in the code.

3. Electric Vehicles and electrical storage in the DCC

Regarding Electric Vehicles or local electrical storage in general, the DSO TEG makes following remarks:

- Care should be taken with requirements as simply turning off or on the charging of a battery will probably not be possible.. What is the impact on the technology? Guidelines are needed on how new technologies have to behave, so that we do not end up with derogations in five years for technologies that are not on a future proof path.
- An analogy is made with the needed controllability of small-scale PV units as set in the RfG . Why should requirements for storage be different? A difference in context is however that PV has already boomed, while small-scale storage is at the moment very limited.

The DSO TEG and DT DCC agree that rules need to be written before R&D defines the end product.

The DT DCC notes that since the topic of storage/EVs has been brought up, an analysis on socio-economic level has to be made anyway, either for including it in the code or not.

The DSO TEG and DT DCC agree to consider electrical storage in a general manner, with a criterium of what is a proven benefit (significance). The focus will be on capabilities.

4. Key comments by the DSO Technical Expert Group

The key comments by the four European DSO associations are presented.

Reactive Power Exchange

On reactive power exchange capabilities, the DSO TEG is not convinced that Art 10.1.b on **reactive compensation by the DSO at 25% loading** is the most efficient solution compared to transmission grid investments. The DSO TEG mentions that especially in HV grids connected to transmission grids in highly meshed grids and/ or high feed in from decentralised production situations with reactive power exchange are very volatile and investment in installations for compensation on the DSO level is not economic. However, no own CBA methodology or data is provided by the DSO TEG at this stage. The DT states that the CBA to support this clause have the same basics as that for Art 10.1.a and will elaborate this for future supporting documents.

The DT clarifies that the requirement of Art 10.1.b aims at having sufficient reactive compensation installed for cable networks at low load (without prejudice over operational rules), which will be tested by simulation, not by field test. In addition the requirement (as all others) applies only to a new or modernized distribution network connection. The DT notes that the baseline of using a value of 25% maximum importing capacity as an assumption for low load, was agreed on earlier. Furthermore, DSO TEG indicates that the requirement is not consistent around the 25 % limit. It is more stringent for 25% + ϵ (load factor 0.9) than for 25% - ϵ (load factor 0.98). This factual remark does not imply that the requirement is in anyway accepted by the DSOs.

The DSO TEG asks for more clarification under which conditions the compliance simulation (scenarios, values?) is exercised. The DSO TEG asks also to clarify in the text that when the active control of Art 10.1.c applies, the compensation capability requirement of Art 10.1.b no longer applies. The DT DCC agrees on making this clear in the code. A new formulation of Art 10.1.c (based on TSO/DSO agreement) should also allow a DSO to request active reactive power management.

Demand Side Response

The DSO TEG reiterates that the European DSR agenda is focusing on a different approach and aims at market based mechanisms. The DT DCC states that in the specific case of DSR-SFC, the philosophy is indeed different, but argued on the basis of several socio-economic cost benefit analyses. The EC will eventually assess **wider implications**.

The DSO TEG considers **compliance testing** for DSR capabilities not to be an issue related to connection and to present a high burden on DSOs. Some DSO TEG members consider that for DSR mass markets the approach will not be focussed on capabilities of individual appliances but on the portfolio of the aggregator or other party buying the service. The DT DCC reiterates that DSOs are only responsible for DSR capability compliance testing for connections above 1000V. If needed, clarification in the text will be considered.

The DSO TEG argues to not use a compliance test procedure in a connection code to test for DSR requirements for accessing a market. The DSO TEG indicates there are limited functional requirements in the DCC and expresses no disagreement on these in itself. However, the DSO TEG, considers that these requirements are linked to access of a DSR market and are therefore to be defined more extensively in a separate code or other regulation describing **access** to a DSR market. The DT DCC notes that in the context of replacement/modernization similar arguments can be given, but still this is clearly in the scope of a connection code as per the framework guidelines. In addition the framework guidelines do not make an artificial distinction between connection and access; both were part of early guideline drafts, while parts of access rules are still mentioned in the final framework guidelines on electricity grid connections.

The DT DCC argues that because of the **relevance of DSR services on system security**, testing provisions in this connection codes are justified. The DT DCC asks whether blind trust on a third party for compliance testing is a better solution.

5. Next interactions

Provisional dates:

- Mid October (doodle will be sent)
- 13 November: DSO TEG & DCC User Group meeting

Based on availabilities, these will be either by conf call or a physical meeting.

End of meeting.