



PDG iCAROS 03/10/2025 – Worskshop on outage planning agent (iCAROS phase 2) – meeting minutes

List of attendees

Market parties

Last name	First name	Organisation
Aspeslagh	Tim	Lidl
Bakkers	Peter	BiogasTec
Bouchat	Marion	Edora
Celis	Chris	FEPEG
Cooman	Wim	Volvo Cars
Delfosse	Nicolas	Nouryon
della Faille	Harld	Next-Kraftwerke
Donnay de Casteau	Loic	Engie
Du Roy	Charles	Energy Pool
Hubert	Benjamin	Next-Kraftwerke
Huyck	Jozef	Bnewable
Joye	Robert	Next Kraftwerke
Le Groffe	Louis	Luminus
Lepape	Remi	COCITER
Marchal	Fabienne	Clef
Marien	Toon	WOM
Meynckens	Geert	Centrica
Mosbeux	Didier	NRB
Mouwen	Ties	Aya Energy
Pauline	Mast	Luminus
Ramacker	Nico	Octa+
Reyniers	Stefaan	Cogen Vlaanderen
Ruben	Laleman	Engie
Smet	Jan	Volvo Cars
Soenen	Stefaan	Elindus
Stals	Thomas	Aperam
Tock	Jean-François	Luminus
Van Bossuyt	Michaël	FEDELIEC
Van Calster	Deborah	NRB
Van Der Veken	Sacha	Virya Energy
van Dijk	Richard	Blupoint
Vandenbeure	Katrijn	Engie

Verhegghe	Karen	Luminus
-----------	-------	---------

Regulators

Last name	First name	Organisation
Flechet	Renaud	CWaPE
Fodil-Pacha	Farid	Brugel
Marchand	Stéphane	CWaPE
Uytterhoeven	Anke	Vlaamse Nutsregulator
Waucomont	Mathieu	CWaPE

System operators

Last name	First name	Organisation
Adam	Louise	Synergrid
Bonelli	Alberto	Elia
Castadot	Raphaël	Sibelga
Dekens	Ellen	Fluvius
Dessart	Delphine	Resa
Dewever	Philippe	Fluvius
Glorieux	Jacques	Synergrid
Illegems	Viviane	Elia
Mees	Lars	Elia
Milis	Kevin	Synergrid
Ryckaert	Bastien	Sibelga
Rys	Nick	Fluxys
Seurinck	Kenny	Fluvius
Tomme	Thomas	Fluvius
Van Bruwaene	Arnout	Elia
Van Nuffel	Niels	Fluvius
Van Praet	Koen	Elia
Vangulick	David	Ores
Vanheule	Simon	Elia
Wallace Fisher	Hellen	Fluxys

Meeting Minutes

The Product Design Group was supported by a slide deck, which can be found on the webpage of Synergrid¹. These meeting minutes capture the interactions between the participants.

Context

The workshop was held in the context of an informal public consultation, organized by Synergrid on behalf of the electricity system operators, on the design note regarding the coordination of unavailabilities of electricity production and storage facilities with a capacity of more than 1 MW and below 25 MW connected to the transmission or distribution grid, as well as demand sites directly connected to the transmission grid (iCAROS phase 2).

The processes described in the consulted design note² will help system operators to carry out better operational security analyses related to grid security. This will enable them to detect and resolve congestions more quickly and to better plan maintenance works on grid components – with as little impact as possible on grid users.

The design also introduces a new role: the Outage Planning Agent (OPA). This role comes with new responsibilities, such as sharing and keeping up-to-date the availability plans for all their grid-relevant installations.

This informal consultation aims to inform market parties who will need to take on this new role and its responsibilities. Market parties are therefore invited to share their concerns and suggestions regarding the proposed design with the system operators, via Synergrid, so these can be taken into account where possible.

General remarks

Throughout the meeting, Elia and the DSOs stress that the goal of this design is to allow the SOs to capture more information regarding the availability of grid user facilities in order to improve the timely detection of operational security risks. The goals of capturing this information is to allow the SO to schedule works on their grids in such a way that there is as little as possible impact on the service quality as experienced by the grid users.

FEBEG remarks that they appreciate the relevance, simplicity and phased approach as displayed by the design note.

FEBELIEC and FEBEG remark that the final design needs to be harmonised across all voltage levels and regions. The SOs note and welcome this remark and stress that this is indeed the objective for the design valid for small production and storage facilities. Furthermore, they point out that the session of today is a common session at Synergrid level, on an informal consultation of a common design. The current way of working towards a common design has also been presented to the regulators through Forbeg, and the SOs also invite market parties to let the various relevant regulators know of their demands for a harmonised design across all voltage levels and regions.

¹https://www.synergrid.be/images/downloads/PDG/iCAROS/20251003_iCAROS_OutagePlanningCoordination.pdf

²www.synergrid.be/images/downloads/Public_Consultations/iCAROS_design_note/Outage_Planning_Coordination_Design_Note_Synergrid%20-%20EN.pdf

Treatment of CDSO's

Febeliec raises a number of points linked to the treatment of closed distribution system operators, stressing that there is need for clarity in the obligations, and stressing that, the EU regulations do not make a distinction between a CDSO and a public DSO, noting that the CDSO is in some case the “relevant system operator” the UE regulations refer to. A number of specific remarks were made during the meeting. First an overview is given of the remarks which were responded to during the meeting. A second overview lists the remarks that were not immediately responded to during the meeting, as they are considerations that might be taken into account as the design is further worked out.

Specific remarks and responses:

- How will it work for CDSOs with multiple active BRP's?
The members of Synergrid clarify that this might dependent on the specific location in the grid and the real time data that is available as such specific cases will be tackled bilaterally with the connecting SO.
- What is required or expected of Seveso-sites, specifically when they switch their load to another connection point in case they need back-up power.
Here, Elia stresses that the goal of the design is to have an insight into possible impacts on the grid that may affect operational security, so any shifting of load from one node in the grid to another node, is useful information to have. To be assessed how this information can be collected.

Specific remarks for further consideration:

- How will locations with the same grid & installation lay-out as a CDSO be handled, especially as such a site might choose to become a CDSO, or a CDSO site might revert to being a single grid user.
- Care should be taken that the same rules apply to CDSOs and DSOs.

Additionally, Febeliec raised some remarks which are applicable not only to CDSOs, but were more general in nature:

- What exactly “Forced Outage” and “Testing” mean for demand sites needs to be clarified
- For all demand sites (so not only for CDSOs), the design should be clear in what is requested to be entered into the tool: the consumption, or the offtake?
- The exact obligations of the OPA should be made very clear

Onboarding and complexity

Several market parties also have questions surrounding the go live and the onboarding process. Febeliec mentions that iCAROS phase two will mean that a lot of people will have to be onboarded that have never been confronted with a similar obligation, which means that this will be a complicated exercise, even if all IT related tools work without any issues, which is never the case. Here, the SO's respond that they want to avoid a “big bang”, as such the idea is to assess whether a progressively onboard of grid users in successive waves might be the most suited approach, and that the design itself will also be evolving based on received feedback and experience.

While market parties indicate that the presented timing seems too optimistic and therefore unrealistic, especially as the IT implementation at grid user site is not taken into account, the SOs respond that the OPA will probably not need to implement anything. Furthermore, the goal is to maximally reuse already existing systems and tooling, meaning that the implementation time can be kept low at SO side.

Availability planning, updates and compensation

When it comes to the availability planning itself, FEBEG wonders what will happen with unavailabilities that have been entered previously when the system generates the availability plan at the start of Y-3, will it be overwritten? The response of the SOs here is that nothing will be overwritten, the automatic generation of the availability plan will mark down as “available” those timeslots for which there is not yet any input received.

Luminus remarks that the deadline of the preliminary availability plan at W-12 is too far into the future for wind farms. Specifically for wind farms, the SOs respond that meteorological conditions do in themselves not constitute an unavailability, but rather sound like the units are available, but with a schedule of zero. More in general, the W-12 deadline is chosen because of the link with operational planning processes that happen at the SO side (more specific Elia – can be reviewed for other SOs): detailed planning of grid maintenance at SO side starts from W-12, so at that time, information on availability of grid assets can significantly contribute to a correct assessment of the operational security.

Market parties also raise concerns with the compensations framework for change requests regarding unavailabilities outlined on slide 37, as this might be problematic, especially for smaller units. Some market parties also express some confusion if this is a compensation framework, or a penalty framework. The members of Synergrid deem it important to stress that that the option to accept a change request conditional to a compensation may not be developed by each SO. It should also be noted that the compensation is limited to costs that are reasonable, demonstrable and directly related to the request as outlined on slide 37. Additionally, this compensation, if accounted for in the SOs contractual framework, will work in both ways, meaning that it will be applicable when a grid user ask to change something in their validated unavailability plan, but also should an SO ask a grid user to make a change in their availability plan after validation. Lastly, it cannot be stressed enough that option to accept a change request conditional to a compensation should not be seen as a penalty mechanism . The information that is aimed to be captured in the OPA-framework is information that is currently unavailable to the SOs. While this means that the SOs will be happy with any information they receive. However, the SOs indicate that they might have reporting obligations to their respective regulators on the quality of the information received from market participants.

In closing, the SOs thank the meeting participants for their feedback and interactions, and remind all participants that the informal public consultation is currently ongoing, and so all participants are invited to submit any other feedback or remarks they might have in the consultation process.