


<b>Minutes Nordic Ediel Group (NEG) meeting</b> <b>Date:</b> October 11 <sup>th</sup> 2011 <b>Time:</b> 09:30-15:00 <b>Place:</b> Copenhagen Airport Hilton October 12 <sup>th</sup> , 2011	
---	---

**Participants:** Christian Le, Statnett  
Christian Odgaard, Energinet.dk  
Jari Hirvonen, Fingrid  
Jesper Gronlund  
Oscar Ludwigs, SvK (Convenor)  
Ove Nesvik, EdiSys

**To:** Participants  
Antti Niemi, Nord Pool Spot  
Eveliina Ishii, Nord Pool Spot  
Hanna Blomfelt, Nord Pool Spot  
Jan Owe, SvK  
Jon-Egil Nordvik  
Ole Fredsø Weigelt, Energinet.dk  
Roar Grindstrand, Statnett  
Tor Bjarne Heiberg, Statnett  
Tor Åge Halvorsen, NordPool

**CC:** Jan-Olov Lundberg, SvK

**Attachment:** None

## 0 Summary of action items

- Oscar will as homework find out if NEMM is a candidate for making the technical specifications for the NBS and if yes a timeframe for a project.
- Jari and Jon-Egil was asked to discuss cooperation/harmonisation between NOIS and NEMM, since both participate in both groups, i.e.:
  - Who should send MRs to ENTSO-E for making the NOIS documents in line with ENTSO-E documents?
  - Is there a need for enhancing the NEMM requirement views to cover all NOIS processes?
- Statnett was asked to investigate the REMIT proposal and give a status at the next NEG meeting.

## 1 Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved with the following additions:

- Status for CIM XML, see 8.1 under AOB
- REMIT, see 8.2 under AOB
- Request for comments for a new Ediel QUOTES IG, see 8.3 under AOB

## 2 Approval of minutes from the last meeting

The minutes from previous meeting were approved.

### 3 NEMM status and further work

The following status was reported from the NEMM project:

**Phase 1**, *Determine transfer capacity process* and **Phase 2**, *Scheduling and Ancillary Services Process* is finalised, except for some MRs to ENTSO-E that not yet have been concluded.

**Phase 3**, *Nordic trading system* is still in progress. It is mainly processes related to Nord Pool Spot that are left. NEMM hopes to finalise the requirement specification by the end of this year.

**Phase 4**, *Settlement process* is currently awaiting the Nordic Balance Settlement (NBS)

**Phase 5**, *Implementation verification* is waiting for suitable projects.

The latest project plan agreed in NEMM can be found in Appendix A.

The following status was reported related to Maintenance requests (MR) to ENTSO-E:

- 59 MRs have so far been closed, i.e. approved, rejected or withdrawn.
- 12 MRs are awaiting the new ERRP project
- 8 MRs are awaiting a decision in ENTSO-E/WG-EDI
- 14 MRs are under development

The status report was approved.

Phase 5, Implementation verification, was discussed with the following comments:

- SvK is running a project for communication with Poland that will be based on ENTSO-E documents. The result may be taken into the NEMM project.
- Similar, Statnett will probably implement documents based on ENTSO-E IGs for intraday NorNed communication to NordPool.
- NOIS documents are currently based on ENTSO-E IG's, however with several additions and "short cuts".

#### **Actions:**

- Oscar will as homework find out if NEMM is a candidate for making the technical specifications for the NBS and if yes a timeframe for a project.
- Jari and Jon-Egil was asked to discuss cooperation/harmonisation between NOIS and NEMM, since both participate in both groups, i.e.:
  - Who should send MRs to ENTSO-E for making the NOIS documents in line with ENTSO-E documents?
  - Is there a need for enhancing the NEMM requirement views to cover all NOIS processes?

### 4 Nordic end customer market

Oscar had distributed a draft report and questions from NordReg about communication in a future Nordic market. Oscar has been asked to make comments to the report within October 17<sup>th</sup>. The next meeting will take place October 25<sup>th</sup>.

Discussion:

- Christian O is happy that the report is positive to a Central Data Base (Data hub), CDB.
- Christian O mentioned that it seems to be extra work (in the Danish hub) related to data synchronisation because of the choice of Model 2 (Metered data stored both in the CDB and at the Grid companies).
- Oscar informed that the Swedish EMIX system has been closed down, due to too high costs for using it.
- The result of the project dealing with communication in a future Nordic market will be a status and list possible future models. No recommendations are expected.
- The questions from the group were partly answered, see Appendix B
- Ove mentioned that the term *Meter* should be changed to *Metering point* in most places in the document.

## 5 Next ebIX forum

The ebIX<sup>®</sup> agenda was reviewed with the following comments:

- The ebIX<sup>®</sup> budget and expenditure was reviewed:
  - ETC had until August spent 101' € out of 80' €. 2/3 of this is used by Kees.
  - Christian O want to keep or lower the ebIX<sup>®</sup> budget
- There is a proposal for starting a project group looking into smart metering.
  - Christian O stressed that this should be a new project and not a continuation of the EMD project.
  - Ove mentioned that the Norwegian Ediel group (NEE) probably will start a smart metering project.
  - Oscar is a bit sceptic to start a smart metering project before the area is more mature.
  - Christian O mentioned that ACER and Eurelectric are planning to start smart metering projects and this could be a reason for ebIX<sup>®</sup> to also do something.
  - It seems that starting a project together with Eurelectric is the best option.
- Vlatka will be proposed as new chairman for ebIX<sup>®</sup>
- Oscar was missing a closer cooperation with the regulators. The closer cooperation could be on a national, Nordic (NordReg) or European (ACER) level. The Nordic participants at the coming ebIX<sup>®</sup> Forum should promote a closer cooperation with ACER. And, in addition, Christian O stressed, a closer cooperation with ENTSO-E.
- Oscar explained that there is a problem that the ebIX<sup>®</sup> forum minutes aren't approved before next forum. The minutes should be circulated and approved by mail.
- The ebIX<sup>®</sup> members of the Harmonisation Group should be reviewed.
- Nordic members of the common technical working group tWG, which is a sort of steering group, will be proposed to be Oscar and Christian O.

## 6 ENTSO-E WG EDI

There have been a long discussion in the Harmonisation Group (HG) between ebIX<sup>®</sup> and ENTSO-E/WG-EDI related to the new construction in the Harmonised Role Model related to *Metering Point* and *Accounting Point*. During this summer there has been a meeting (by telephone) between the ebIX<sup>®</sup> and ENTSO-E chairmen and HG members where a compromise was proposed:

**Metering Point:** An entity where energy products are measured or computed

**Accounting Point:** An entity for which commercial business processes are defined such as balance responsibility and balance supply

**Additional information:**

These entities are usually defined in a contract.  
This is a type of metering point.

The Nordic participants at the coming ebIX® Forum will vote for keeping the definitions above, which is in line with the decision at the latest ENTSO-E/WG-EDI meeting.

## 7 Next meeting

Tuesday April 17<sup>th</sup> 2012 in Finland

## 8 AOB

### 8.1 Status for CIM XML

Nobody had anything to report.

### 8.2 REMIT

The European regulators propose in the “REMIT proposal” to use only one identification scheme for all parties in the European energy market, and the current proposal is EIC or an ID maintained by the regulators.

Denmark and Norway are currently using GS1 IDs. In case of moving to EIC the TSOs will have to be responsible for maintaining the codes. In Sweden, SvK is already maintaining national Ediel IDs and changing to EIC will not bring much extra costs.

#### Action:

- Statnett was asked to investigate the REMIT proposal and give a status at the next NEG meeting.

### 8.3 Request for comments for a new Ediel QUOTES IG

A request for comments for a new Ediel QUOTES IG has been distributed for comments within November 10<sup>th</sup>. There were no comments from the NEG participants.

The following additions are proposed:

- Addition of a new Functional area code:
  - **L** Peak Load Capacity Market
- Addition of segments and codes related to the Norwegian Frequency activated reserve market:
  - Addition of a new *Cue list* in chapter 6.5.
  - Addition of new *Document type codes* in BGM:
    - **N07** Bid, weekly market
    - **N08** Bid, daily market
    - **N09** Bid, hourly market
  - Addition of new *Quotation status codes* in LIN:
    - **37** Cancelled
    - **38** Replaced
  - Addition of new Request for quote number qualifier in SG32/RFF:
    - **AHU** Request for quote number
- A model for “Profile block bids” is added.
- The example in Appendix B is updated.

- An example of Profile block bids is added as Appendix C.
- An example of Flexi block bids is added as Appendix D.

## Appendix A EXTRACT OF THE OVERALL PROJECT PLAN

The following 5 phases have been identified in the *Nordic TSO Market model project for data exchange*:

### **Phase 1** *Determine transfer capacity process*

Phase 1 was finalised spring 2009 regarding documents from the project group. However Maintenance Requests (MR) to ENTSO-E/WG-EDI is still in progress.

### **Phase 2** *Scheduling and Ancillary Services Process* covered by the ENTSO-E ESS and ERRP IGs

- operational and financial
- balancing and reserves
- In addition phase 2 include:
  - A document containing common rules and recommendations, *including* detailing of a communication platform
  - A document covering a common *Domain model* for the Nordic market.

Phase 2 was finalised spring 2010 regarding documents from the project group. However Maintenance Requests (MR) to ENTSO-E/WG-EDI is still in progress.

### **Phase 3** *Nordic trading system*

- Bid to the Balance regulation market
- Prices from the balancing market and spot market, and other Nord Pool messages
- Activation messages
- Bid process to the Spot market (dependent on NordPool)

Phase 3 started autumn 2009 and is still in progress. It is mainly processes related to Nord Pool Spot that are left.

### **Phase 4** Settlement process

Phase 4 started in spring 2010, but is currently awaiting the Nordic Balance Settlement (NBS)

### **Phase 5** Preparation for implementation verification of the documents between the Nordic TSOs and Nord Pool Spot.

The Customer switching (CuS) process is a potential additional phase, dependent on political decisions, i.e. a common Nordic end user market.

For each of the phases mentioned above, a BRS will be made for the relevant business process. Change requests will be submitted for all identified differences between the Nordic processes and ENTSO-E/ebIX® standards.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Spring 2009</b>	<b>Autumn 2009</b>	<b>Spring 2010</b>	<b>Autumn 2010</b>	<b>Spring 2011</b>	<b>Autumn 2011</b>	<b>Spring 2012</b>	<b>Autumn 2012</b>
Phase 1, Determine transport capacity	[Active]							
BRS	[Active]							
Change request to ENTSO-E	[Active]							
Phase 2, Scheduling process	[Active]							
BRS	[Active]							
Change request to ENTSO-E	[Active]							
Phase 3, Nordic Trading System	[Active]							
BRS	[Active]							
Change request to ENTSO-E	[Active]							
Phase 4, Settlement process	[Active]							
BRS	[Active]							
Change request to ENTSO-E	[Active]							
Phase 5, implementation verification	[Active]							

## Appendix B QUESTIONS FOR THE INPUT TEAM 20111011

### Chapter 5

1. What information should and can possibly be given through a web service?

**NEG:**

- All information can be given through a web service, i.e.
    - The Danish limit is 50 Mb of data in a document
    - There are no extra limitations when using web services, related to other means, such as FTP or SMTP.
2. Are national web services in your opinion a sufficient solution for a harmonized Nordic market (given also harmonization of messages, timeframes etc.)?

**NEG:**

- Yes, but it will not increase data quality etc., as other more centralized models may do.

### Chapter 6

3. Looking at responsibility in figure 5 in chapter 6, do you see any problems by the supplier being the responsible party for updating and changing customer data (customer address, name, billing address)? What do you see as the positive effects of the supplier being able to change the mentioned data in a CDB?

**NEG:**

- The Grid company should be happy if the Supplier take over the customer data maintenance.
4. How big an obstacle is it to have national/different rules regarding the supplier's rights and obligation to update and change data in a CDB? For instance if it in Norway are only the DSOs that can update and change all data in the CDB while the suppliers are the responsible parties for updating some customer data in Finland's CDB?

**NEG:**

- In a common Nordic end user market the rules, regulations and processes should be the same. Having different rules means that the Suppliers need different data systems for different countries and there is no common market anymore.
5. **What should and could the CDB be able to perform of business processes (supplier switching etc.)? Do we still need EDI messages as today alongside a CDB in your opinion?**

**NEG:**

- A CDB should cover all needed processes, such as Customer switching, move, end of supply, settlement, reconciliation, metered data exchange etc.
- We still need to exchange all the information, either as traditional EDIFACT messages, XML documents, embedded in Web Services or other means between the CDB and the Suppliers/Grid companies. The means of communication will probably not influence cost/benefit, data quality, etc.



**The important** issue is to agree on one common way of exchanging information. It is less important if this one standard is based on EDIFACT, XML or embedded WS.

6. **Can you add any other positive and negative consequences for the suppliers and DSOs for the models 2, 3, 4 and 5 in chapter 6?**
7. In your opinion, would CDB affect competition between suppliers?
8. Should data search from a web service or a CDB be based on such exact customer information that misuse of the service isn't possible or should instead the search be more open and the misbehaving suppliers, if these occur be punished somehow?

**NEG:**

- Yes, data search from a web service or a CDB should be based on such exact customer information that misuse of the service isn't possible.

*Regarding competition and IT service providers*

9. Do you find it difficult to buy IT-services from IT-service providers?
10. What is your view on the competition between IT-service providers?

*General questions:*

11. Are we mentioning the relevant models or do you have any good suggestions to other models/ways of doing information exchange in a Nordic market that are not mentioned in this report?
12. Are the models described clearly enough in the report? If not, on which part would you suggest clarifications and what would they be?
13. Should DSOs know which supplier is selling electricity to which consumption point? Why or why not?