Agenda: NME meeting **Date:** Thursday January 4th, 2018 **Time:** 09:00 –16:00 **Place:** RSC offices in Copenhagen	**NME** Nordic Market Experts
January 12th, 2018	

Present: Fedder Skovgaard, Energinet.dk
Christian Odgaard, Energinet.dk
Jan Owe, Svenska kraftnät
Jari Hirvonen, Fingrid
Minna Arffman, Fingrid
Jon-Egil Nordvik, Statnett (Convenor & Secretary)

To (NME): Anne Stine Hop, Statnett
Christian Odgaard, Energinet.dk
Fedder Skovgaard, Energinet.dk
Hans Erik Budde, Elhub
Jan Owe, Svenska kraftnät
Jari Hirvonen, Fingrid
Jon-Egil Nordvik, Statnett
Minna Arffman, Fingrid
Ove Nesvik, Edisys (Secretary)

Appendixes: **Appendix A,** "To remember list"
Appendix B, Reactive energy (from Sweden)
Appendix C, Overview of the usage of xml-schemas in the Nordic countries

Attachment: None

1 Approval of agenda

Agenda approved with three additions under AOB:

- Reactive energy (from Sweden), see item 17.1
- Further developments for eSett, see item 17.2
- Need for development on downstream documents/processes, see item 17.3

2 Approval of previous meeting minutes

Approved.

3 Status for NME' ToR and work program for 2018

The following actions from previous meeting have been done:

- Ove will clean up the ToR and work program and distribute it to NME within Friday November 3rd
- Thereafter NME will review the documents for 14 days, i.e. within Friday November 17th
- Finally, Jon-Egil will forward the documents to Karsten, for approval by RMG
- Jon-Egil will ask Karsten what more he expects related to reporting our tasks (status and progress) to RMG

The item is closed

4 Status and update of Nordic BRSs and other documents if needed

All Nordic BRSs and other documents are up to date.

5 AD 28 - Strategy for CGMES transition

Coreso and SCC will be using the CRAC and GLSK, TSCNET will probably do the same.

Conclusion:

> Since the CRAC and GLSK are approved CIM-based ENTSO-E standards that will be used by other major parties for this purpose, we strongly advice the Nordic RSC to do the same, instead of making a purely Nordic extension to the CGMES for this. In addition, since the CRAC and GLSK is only CIM-based, any changes needed would be possible to get approved by ENTSO-E within about two months.

6 BRS for Nordic Operational System – if any issues

No news.

Continued action:

- Fedder and Jon-Egil will ask WG-EDI for the status in the ERRP project

7 XML schemas

7.1 NME set of schemas

The NME set of schemas are shown in Appendix C.

Action:

- Everyone are asked to find what versions of xml-schemas are used to day in different projects and come up with proposals for new schemas and/or sets of schemas that should be published at www.ediel.org (continued).
- Ove will extend the table to include the different TSO's and rename the "TSO" column to "Available in …"

7.2 CIM based NME xml-schemas

The intention with the item was to review the first draft of the NME Currency Exchange Rate Document from Ove. However, Ove is still waiting for André. Fedder stated that ENTSO-E has allocated money for this now, so there is hope.

8 Addition of Metered Data Administrator to the Harmonised Role Model

The item was postponed.

Continued action:

- Jon-Egil will forward the memo to NRMG, asking for support to forward the MR to the HG.

9 Usage of ebIX® Business Reason Codes

Should we compare (harmonise) the usage of ebIX® Business Reason Codes in the Nordic countries, ref. list from Denmark (DK)?

Action:

- Everybody are asked to come up with the list of codes used today and codes planned to be used in the not so far future, and send it to Ove before the next meeting.
- Ove will come up with the ebIX codes.

10 File sharing

Hans Erik has asked if we should ask Karsten F. to get a common file area for the Pilot Harmonised Nordic Datahub processes project and possibly NME, similar to what NRMG/NCEG have had. Hans Erik's experience is that this makes distribution of documents easier, incl. overview and history.

Fedder had as action from previous meeting to create a SharePoint file area for the NME group. However, this is not done, since it seems like a better solution will be to use ProjectPlace.

Action:

- Jon-Egil will contact Nina Kujala at Fingrid.

11 BRS for schedules

Review of chapter 7 and the rest of the BRS. The draft BRS can be downloaded from: NTC working documents

Continued action:

- Jan and Fedder will check the dependency matrix for ESS schedule document and ESS confirmation report, chapter 7.1 and 7.3;
- Fedder, Jan and Jari will verify if "**A09** Finalised" is (will be) used for the ERRP Planned Resource Schedule Document from BRP to SO, or if it is only "**A14** Resource Provider Resource Schedule (Operational schedule)" that will be used (as in Norway), ref. chapter 7.4 in the Schedule BRS; *SvK and Fingrid will be using A14. Energinet is pending.*
- Everyone should verify and possibly update the "Used in" column in chapter 7.4.3;
- Jari will find Finnish usages of Business types in chapter 7.4.4;
- Everyone should verify and possibly update the "dependency matrix" in chapter 7.4.5.

12 Status for MRs to ENTSO-E

Including status for ENTSO-E/WG-EDI project related to ERRP (ancillary services), that will deal with not yet dealt with NME (NEG) MRs.

A list with relevant MRs can be found at NTC working documents. The list was reviewed and the following status noted:

MR #	Status
NEMM 2010/33	• MR closed (withdrawn). • A new change request will be made for removing Control Block ++ from description of A74.
NEMM 2011/63	To be kept as a new documentType.
NEMM 2011/94	To be kept.
NEMM 2012/102	To be kept.
NEMM 2012/103	To be kept.
NEMM 2012/106	To be kept.
NEMM 2012/108	To be kept.
NEMM 2012/110	• This MR will be withdrawn. • The new "Balancing" document is to be used. MR closed.
NEMM 2013/113B	• To be kept • A new MR for addition of ESCO to the ENTSO-E code list will be made.
NEMM 2013/114	To be kept.
NEMM 2013/118	To be withdrawn.
NEMM 2013/119	• Fixed by MADES 2 • MR closed
NEMM 2014/120	• Rejected. • MR closed.
NEMM 2014/122	• Approved. • MR closed.
NEMM 2014/126	To be kept.
NEMM 2014/128	• Approved (code received). • MR closed.
NEMM 2014/129	• MR closed (withdrawn).
NEMM 2015/130	• Approved (code received). • MR closed.
NEMM 2015/131	• Approved (code received). • MR closed.
NEMM 2017/133	• Approved (code received). • MR closed.

Action:

- Ove will update the MR status table and make relevant new MRs.

13 Status www.ediel.org

Actions from previous meeting were postponed.

Continued action:

- Ove will make a proposal for how to deal with “NEG”, i.e. change to Ediel or NME, dependent on the context
- Ove will remove Tor Åge from the NME (NEG) member list and NPS from the agenda

- Jan will, based om GDPR work at Svenska kraftnät, try finding which rules we will have to follow regarding GDPR, especially related to member lists on www.ediel.org

14 Review of Appendix A, "To remember list"

The item was postponed.

15 Information (if any)

Norway:

- New go-live date for the Norwegian Elhub is February 18th 2019.

CIM:

- There was a fruitful workshop between Jan, Fedder, Greta and Maurizio in November to go through the TR and changes needed in the CIM.
- There is an ongoing discussion about the copyright of the CIM i.e. are the schemas public domain or not.
- The copyright of CIM itself is also in question.

My energy data:

- Jan and Ove is working on this within WG16.

16 Next meeting

Next meeting March 7th 2018 at Arlanda.

17 AOB

17.1 Reactive energy (from Sweden)

See mail exchange in Appendix B

Action:

- Everybody to give examples of how it is done in their countries before next meeting.

17.2 Further developments for eSett

eSett will implement MADES and move towards CIM.

Action:

- Minna/Jari will ask Minnakaisa (eSett) to contact NME to ask them to start working on these issues.

17.3 Need for development on downstream documents/processes

Action:

- Everybody to check internally if there are some known issues/needs that should be handled by NME.

Appendix A "To remember list"

Item #	Item	Description	Status
1.	EMFIP Configuration Market Document	Within EMFIP there is a document called Configuration Market Document. NTC don't think that the document can be use for any master data, outside of the transparency platform, in the foreseeable future. However, the topic should be kept in mind and we might get questions why we didn't use it. At a later stage, NEG might do some work to influence the European standards.	TBD
2.	Balancing Publication Implementation Guide	To be considered	TBD
3.	BRS for Operate	• Add "Reporting as UseCase • Add code for Metered frequency (Z69?) and Hz	

Appendix B Reactive energy (from Sweden)

One of these suppliers will also bill the customer for the reactive energy (we assume this will not be done by the grid owner as you are doing in Norway).

Probably some DSOs will link the reactive energy to the production within the metering point, and some DSOs will link the reactive to the consumption within the metering point. I.e. that depends on what kind of installation it is (production plant, industry…)

And that will be handled by the datahub.

In the example you will see that I specified code E20 “combined” as the code for Metering point type for the two time series with reactive values.

However, in our internal data model for our Swedish datahub we currently don’t have “metering point type”. What we do have is “Mätserietyp” that could be described as

1) Active in (i.e. production)
2) Active out (i.e. consumption)
3) Reactive capacitve
4) Reactive inductive

I.e. as the four time series in my example.

So it could be interesting to see examples (Norwegian, Finnish, Danish) with time series for reactive energy values sent to the datahub. I.e. if you are sending ebIX-look-a-like messages, what kind of Metering point type are you then specifying?

BR Jan

Från: Andreas Holmqvist [mailto:Andreas.Holmqvist@Statnett.no]
Skickat: den 13 november 2017 15:32
Till: ove.nesvik@edisys.no; Owe, Jan; Hans Erik Budde; Christian Odgaard; Jari Hirvonen (Jari.Hirvonen@fingrid.fi); Jon-Egil Nordvik; Minna Arffman [Minna.Arffman@fingrid.fi]; Preben Høj Larsen
Ämne: SV: Reactive values from an accounting point - what is the metering point type?

Hi,

I'll add a few words to Ove's mail regarding how Elhub is designed to wrok. Reactive energy metering values will be sent to Elhub only if they are used to bill the end user. The reason being that the Norwegian regulation states that it is metering values in Elhub that should be used to bill the end user. However, there will not be any calculations or settlement performed in Elhub based on reactive values. Elhub will forward these values to the balance supplier, but to my knowledge it is always the grid owner who bills the end user for reactive energy. I do not know if the balance supplier has any real use for this information as of today.

We've said that reactive values who are metered by the grid owner but not billed to the end user should not be sent to Elhub.

The reactive energy will be reported on the same metering point as the active energy, hence metering point type is not a problem. Elhub can handle it for all settled metering point types (Consumption, Production and Combined (i.e. prosumer)). As Ove also comments I would be wary of reporting the same values twice on two separate settled metering points. If this happened in Elhub it wouldn't create an immediate problem since we don't include the values in any calculations, but I'm thinking it might cause confusion for the balance suppliers and the end user.

Regards

Andreas Holmqvist
Senior Advisor

elhub

M +47 406 14 174

T +47 239 03 000

elhub.no
statnett.no

Fra: ove.nesvik@edisys.no [mailto:ove.nesvik@edisys.no]
Sendt: 10. november 2017 18:23
Til: Owe, Jan <Jan.Owe@svk.se>; Hans Erik Budde <hans.erik.budde@statnett.no>; Christian Odgaard <CCO@energinet.dk>; Andreas Holmqvist <Andreas.Holmqvist@Statnett.no>; Jari Hirvonen (Jari.Hirvonen@fingrid.fi) <Jari.Hirvonen@fingrid.fi>; Jon-Egil Nordvik <jon-egil.nordvik@statnett.no>; Minna Arffman [Minna.Arffman@fingrid.fi] <Minna.Arffman@fingrid.fi>; Preben Høj Larsen <PHQ@energinet.dk>
Emne: [SENDER UNVERIFIED]RE: Reactive values from an accounting point - what is the metering point type?

Hei Jan,

This sounds like an “interesting issue”.

As far as I know, this will not be an issue in Norway. For the small prosumers (plusskunde), the Balance supplier (BS) will be the same, and, at least in the foreseeable future, reactive energy will not be exchanged. For the bigger producers, the production and consumption must be metered separately.

But, I guess the reason for sending time series 3 & 4 to the BSs is for billing purposes (?). And to me it sounds a bit strange that both BSs shall get the same time series – logically this will mean that the customer will be billed for the reactive energy twice (?).

If you inform Ann-Sofie about the issue, we could bring the question up on the MDS meeting next week, or we could add it to the NME Harmonised data hub pilot project meeting November 24th

Rgds,

Ove Nesvik
Senior rådgiver / Senior adviser
Mobil (+47) 928 22 908
edisys consulting
Havnelageret
Langkaia 1
0150 Oslo
Tel: (+47) 22 42 13 80
Fax: (+47) 22 42 26 40
www.edisys.no

From: Owe, Jan [mailto:Jan.Owe@svk.se]
Sent: fredag 10. november 2017 15.15
To: Ove Nesvik <ove.nesvik@edisys.no>; Hans Erik Budde (hans.erik.budde@statnett.no) <hans.erik.budde@statnett.no>; Christian Odgaard <CCO@energinet.dk>; Andreas Holmqvist <Andreas.Holmqvist@Statnett.no>; Jari Hirvonen (Jari.Hirvonen@fingrid.fi) <Jari.Hirvonen@fingrid.fi>; Jon-Egil Nordvik <jon-egil.nordvik@statnett.no>; Minna Arffman [Minna.Arffman@fingrid.fi]

<Minna.Arffman@fingrid.fi>; Preben Høj Larsen <PHQ@energinet.dk>
Subject: Reactive values from an accounting point - what is the metering point type?

Dear all,

In larger installations we meter not only active energy but also reactive energy values. Those values could be of interest both to the supplier linked to the production and to the supplier linked to the consumption.

So, in our Swedish data hub we plan to make these reactive values available for both suppliers (in many cases those suppliers will be the same – but the "party connected to grid" may choose different suppliers for production and for consumption).

Let us then assume that the DSO sends in four time series associated to this large installation. We have in Swedish called these different types "Mätserietyp".

1) Active in (i.e. production)
2) Active out (i.e. consumption)
3) Reactive in
4) Reactive out

Time series 1 & 2 will be associated to different accounting points and can then have different suppliers (and balance responsible parties).

Time series 3 & 4 will in Sweden be available for both suppliers.

In an ebIX (based) message we specify the product that will be "active energy" or "reactive energy" (or reactive energy capacitive / inductive).

We also specify the Metering point type that will be "production" or "consumption". But what should we do with time series 3 and 4?

What are you specifying as the "Metering point type" for the reactive values?

And in our Nordic case: what should be specified in the messages sent to (or provided to, if not sent to because you are perhaps not subscribing them, just want to have access to them) the suppliers or the ESCO:s from the data hub?

Have a nice weekend!

BR Jan

JAN OWE
TEL +46 10 475 82 85
JAN.OWE@SVK.SE

Appendix C Overview of the usage of xml-schemas in the Nordic countries

#	XML schema	BRS	Version used by	
			NBS	TSO
1.	NEG ECAN publication document	NBS BRS for TSO/MO	1.0	
2.	NEG ERRP Reserve Allocation Result Document	a) NBS BRS for TSO/MO b) BRS for Trade	1.0	1.0
3.	NEG Area Specification Document	a) NBS BRS for Master Data b) BRS for Trade	1.0[1]	
4.	NEG Bilateral Trade Structure Document	NBS BRS for Master Data	1.0	
5.	NEG Party Master Data Document	NBS BRS for Master Data	1.0	
6.	NEG Resource Object Master Data Document	NBS BRS for Master Data	1.1	
7.	ENTSO-E Acknowledgement Document	NEG Common XML rules and …	6.0	
8.	ENTSO-E ERRP Planned Resource Schedule Document	NBS BRS for TSO/MO	5.0	
9.	NEG ERRP Planned Resource Schedule Document	BRS for Schedules		1.0
10.	ENTSO-E ERRP Resource Schedule Confirmation Report	BRS for Schedules	No NEG version	
11.	ENTSO-E ESS Anomaly Report	BRS for Schedules	No NEG version	
12.	ENTSO-E Outage document	BRS for Schedules	No NEG version	
13.	NEG ESP Energy Account Report Document	NBS BRS	1.0	
14.	ENTSO-E ESS Confirmation Report	NBS BRS	4.1	
15.	ENTSO-E ESS Schedule Document	a) NBS BRS	4.1	

[1] The NBS version 1.0 is using dateTimeType for Validity Start/End (error correction), while the MO version 1.0 is using dateType. dateTimeType will be used from version 2.0.

		b) NBS BRS for TSO/MO		
16.	ebIX® Aggregated Data per MGA for Settlement for Settlement Responsible	NBS BRS	2013pA	
17.	ebIX® Aggregated Data per Neighbouring Grid for Settlement for Settlement Responsible	NBS BRS	2013pA	
18.	ebIX® NEG Confirmation of Aggregated Data per Neighbouring Grid for ISR	NBS BRS	2013pA	
19.	ebIX® Validated Data for Settlement for Aggregator	NBS BRS	2013pA	
20.	NEG ECAN Allocation Result Document	BRS for Trade		3.0
21.	NEG Currency Exchange Rate Document	BRS for Trade		
22.	NEG Auction Specification	BRS for Trade		
23.	NEG Spot Market Bid Document	BRS for Trade		
24.	ENTSO-E ERRP Reserve Bid Document	BRS for Trade		5.0
25.	ENTSO-E ERRP Activation Document	BRS for Operate		5.0