



<b>Agenda:</b> NEG Technical Committee <b>Date:</b> Monday January 19 <sup>th</sup> , 2015 <b>Time:</b> 09:00 – 16:00 <b>Place:</b> Fingrid, Helsinki January 22 <sup>nd</sup> , 2015	 Nordic Ediel Group
---	---

- Present:** Jan Owe, Svenska kraftnät  
 Jari Hirvonen, Fingrid  
 Jon-Egil Nordvik, Statnett (Convenor)  
 Kim Dahl, Statnett  
 Mats Elmér, Svenska kraftnät  
 Ove Nesvik, Edisys (Secretary)
- To (NTC):** Antti Niemi, Nord Pool Spot  
 Christian Odgaard, Energinet.dk  
 Eveliina Ishii, Nord Pool Spot  
 Hanna Blomfelt, Nord Pool Spot  
 Jan Owe, Svenska kraftnät  
 Jari Hirvonen, Fingrid  
 Jon-Egil Nordvik, Statnett (Convenor)  
 Kim Dahl, Statnett  
 Marja Eronen, Nord Pool Spot  
 Minna Arffman, Fingrid  
 Ole Fredsø Weigelt, Energinet.dk  
 Ove Nesvik, Edisys (Secretary)
- (NBS):** Mats Elmér, Svenska kraftnät  
 Minnakaisa Ahonen, eSet  
 Morten Hilger, Energinet.dk  
 Morten Torgalsbøen, Statnett  
 Pasi Lintunen, Fingrid
- Unicorn:** Filip Kral, Unicorn  
 Miloš Mojžiš, Unicorn
- CC:** Anne Stine Hop, Statnett  
 Oscar Ludwigs, Svenska kraftnät  
 Tor Bjarne Heiberg, Statnett  
 Tor Åge Halvorsen, NordPool
- Appendixes:** [Appendix A](#), NBS Issue list  
[Appendix B](#), Mismatch in schedule document usage  
[Appendix C](#), “To remember list

**Attachment:**  NEG Common rules and recommendatio  
 , see item 12, Review of comments to NEG Common rules and recommendations

 Business types for Lithuania 0 2  
 , see item 13, SvK exchange with Lithuania



Basse-Data\_Packag  
es\_HLC(2).docx

, see item 4, BRS for Master Data Documents (Structure Data Flows)

## --- Combined NBS and Ordinary NTC---

### 1 Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved with the following additions:

- Uniqueness of Time Series ID, see 20.1 under AOB
- Identification of eSett, see 20.2 under AOB
- “All or nothing” principle when acknowledging received documents, see 20.3 under AOB
- The concept of “data packages”, see 20.4 under AOB
- EMFIP: Configuration market document, 20.5 under AOB

### 2 Approval of previous meeting minutes

The minutes from previous meeting were approved.

### 3 NBS Issue list

The issue list in Appendix A was reviewed:

**Issue 1:** Structure data flows are handled under item 4 below

- The issue will in the future be handled as normal agenda item

**Issue 2:** Decision for means of communication - Nothing new reported

- The issue will in the future be handled as normal agenda item

**Issue 3:** Should we regulate the sizes of the files?

- Information from Unicorn:
  - We haven't made any particular testing or measurements yet, but let's shortly recapitulate some information about this:
    - 1 MEC, weekly timeseries data (168 values/records), is approximately 10kB
    - the maximum size of messages is 50MB
    - there is requirement (NFR\_044), which define message processing time for messages of 50 MECs (500kB)
  - Based on these, I would roughly propose an optimal size for messages to be 300-400 kB. This is of course just a recommendation.
- A maximum of 50 MB will be specified in the UGs.
- The issue is closed

**Issue 4:** Domain code for Nordic Market Area

- Jon-Egil informed after the meeting that the EIC code for the Nordic Market Area is now published in the CIO repository:

Y EIC Code	Area Name	Display Name	Function
10Y1001A1001A91G	Nordic Market Area	NORDIC_AREA	Market Area

- The issue is closed

Since there only are two issues left in the list, these will be handled as normal agenda items in the future.

**Homework:**

- Ove will add information in the User Guides that there is a maximum document size of 50 MB
- Ove will add the Domain code for Nordic Market Area to XML examples and the NBS User Guide

**4 BRS for Master Data Documents (Structure Data Flows)**

Ove and Erik had as actions (homework) from previous meeting updated the BRS, User Guide (UG) and XML schemas:

- Changed all occurrences of Validity Start/End to be of type “DateType” (and not DateTimeType) in all Master Data documents and XML schemas, BRS and UG
- The term “structure information” was renamed to “master data” in BRS and UG
- Renamed NBS to Imbalance Settlement Responsible (ISR) eSett in all documents, codes etc., when used as a role and renamed to eSett when used as a company or system
- Distributed the updates to NTC before December 29
- Distributed to NEG and asked for comments

Mats’ homework to verify if Basse need a MGA Type of **Z07** = “Main (or central) grid”, to be used in “NEG Area Specification Document for MBA and MGA Master Data” was postponed

Statnett informed that Norway would like to send separate "Validity Periods" in the MGA-MBA relation document, for each MBA, which is possible with the current document structure. An explanatory text, explaining the possibility, was added to the BRS, both for MBA/MGA master data and MBA-MGA relations documents. The cardinality of the relation between “Resource Object Details” and “Related Area” was extended to [0..\*], to be able to handle the Norwegian requirement for having Station Groups defined in several MBAs.

Jari informed that he was missing MGA Types for production. “**Z06**, Production”, this was added to the BRS and UG.

Jan was still missing a MGA Type for the main grid (see homework for Mats below).

**Homework:**

- Mats will verify if Basse need for a MGA Type of **Z07** = “Main (or central) grid”, to be used in “NEG Area Specification Document for MBA and MGA Master Data” (continued homework). Mats will inform Ove if MGA Types for production **Z07** = “Main (or central) grid” should be added to the BRS before the end of week 4.
- Ove will publish the document by the end of the week 4 with the status “For test implementation”
- Ove will verify that the Code List Document is updated with all new code lists from the Master Data BRS
- Ove will update the XML schemas:
  - Add MGA Types for production “**Z06**, Production” where relevant

- Change the cardinality of the relation between “Resource Object Details” and “Related Area” to [0..\*] in the NEG-Resource Object Master Data

## 5 NBS BRS

Ove (Erik) had as homework updated the BRS, User Guide (UG) and XML schemas:

- Both BS and BRP are made dependent [0..1] in eblX\_AggregatedDataPerMGAFForSettlementForSettlementResponsible\_2013pA.xsd
- MGA is added to ENTSO-E ESP Energy Account Report Document
- A comment is added below table 13 (Appendix B) that for parties active in more than one country only one ID, GS1 or EIC, shall be used when communicating with eSett.
- The updated document have be sent on circulation for comments to NTC

There were no new updates for the NBS BRS.

### **Homework:**

- Ove will publish the document by the end of the week unless blocking comments are received

## 6 NBS BRS for TSO/NPS communication

From Jan:

- 1) The file name – why “Draft”?

**Status:** Not any more 😊

- 2) Chapter 5.1 is not looking the same as chapter 5.6 in Nordic Balance Settlement NBS v1r5B - 20141205.pdf

- a. In area/Out area should be MBA ID
- b. InParty and OutParty should look the same (content and description) as in Nordic Balance Settlement NBS v1r5B - 20141205.pdf

**Status:** The In Area, Out Area, In Party and Out Party descriptions from the NBS BRS was copied to the NBS TSO/NPS BRS

- 3) The description of Quantity is not the same in the two documents, i.e. “The direction from out party (seller) to in party (buyer) is positive, while the opposite direction is negative (with minus signs)” is missing.

**Status:** The text was copied from the NBS BRS

- 4) When looking at the current code **A08** we are saying: “Net internal trade (Within a Market balance area)”. We should discuss if we should change our text. Because we will still use the same principle of signed values. The text “(Within a Market balance area)” is our own and doesn’t come from ENTSO-E, so it could be removed.

**Status:** No change

- 5) A practical issue is: How can we identify Åland? I think we will currently use national identifications.

**Status:** Homework for Mats

- 6) There is also some bilateral trade that goes between MBA:s but not through Nord Pool Spot. I am right now thinking of Åland, but there are probably more.
  - a. Åland is a small market with one TSO, two DSO:s, three BRP:s and four BS/Retailers
  - b. Even if that is specialties, I hope it is clear for Unicorn that those bilateral trades will be sent from Svenska kraftnät to Basse. I don't think there is a need for special codes than just specifying the two parties and the two areas.

**Status:** Homework for Mats

**Homework:**

- Mats will investigate how to deal with Åland
- Ove will publish the document by the end of the week unless blocking comments are received

## 7 NBS UserGuide

Ove and Erik had as actions (homework) from previous meeting to update the BRS, User Guide (UG) and XML schemas:

- Both BS and BRP are made dependent [0..1] in ebIX\_AggregatedDataPerMGAForSettlementForSettlementResponsible\_2013pA.xsd
- MGA is added as possible area in ENTSO-E ESP Energy Account Report Document
- The updated document have be sent on circulation for comments to NTC

**Homework:**

- Ove will publish the document by the end of the week unless blocking comments are received

## 8 Routing of acknowledgements versus MADES for routing purposes

Jon-Egil informed that Process Type will be added to version 7 (CIM version) of the ENTSO-E acknowledgement document. I.e. there will not be any Process Type in the acknowledgement we will use in the start.

*Continued homework from earlier meeting:*

- Jari Will ask Unicorn for their position regarding usage of MADES/SOAP header and the usage of businessType and senderApplication for routing purposes

## 9 Format for "Information Service"

Due to lack of information, i.e. how Unicorn intend to implement the "Information Service", the item was postponed.

## 10 Status for NPS implementation of NEG Documents and alignment of ESS/Area specification documents

The comments from Eveliina regarding "Mismatch in schedule document usage" in Appendix B were reviewed. Arrow 2 in Figure 6 (sequence diagram) is a schedule document from NPS to the SOs and the sender role should

be the market operator (NPS). The document is sent to the SO as input to the balance regulation process, hence it should be a part of the scheduling BRS.

The following additions were proposed:

- Add the following codes to the ESS Schedule Document, Balance Responsible schedule to System Operator (SO), to the Nordic TSO Schedules BRS (arrow 2 in Figure 6 (sequence diagram)):
  - Sender role: **A11** Market Operator
  - Process type: **A01** Day-ahead (Elspot) and **A19** Intraday accumulated (Elbas)

**Homework:**

- Ove will verify with Eveliina and put a verification on the next agenda

### 11 Follow up on RPMimp project

The BRS for the Nordic Operational System was reviewed and agreed. It was agreed not to move more processes from the BRS for trade to the BRS for the time being.

During this item Jan mentioned that Lithuania has gone over to using Euro, hence **LTL**, Lithuanian Litas, should be removed from all currency elements.

**Homework**

- Ove will remove LTL, Lithuanian Litas from all currency elements
- Ove will send the updated BRS to RPMimp and NTC members, and ask for comments after their next meeting February 24. Unless blocking comments the BRS will be published thereafter.

### 12 Review of comments to NEG Common rules and recommendations

Due to lack of time the item was postponed

### 13 SvK exchange with Lithuania

There is a need for new Business Types when communicating with Lithuania. Unfortunately also Lithuania is using Znn codes and there is no codingScheme attribute in the ENTSO-E documents, neither in the “old proprietary” ENTSO-E documents, nor in the newer IEC/CIM based documents. However, for the exchange with Litgrid, both Litgrid and SvK have decided to use the Nordic Zxx-codes for Business types i.e. no conflicts.

In the Day-Ahead Capacity Allocation and in the Intra-Day Capacity Allocation both TSO:s will send some time series using ECAN. One will be TRM (Transmission Reliability Margin) outbound capacity. Another will be TRM inbound capacity. But there is no Business Type for TRM.

Jan asked to get a Nordic code for TRM and in addition he asked NTC to ask for an ENTSO-E-code for it.

Jan also proposed to ask WG-EDI to add a codingScheme for Business Type, otherwise we cannot distinguish locally issued codes from each other. This proposal will be added to next NTC agenda.

**The new Nordic Business Type code is: Z67** TRM (Transmission Reliability Margin)

Finally, Jan informed that in the Intra-Day Capacity Allocation, Svenska kraftnät will send Reference Value Outbound (ATC) and Reference Value Inbound (ATC). Will it be OK to use the Business type **A26** (Available transfer capacity (ATC)) for this? The NTC answer was **yes**.

**Homework:**

- Ove/Jon-Egil will make/submit a MR to ENTSO-E/WG-EDI for a new Business Type “**Z67** TRM (Transmission Reliability Margin)”

**14 Micro production in Sweden**

Sweden get a new law from January 2015, where the Balance Supplier (BS), supplying the consumption, also must take the production, unless the Customer chooses another BS. New codes are needed for this process. Micro production is production where a fuse of maximum 100 A (Ampere) is used. In Sweden there will always be two MPs and two registers.

**Homework:**

- Jan will come up with proposals for new codes for the PRODAT messages

**15 Status for continuation of the HNR project**

Start-up of the next phase of the HNR project is awaiting discussions between NordREG and MSG.

**16 Status for MRs to ENTSO-E**

**Homework:**

- Jon-Egil will ask WG-EDI to request the addition of Trader (NEMM 2013/113B and 2012/97) to the ebIX®, EFET and ENTSO-E Harmonised Role Model

**17 Review of [www.ediel.org](http://www.ediel.org)**

Ove had as action from previous meeting published the latest HNR report and the minutes not yet published.

**18 Information (if any)**

No information exchanges

**19 Next meeting**

- Friday March 27<sup>th</sup> in Oslo

**20 AOB**

**20.1 Uniqueness of Time Series ID**

Jari had informed that there has been some discussion in Finland about Time Series ID's and uniqueness of it related to NBS:

- In the BRS it has been stated that "The Time Series Identification shall be an unique ID over time for the originator (sender) of a time series. I.e. every time a time series changed, the originator shall issue a new Time Series ID." which is different to rules in ENTSO-E IG's.
- Unicorn has however specified the following rule: "Time Series identification must be unique within the submitted document.", which correspond to the ENTSO-E rules.
- I.e. we have a mix up in the documents at the moment.
- Unicorn has not seen this as a problem and Jari would like to discuss why we came to the conclusion that it should be unique over time.

From discussion:

- Ove had noted the following:
  - The rule "The Time Series Identification shall be an unique ID over time for the originator (sender) of a time series" originates from the Ediel and later on ebIX®. One of the intentions with the rule is to avoid communication errors, i.e. to avoid unintended resending of documents. Using the ebIX® rule means that you have to concatenate the sender ID with the TSID to get an unique ID of the TS. Using the ENTSO-E rule means that you have to concatenate the sender ID and the Document ID with the TSID to get an unique ID of the TS.
  - From a Norwegian, and I believe also from a Swedish perspective, the ebIX® rule is already used in all exchanges.
  - One problem I can see if we change the rule to the ENTSO-E principles is that the receiver may reject documents from eSett if there are duplicates of the TSID. I.e. this may bring additional costs for the actors.
- Unicorn want to use a TS ID starting with a date (no time) concatenated with some more elements identifying party etc. – This will make the TS ID unique within the document.
- By adding hours, minutes and seconds to the TSID, it will be unique over time and also be within the maximum number of characters (an..35).

**Conclusion:**

- We want to keep the TSID unique and propose for Unicorn, as one alternative, to extend the date element in the TSID with hours, minutes and seconds in the documents from eSett, which will make the TSID unique.

**Homework:**

- Jari will verify the proposal with Unicorn – If rejected by Unicorn the item will be reopened at the next NTC meeting

**20.2 Identification of eSett**

Jan asked if we have an identification of eSett? The ID should be used in the examples.

**Homework:**

- Jari will make a request for an EIC code for eSett.
- When the EIC code is ready, Ove will update all XML examples

**20.3 "All or nothing" principle when acknowledging received documents**

From Jan:



According to the NBS-BRS (chapter 6.1.1), eSett will use the principle “All or nothing” when acknowledging received documents.

But must that be true for every actor? To me, the eSett solution is not the one that I would have implemented. If receiving 100 time series with one in error, I would be very happy to use the values from the other 99 time series – since I don’t know when I will get corrections and (specially for a BRP) time is running fast before I must trade for the next day, I would very much be able to use everything that is possible to use. So rejecting all or not all, should in my opinion be the decision by the recipient (and then related to the process – for some processes all time series are linked). I.e. if eSett don’t want to use the values from the 99 time series not in error should be their decision. If another actor wants to use the values should be their decision. But according to Figure 29 in the BRS the actor can’t do that. Nor it can be done according to the NEG Common rules and recommendations.

The solution is currently then: You must reject also the 99 time series not in error. I have not checked the ENTSO-E description of acknowledgements, but I would like to keep this in mind for a possible change in the future.

**Discussion:**

- Within the current rules, the solution for the actors is to send only one time series in each XML-document.

**Conclusion:**

- We keep the current rules

**20.4 The concept of “data packages”**

There is an eSett requirement to be able to distribute all available data, even if no “data flow” is defined for the flow.

The example on page 9 in the attached “Basse-Data\_Packages\_HLC(2).docx” was reviewed. Jon-Egil stressed that the documents specified in the BRSs should be used whenever possible. For other purposes, such as aggregated data, the ECAN/EPD or ESP/EAR documents are candidates.

**Homework:**

- Mats will go through the “data packages” and see what kind of information that may be requested from the actors, which not are part of the already defined documents. An example is the Norwegian request for total consumption (both profiled and non-profiled) per BS (RE) and MGA.

**20.5 EMFIP: Configuration market document**

Jan informed that within EMFIP there is a document called Configuration Market Document. Jan don’t think that we can't use it for any master data 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.

**Conclusion:**

- The item was added to a “[To remember list](#), see Appendix C

**Appendix A NBS Issue list – Will be deleted from next NTC meeting**

#	Issue	Clarification, discussion, conclusion and/or action
Issue 1	Structure data flows	<p><b>20150119:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See item 4</li> </ul> <p><b>20141217:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updated BRS for NBS master data exchange was reviewed and updated, see item 4</li> </ul> <p><b>20141014:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ove had made a first draft of a BRS for NBS master data exchange</li> </ul> <p><b>20140916:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ove will make a first draft of a BRS for NBS master data exchange.</li> </ul> <p><b>20140623:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ove had made a draft document</li> <li>• To be followed up</li> </ul> <p><b>20140523: Action:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ove will make a draft specification including all Structure data flows specified by Unicorn and an extension for Resource Object (Production Unit) Master Data</li> </ul>
Issue 2	Decision for means of communication	<p><b>20150119:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing new reported</li> <li>• The issue will be moved to a normal agenda, i.e. to be followed up</li> </ul> <p><b>20141217:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MADES will not be implemented in the first version.</li> <li>• From eSet steering group minutes:</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“SG decision: The SG decided that MADES will not be implemented before the NBS go-live. However, the message for the market participants will be that the MADES will be introduced in the later phase after the go-live.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The item will be followed up.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mats will distribute the conclusion, related to not implementing MADES, from the NBS steering group minutes to NTC.</li> </ul> <p><b>20141014:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no final decision regarding MADES.</li> <li>• The item will be followed up.</li> </ul> <p><b>20140916:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NBS will support FTP and SMTP and MADES is under investigation. If anyone want encryption, compression etc. MADES should be used</li> </ul> <p><b>20140623:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jari informed that NBS is planning to offer a combination of MADES, FTP and SMTP (see also information from 20140523 below)</li> </ul>

#	Issue	Clarification, discussion, conclusion and/or action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be followed up</li> </ul> <p><b>20140523:</b> To be followed up</p> <p><b>20140523:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MSG has approved the MADES as a standard, but not what version of the MADES, i.e. the standard version from Unicorn or a multithreaded version.</li> <li>• NBS propose to support FTP, SMTP and MADES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal was supported by NTC</li> <li>○ If anyone want encryption, compression etc. MADES should be used (there are no encryption in Sweden today related to settlement)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Issue 3	Should we regulate the sizes of the files (similar sizes ??)	<p><b>20150119:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information from Unicorn: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We haven't made any particular testing or measurements yet, but let's shortly recapitulate some information about this: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 1 MEC, weekly timeseries data (168 values/records), is approximately 10kB</li> <li>▪ the maximum size of messages is 50MB</li> <li>▪ there is requirement (NFR_044), which define message processing time for messages of 50 MECs (500kB)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Based on these, I would roughly propose an optimal size for messages to be 300-400 kB. This is of course just a recommendation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A maximum of 50 MB will be specified in the UGs.</li> <li>• The issue will be closed.</li> </ul> <p><b>20141217:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No answer from Unicorn.</li> <li>• The item will be followed up.</li> </ul> <p><b>20141014:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No answer from Unicorn.</li> <li>• The largest documents will contain metered values from production MPs in a MGA, i.e. no documents sent to/from NBS will be "large", hence not seen as a big issue.</li> <li>• The item will be followed up.</li> </ul> <p><b>20140916:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>To be followed up</b></li> </ul> <p><b>20140623:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ove informed that the Norwegian Elhub will have a limit on 10.000 Metering points in one document</li> <li>• The item was postponed</li> </ul> <p><b>20140523:</b> Awaiting Unicorn</p> <p><b>20140509: Action:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jari will ask Unicorn if they have a preference for a limit of file size</li> </ul>

#	Issue	Clarification, discussion, conclusion and/or action
Issue 4	Unicorn would like to get the Domain code for Nordic Market Area	<p><b>20150119:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jon-Egil send a request for a “Nordic Market Area”, with the “display name “Nordic Area”, since there is a restriction of 16 characters.</li> </ul> <p><b>20141217:</b> <i>Continued homework:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jon-Egil will follow up.</li> </ul> <p><b>20141014:</b> <i>Continued homework:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jon-Egil will follow up.</li> </ul> <p><b>20140916:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A MR was sent before summer, but no code have been issued</li> </ul> <p><i>Homework:</i> Jon-Egil will follow up</p> <p><b>20140623:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jon-Egil has sent a request to ENTSO-E for a EIC code, however not yet issued by ENTSO-E</li> </ul> <p><b>20140523: Action:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ove will make an MR for ENTSO-E for adding a Domain code for the Nordic Market Area and send it to Jon-Egil for submission to WG-EDI before the meeting June 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup></li> </ul>

## Appendix B Mismatch in schedule document usage

Hi,

I could in some way be more correct to specify **A19** as Process Type if the process is only covering the Intraday market, due A17 is telling the is covers all process (LongTerm, DayAhead and Intraday).

Venlig hilsen

**Ole Fredsø Weigelt**  
IT Serviceudvikling  
+4530674701  
[OFW@energinet.dk](mailto:OFW@energinet.dk)

**From:** Ove Nesvik [<mailto:ove.nesvik@edisys.no>]

**Sent:** 17. november 2014 10:30

**To:** Eveliina Ishii; Jan Owe (SvK); Jon-Egil Nordvik; Jari Hirvonen ([Jari.Hirvonen@fingrid.fi](mailto:Jari.Hirvonen@fingrid.fi)); Ole Fredsø Weigelt

**Cc:** Elmér, Mats; Kim Dahl ([kim.dahl@statnett.no](mailto:kim.dahl@statnett.no))

**Subject:** FW: Mismatch in schedule document usage

Dear Eveliina and all,

**All:** I do not have the business expertise to be sure I answer this (see below) correctly so please comment.

As far as understand, the document described in the *BRS for the Nordic TSO Scheduling and Ancillary Services Process* is sent from the BRPs (including NPS) to the TSOs, while the document described in the *NBS BRS for NPS-TSO* is sent from NPS and the TSOs to NBS.

However it looks a bit strange that the document from NPS to the TSOs not specify Elbas and Elspot as process types (?)

Attribute	Nordic TSO Schedules BRS v2r1A 20140207.pdf	Nordic Balance Settlement NBS for NPS-TSO Draft 1r3A – 20141017.pdf
Process Type	<b>A17</b> Schedule day  Should we add Elspot and Elbas, i.e. <b>A01</b> Day-ahead (Elspot) <b>A19</b> Intraday accumulated (Elbas)?	<b>A01</b> Day-ahead (Elspot) <b>A19</b> Intraday accumulated (Elbas)
Sender Role	<b>A08</b> Balance Responsible party (Nord Pool Spot is seen as a BRP)	<b>A04</b> System Operator <b>A11</b> Market Operator
Receiver Role	<b>A04</b> System Operator	<b>A05</b> Imbalance Settlement Responsible
Out Party	Balance Responsible party, usage: see 0	The unique identification of the Market Operator
Capacity Contract Type	Not used internally in the Nordic market	<missing>

Capacity Agreement Identification	<missing> Do we need a portfolio in this document?	The unique identification of the portfolio in question
-----------------------------------	---	--

Are we able to clarify this via mail? Alternatively, do we need a telephone conference? Alternatively, is it good enough to discuss it at the next NTC meeting, December 17<sup>th</sup>?

Rgds,

Ove Nesvik  
Senior rådgiver / Senior adviser  
Mobil (+47) 928 22 908



Havnelageret  
Langkaia 1  
0150 Oslo  
Tel: (+47) 22 42 13 80  
Fax: (+47) 22 42 26 40  
[www.edisys.no](http://www.edisys.no)

**From:** Eveliina Ishii [<mailto:eveliina.ishii@npspot.com>]  
**Sent:** 17. november 2014 09:56  
**To:** Ove Nesvik  
**Subject:** Mismatch in schedule document usage

Hi Ove,

Follow up on earlier email conversation (7.-8.11.2014), there is a mismatch in Schedule document usage. Please see following and please inform me which one is the correct one to be used and please correct the information in the erroneous one.

Nordic Trading System BRS (Nordic Trading System BRS 1r1C – 20141016.docx), Table 2 refers to use following:

Day-ahead schedules per BRP	ESS Schedule document, See BRS for the Nordic TSO Scheduling and Ancillary Services Process [10]
-----------------------------	--

I assume this is Table 1 in Nordic TSO Scheduling and Ancillary Services Process BRS, (Nordic TSO Schedules BRS v2r1A 20140207.pdf).

However, we have discussed that NPS should send schedules according to description in Nordic Settlement System NBS for NPS-TSO, Table 5 (Nordic Balance Settlement NBS for NPS-TSO Draft 1r3A – 20141017.pdf).

I found following differences between these two documents / tables:

<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Nordic TSO Schedules BRS v2r1A 20140207.pdf</b>	<b>Nordic Balance Settlement NBS for NPS-TSO Draft 1r3A – 20141017.pdf</b>
Process Type	A17 Schedule day	A01 Day-ahead (Elspot) A19 Intraday accumulated (Elbas)
Sender Role	A08 Balance Responsible party (Nord Pool Spot is seen as a BRP)	A04 System Operator A11 Market Operator
Receiver Role	A04 System Operator	A05 Imbalance Settlement Responsible
Out Party	Balance Responsible party, usage: see 0	The unique identification of the Market Operator
Capacity Contract Type	Not used internally in the Nordic market	<missing>
Capacity Agreement Identification	<missing>	The unique identification of the portfolio in question

Br,  
Eveliina

## Appendix C “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 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