Product Design Group:
«*Multiple Supply Contracts for Adjustable Appliances*»
Meeting of April 28th, 2022

Participants:

49 people from the companies and organisations listed in the tables below attended the meeting.

Distribution Grid Operators		(14 participants)
Marnix	Schots	Fluvius
Sven	Van den Bosch	Fluvius
Thomas	Tomme	Fluvius
Pieterjan	Leemans	Fluvius
Edwin	Menu	Fluvius
Cédric	Léonard	Ores
Rik	Deruyter	Ores
Aurélie	Lepair	Ores
Michel	Paque	RESA
Murielle	Coheur	RESA
Daphné	Benzennou	Sibelga
Matthieu	Boucquey	Sibelga
Daniel	Raes	Sibelga
Luc	Vercruyssen	Facilitator

Transport Grid Operators		(2 participants)
Kristien	Clement-Nyns	Elia
Hans	Vandenbroucke	Elia

Market Actors		(26 participants)
Stefan	De Schouwer	Atrias
Maurice	Bohet	Brussels Gov.
Fabienne	Marchal	Clef-SCRL
Gérard	Hubaux	Clef-SCRL
Hans	Vandersyppe	COGEN Vlaanderen
Wouter	Vanaken	Dats24
Robin	Goossens	Emix Consulting
Jean-Francois	Williame	Eneco
Benjamin	Wilkin	Energie Commune
Ruben	Laleman	Engie Belgium
Arnaud	Devleeschauwer	Engie Belgium
Toon	Bats	Engie Belgium
Guillaume	Chicco	Engie Belgium
Sarah	Ouziaux	Engie Impact
Michael	Van Bossuyt	FEBELIEC

Vincent	Deblocq	FEBEG
Katharina	Bonte	FEBEG
Pierre-Henri	Gresse	Flexide-energy
Patrick	Devos	Flux50
Harm	Vervoort	Haulogy
Karen	Verhegghe	Luminus
Annabelle	Jacquet	TotalEnergies
Olivier	Linder	Techlink
Mathieu	Vermeersch	VEKA
Bart	Vannoppen	Volta
Sabine	Wuytens	Yuso

Regulators		**(7 participants)**
Nick	Haaker	BRUGEL
Farid	Fodil-Pacha	BRUGEL
Frédéric	Jacquemin	CWAPE
Gérard	Naert	CWAPE
Tim	Mertens	VREG
Marc	Michiels	VREG
Anke	Uytterhoeven	VREG

The Product Design Group started at 9h30.

The agenda of the meeting is:

1. Approval Meeting Minutes PDG session 17/03/2022
2. Last session wrap-up (part I)
3. MC4AA's impact on MIG6 structure domain
4. Last-session wrap-up (part 2)
5. Priority use cases (FEBEG's vision)
6. MC4AA's interactions with other contracts (flexibility, energy sharing and TPDA)
7. Planning and next steps

A slide deck covering the different topics is presented. The comments hereafter relate to this presentation and the different agenda items.

Minutes of meeting

1. Approval Minutes of meeting - PDG session 17/03/2022

The minutes of meeting from the previous Product Design Group « *Multiple Supply Contracts for Adjustable Appliances* » (PDG MC4AA) session of 17/03/2022 are approved.

2. Last session wrap-up (part I)

No comments.

3. MC4AA's impact on MIG6 structure domain

FEBELIEC notes that less strict rules and limitations are necessary for industrial clients or closed distribution grids on the medium and high voltage network. Specifically, the single layer of submetering and the allowed amount of submeters should be different for these applications.
The DSOs confirm that the focus was on low voltage appliances in preparing the use cases and that the principles should be reviewed with regards to different grid user types. The technical setup has to remain manageable but could be defined differently for different user categories.
FEBELIEC continues that the principles can indeed be first defined for the low voltage grid and then reviewed and adapted according to the medium and high voltage setting.

4. Last-session wrap-up (part 2)

No comments.

5. Priority use cases (FEBEG's vision)

The DSOs would like to understand if suppliers would have specific data requirements in the allocation process in the case of two contracts from the same supplier and private meters. For instance, in the case of a dynamic contract for the EV and a "stable" contract for home + PV + battery, should the DSO share only the headmeter data in the market processes (all other metering being managed by the supplier) or should the DSO share the load curve of the EV for the allocation process and something else for the rest.
FEBEG had not considered this question about the allocation and will reflect on it to define its position.

The DSOs ask for confirmation whether in the most important use case in the short-term, according to FEBEG, in which a customer would like a totally separated contract for his EV in order for his employer to pay for the EV electricity use for instance, the optimisation calculation would not be relevant or necessary in the short-term. FEBEG confirms the statement and acknowledges the limits of their suggestions, but explains that they consider this pragmatic view for the short-term necessary in order to make further progress. FEBEG would like to further discuss the optimization options for the longer term based on concrete examples.

FEBEG indicates further that they hope to continue this cocreation work based on concrete examples and cases. The facilitator agrees and continues that both cocreation in group as bilateral discussions are possible. FEBELIEC adds that they are open to a group discussion, but believe it might be more efficient and relevant to include sub-groups of participants to ensure the designed solutions work across regions and for the different voltage levels.
The DSOs agree and will liaise with ELIA to consider organising a specific session for professional/industrial consumers to identify solutions fitting for both the distribution and transmission grid customers (low, medium and high voltage).

6. MC4AA's interactions with other contracts (flexibility, energy sharing and TPDA)

The DSOs asks the audience whether there are remarks or questions regarding the subject and whether all suggested use cases are relevant.

ENGIE asks for clarification regarding use case 1, specifically whether this represents the case of an offtake contract, an injection contract and a flexibility contract on both the head and submeter. The DSOs clarify that in use case 1 there are 2 supply contracts, one for offtake, and one for injection, and one flexibility contract on offtake and injection at the level of the head meter. ENGIE agrees with the explanation, but wonders how to divide the flexibility among the supply contracts, in case of two contracts. The DSOs respond that this case already exists on the medium voltage level and that ELIA has defined allocation rules (an approximation) for this case.
ENGIE remarks that operators have to forecast and measure the deviation in order to be accurate in the energy they deliver. For this, access to the data of the head and submeter is necessary. The DSOs clarify that if ENGIE is referring, for example, to use case 2, in which the flexibility takes place on a submeter level and is provided by a separate FSP, which is not a supplier, this FSP will not have a complete view on what's happening on the asset but he would however be responsible for the forecasting, for the allocation results and for the balancing. This is the exact purpose of the transfer of energy (ToE) process that neutralizes the impact of the activation for the BRP and the suppliers.
ENGIE remarks that in case of flexibility on a submeter, where a certain amount needs to be freed up to provide flexibility, it would not be visible to the FSP when another appliance started up (on the head meter) and the flexible amount could not be guaranteed anymore. The DSOs respond by saying that due to similar discussions within the ELIA workgroup the need for submetering in flexibility was confirmed. Moreover, for use case 1 and 4, flexibility on the head meter is only possible in case there is only one flexible contract. In case of multiple flexible loads, it is necessary to work at the submeter level. The DSOs conclude that the different use cases were presented to reflect the different possibilities for flexibility at headmeter or submeter levels.

FEBEG asks for further explanation regarding the different use cases of supply and energy sharing, and the associated limitations. Fluvius clarifies that this was decided on legal bases : the current Flemish decree specifies that you can only share energy with another party to the extent of the 15 minute injection and the other party's 15 minute offtake. Moreover, Fluvius assumes that the grid starts and ends at the head meter, which implies that the volumes of injection and offtake are defined at the head meter level. The volume at a head meter level might though be less than that measured at the submeter level.

Energie Commune wonders whether the net leftover electricity, from the electricity that was produced and injected by a certain party but not entirely consumed by the energy community participants, could be sold to a retailer. Fluvius replies that the energy sharing concept was implemented in such a manner that the shared energy complies with the injection and offtake limitations at the level of the access points, and that net leftover electricity - if any- is reassigned to the injection site and can be marketed again.
Energie Commune asks further whether the net leftover electricity could be assigned to the energy community. Fluvius responds that this use case is very complex due to hierarchy in which volumes need to be assigned and the impact of errors and rectifications that are propagated to all affected points. For instance, in schemes where the energy sharing would be first done within a community and where the leftover electricity would be assigned, or used in some other community, or sold to another party, the rectification on one of the access points would impact and propagate to multiple access points, potentially triggering update of billings towards many customers. Fluvius considers this use case as complex from an operational perspective, not only for the DSO but also for the suppliers and the community managers.
Energie Commune wonders in turn what should be done with the surplus of injection that cannot be consumed. Fluvius responds that different options are available:

- add offtake to the community to make sure offtake is sufficient and exceeds injection,
- for Renewable Energy Communities, the production needs to be owned by the community meaning the remainder of the available injection is reassigned to the injecting access point and still belong to the community,
- aggregation could take place over a number of access points to sell the electricity remaining after the energy sharing process.

According to Fluvius it is better to reassign the leftover energy to the individual access points and leave the options open to sell their energy individually or via an aggregator in the market.

ENGIE asks for more background or examples about data contracts. The DSOs reply that data sharing is already available in Flanders (smart meters) and this should be available in the coming months in the other regions. A customer can mandate a party to access its data, in which case the DSOs will register this data sharing contract in the access register. Consequently the DSOs will be responsible for managing all the changes related to this contract (e.g.: a consumer moveout should lead to the end of the sharing of data on this access point to avoid sharing data of one consumer with another). The management of consent and the consistency between the data sharing contracts is considered as a very important role by the DSOs. A MIG TPDA was drafted 10 years ago but not implemented due to other urgencies (MIG6 – CMS, Central Market System). The idea is to discuss again the different types of data sharing (near real-time data, 15 min unvalidated data, and validated data) and the role DSOs and TSOs could play in the sharing of this data.
Fluvius wishes to add that in the Flemish grid code the concept of data service point is already defined ("*datadienstenpunt"*) and that the subject of mandating access to data can become complex in the context of the Multiple Supply Contracts, where there can be different grid users on different service delivery points (SDP-Supply). In that case, the question of who should give the mandate if someone wants to access the data of a particular SDP needs to be addressed. Currently Fluvius makes the data available at the meter level, but would the party that gives the mandate at the meter level be the same as the one that gives the mandate at the SDP level, considering that different volumes can be combined to compute the volume

that is used on a SDP, that you can have multiple grid users active on the same access point with multiple SDPs… Fluvius concludes that it can quickly become very complex and that the objective should be to avoid to have to obtain approval of several parties before being authorized to share the data.

ENGIE, in line with the vision supported by the FEBEG, considers that it is important to limit the use cases to the ones that are relevant and have an economic value for the market. ENGIE would like to understand what DSOs intend to do in terms of data collection, acknowledging that these data could be useful for the purpose of grid operation/management but seeing a risk that collecting a too large amount of data could lead to high costs.

The DSOs agree that data collection should be limited to what is useful to provide services deemed relevant by the market and note that the subject of GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation) is highly sensitive and that mistakes or gaps should absolutely be avoided to ensure GDRP compliance. Furthermore, a set of rules and processes is needed to define how to share data and address mandate questions, GDPR, changes on the access point, etc.

Energie Commune adds that they envision one clear business model for the data sharing: design and creation of an energy community. It is important to be able to correctly simulate the impact of adding or removing certain profiles or participants. For this, the access to the data is key.

The DSOs highlight that the idea is to have a PDG on data to define an harmonised set of rules and processes and to publish a documentation about the rules for data sharing.

Flux50 wonders whether it is not possible to start with the more simple use cases and gradually build to more complex situations. The facilitator reminds the audience that the topic of the PDG is Multiple Supply Contracts, in which we are touching on the interactions with data sharing. Another PDG will address the subject of data in detail.
The DSOs clarify that the objective of this PDG is to write a vision paper and that a clear distinction must be made between the end goal, the vision paper, and the steps which built toward that vision, the implementation and processes.

COGEN Vlaanderen wonders whether it would be useful to explain certain principles by documenting them with load and injection profiles which will finally be allocated to the different types of SDPs in the different use cases. The facilitator Luc Vercruyssen indicates that this is part of the current method and that a few of these use cases were already presented. The DSOs clarify that the idea of this PDG is to discuss use cases with different positions of the contracts, not the associated volumes.

7. Planning and next steps

The next "Multiple Contracts for Adjustable Appliances" PDG meeting is planned on 29 September and will focus on contractual framework and reporting. The PDG aims to finalize the vision paper by December 2022.

In the meanwhile, feedback can be sent to marketconsultation@synergid.be, by the 30th of June at the latest.

*****

The following table summarizes the comments received from market parties during the meeting and the way DSOs intend to address these.

Comment	DSOs response
Different rules and limitations are necessary for industrial clients or closed distribution grids on the medium and high voltage grid in comparison to the low voltage grid. The designed solutions work across regions and for the different voltage levels.	The DSOs acknowledge the proposal and agree that this is to be discussed, taking into account that certain limitations will be necessary. The DSOs will liaise with ELIA to consider organising a specific session for professional/industrial consumers to identify solutions fitting for both the distribution and transmission grid customers (low, medium and high voltage).
PDG On Multiple Supply Contracts for Adjustable Appliances should work on the basis of concrete and relevant use cases. In the short-term and at low voltage level, the most relevant use case relates to a situation where a customer would like a totally separated contract for his EV in order for his employer to pay for the EV electricity use. In such case, the optimisation calculation would not be relevant or necessary in the short-term	The DSOs agree with the proposed approach and priority use case for low voltage consumers and will take it into account for further work.