



Meeting minutes	
	16.12.2024
Meeting	WG-PDG Forecasting & Settlement
Date	10.12.2024
Location	Synergrid – Meeting Room “Avogadro” and Teams

Attendance list

A. Market Parties

Last Name	First Name	Organisation
Bomboir	Suzanne	Mega
Bonte	Katharina	Febeg
Bracke	Roeland	Fortech
Butaye	Frédéric	Transfoenergy
Callebaut	Santini	Energie.Be
Dal Pont	Marie	Mega
Dangila	Stefania	Cogenius
Deblocq	Vincent	Febeg
Decamps	Thomas	Cogenius
Delcroix	Joline	Yuso
Demeyer	Valentijn	Scholt
Demeyere	Jo	Vreg
D'Hollander	Gert	Luminus
Dubois	Pierre	Totalenergies
Fodil	Farid	Brugel
Haaker	Nick	Brugel
Henderson	Sven	Energyglobal
Hendrix	Johan	Ebem
Ladrière	Julien	Engie
Laevens	Shanice	Elindus
Marcos	Alejandro	TotalEnergies
Mélard	Thibault	Octaplus
Mertens	Toon	Smart Energy

Metten	David	Luminus
Michiels	Marc	Vreg
Olivier	Eric	Blueoak
Pirotte	Sébastien	Mega
Pycke	Bart	Yuso
Sarrazin	Jasper	European Commodities
Somers	Wim	Ecopower
Van den Berghe	Laura	Next-Kraftwerke
Van der Woude	Hans	Apcreation
Vanaken	Wouter	Mega
Verhaeghe	Jasper	Veb
Verhegghe	Karen	Luminus
Walmagh	Gunter	Delta-Advice
Wéry	Sébastien	Luminus

B. Network operators

Last Name	First Name	Organisation
Adam	Louise	Synergrid
Benzennou	Daphné	Sibelga
Bougrine	Hamza	Atrias
Christina	Salden	Fluvius
Dessart	Delphine	Resa
Donnay	Eric	Resa
Duriau	Frédéric	Fluxys
Glorieux	Jacques	Synergrid
Hermans	Marcel	Resa
Jeuniaux	Eric	Ores
Malfait	Olivier	Ores
Milis	Kevin	Synergrid
Paque	Michel	Resa
Verbiese	Michaël	Atrias
Zeebroek	Guido	Fluvius

The meeting was supported by a slide deck, which is available on the Synergrid website, on the page of the PDG Settlement¹.

This meeting was the second stakeholder meeting on Settle 2.0, the preceding one was held on 10/10/2024. On the one hand, during this meeting certain revised propositions, based on feedback received from market parties after the meeting of 10/10, were discussed. On the other hand, certain new propositions were also presented to market

¹ <https://www.synergrid.be/nl/marktoverleg/pdg-settlement> or <https://www.synergrid.be/fr/concertation-du-marche/pdg-settlement>

parties. These meeting minutes aim to capture the oral discussions that took place during the meeting, as the full content of the presented slides can be found on the Synergrid website as described previously.

Time of use Measure versus Time of use Settle

A first point of discussion is the adapted proposal on how the Settle ToU will be handled with regards to the implementation of *Tariff Wallonie*. The first proposal, made on 10/10/2024, was to aggregate settle ToU on TH for all non-profiled customers.

But, as rightly raised by suppliers via Febeg's feedback, this proposal has an impact on all volumes related to the ToU Settle, notably the VIs volumes, and these volumes are also used by suppliers for invoicing. In response to this feedback, the DSOs propose to keep the Settle ToU aligned with Measure ToU for Non-Profiled customers (DAV's, MAV's & VI's are calculated per Measure/Settle ToU). The volumes will be summed up to TH during reconciliation process only.

FEPEG indicates that at first glance, this proposal addresses the problems outlined by them and thanks the DSOs for this adapted proposal. However, more analysis is needed with the members of FEPEG to study the new proposal in detail, and to confirm that the new proposal is indeed okay for them.

Use of 15' data for SMR1

Yuso asks for clarification on the difference of treatment between allocation and measure: as they understand it, a point in SMR1 will be allocated based on 15' volumes to a BRP, while the supplier will receive monthly aggregated volumes on measure. This creates some uncertainty for suppliers, as it is then not clear how to determine the price to be applied to these consumers.

The DSOs indicate that the understanding of how SMR1 data will be used in Flanders under the new model is correct: SMR1 will be allocated on 15' data, and the supplier will receive monthly aggregated volumes per ToU. In order to have 15' data in measure as well, the point needs to be in SMR3.

Residue and Net Losses

Electricity

Luminus feels that presented proposal concerning residue and net losses for electricity would mean that all the risks present in the allocation model (like model errors) will be pushed towards the net losses, which also means that this risk will no longer be spread among market parties, but rather will be borne by a single party: the BRP responsible for the net losses. This is even more problematic as these net losses are tendered: meaning that there is an ongoing contract that might be impacted by this change, and furthermore that it will be very difficult to accurately gauge the impact of this change in time for the tender for the coming years. Therefore, Luminus would like to know how the DSOs aim to tackle these issues in the various regions.

While the DSOs agree that this change has an impact on the BRP responsible for the net losses, they stress that the roll-out of the digital meter is putting increasing pressure on

the existing model, necessitating a change. The impacts of the change are still being analysed and simulations are being carried out.

How this exactly impacts the running contract and future tenders in Flanders, is an issue that needs to be discussed with Fluvius' procurement service.

For Wallonia, the current net losses contract runs until the end of 2026. The new methodology will not be applied before that data, as the main driver to switch to this new methodology is the roll out of smart meters, and the smart meter deployment level will not necessitate this method change in Wallonia before 2027.

Siblega indicates that their position is similar to their Walloon colleagues, with a lower number of deployed smart meters compared to Flanders, and so also less of an immediate need for this change to be applicable in Brussels.

Gas

Total Energies indicates that they are puzzled by the proposal, as this proposal seems to move away from the idea used in electricity, to have allocations be based on as exact data as possible. Total also remarks that this change encompasses a financial risk for suppliers, as the sourcing prices are not the same as reconciliation prices. Furthermore, this proposal also risks to increase the imbalance risk for the shippers, as forecasting the demand becomes harder. Total Energies finish by stating that they clearly understand the challenge which need to be faced, but that they do not agree that the right solution is to tweak the volumes coming from the digital meter, especially as suppliers have need of a single source of truth (=same volume) throughout the entire change.

The DSOs state that this proposal is aimed at dividing the residue over those groups of customers that are responsible for creating it through the metrology effect, and that with the advancing rollout of smart meters for gas, only spreading the residue over the profiled customers will not remain feasible for long. Additionally, the risks raised by Total Energies above, are already there today, all this proposal does, is present a new way of dealing with this risk. While the DSOs agree that the currently present solution might not be 100% perfect, but they do not see many other ways of dealing with this problem. It is also stressed that the volume discrepancy will be reconciled at FeReSO prices.

Market parties also wonder if it would be possible to, in parallel with the approach taken for electricity, to introduce net losses for gas in order to resolve this issue. Additionally, market parties also indicate that they prefer that the residue will still be computed, as this will make it visible, which can be a driver for corrective action in the future.

The DSO respond that creating net losses for gas would not be feasible, as there are no physical losses for gas, meaning that the residue might be negative, which is a very theoretical way of trying to handle it. They also confirm that, even under the new proposal, the residue will still be computed and made visible, and that the DSOs remain committed to minimising said residue.

Closing remarks

The DSOs thank all parties present for their participation and the lively interaction and debate during the stakeholder meeting, and warmly invite everyone to share their feedback by 7/1/2025, via marketconsultation@synergrid.be.

