


<b>Minutes Nordic TSO XML format meeting</b> <b>Date:</b> September, Tuesday 8 <sup>th</sup> and Wednesday 9 <sup>th</sup> <b>Time:</b> 9:30-18:00 and 9:00 – 16:00 <b>Place:</b> EdiSys, Oslo	
September 25 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	

**Participants:** Christian Odgaard, Energinet.dk (first day)  
Jan Owe, SvK  
Jon-Egil Nordvik (Convenor)  
Mikael Kristensen, Energinet.dk  
Ove Nesvik, EdiSys (Secretary)  
Roar Grindstrand, Statnett

**To:** Participants  
Antti Niemi, Nord Pool Spot  
Christian Hoang Huy Le, Statnett  
Heli Anttila, Fingrid  
Jari Hirvonen, Fingrid  
Willem Karel D van der Meijden, Energinet.dk

**CC:** Jan-Olov Lundberg, SvK  
Oscar Ludwigs, SvK  
Tor Bjarne Heiberg, Statnett  
Tor Åge Halvorsen, NordPool

**Attachment:** None

### 1 Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved with the following additions:

- Roars question; if a *Test flag*, *Acknowledgement request*, *Application reference* and *Document type/Process type/Business type* should be a part of the SOAP (ECP) header was not answered at the latest meeting and was reopened under item 3.
- Addition of a Short status report to NEG, see 10.1 under AOB.

### 2 Approval of previous meeting minutes

The minutes from previous meeting were approved.

### 3 Review of Nordic TSO common rules and recommendation document

#### *Common Nordic XML rules and recommendations*

- As homework from previous meeting everybody should review Appendix B (Interchange agreement) of the *Common Nordic XML rules and recommendations* and verify if there still is a need for this appendix. There was a short discussion related to the topic, which concluded that Appendix B is proposed kept, but will be forwarded to NEG, together with the *Common Nordic XML rules and recommendations*, for a final decision.
  - Jan mentioned that Sweden has a national interchange agreement that covers the Swedish needs.
  - Ove mentioned that the Norwegian Ediel documentation is referencing the interchange agreement in the *Common Nordic XML rules and recommendations* and that this will have to be rewritten if the interchange agreement is removed.
- Also as homework from previous meeting, Ove had renamed *Common rules and recommendations* to *Common Nordic XML rules and recommendations*, throughout the document.

- The document was reviewed and Mikael will as homework make a proposal for how to handle Web Services.
- The *Common Nordic XML rules and recommendations* will, after Mikael have written some WS rules, be sent to NEG for approval. NEG will be asked to especially review the interchange agreement in appendix B.

### ***Nordic CC document***

Also under this item the Nordic CC document was discussed:

- Ove had started making Word tables for the relevant code lists, but wanted a discussion on what the content of the code lists should be before finalising the work. It was agreed to only document codes used in the Nordic TSO BRSs in the Nordic TSO CC document. The document will be updated and sent for QA to the project group after finalisation of the BRS.
- It was discussed if we should use ENTSO-E or CEFACT codes, e.g. which codes to be used for *Code list responsible agency*?
  - **A01** ETSO (ETSO code)
  - **A10** EAN (GS1) (ETSO code)
  - **9** GS1 (UN/CEFACT code)
  - **305** ETSO (UN/CEFACT code)

For the time being the project group proposes to keep both possibilities, since ENTSO-E codes probably is needed towards TSOs south of the Nordic countries and CEFACT codes are needed in the Nordic downstream market. At a later stage the question should be raised to the ebIX/ENTSO-E harmonisation group (HG). The project group prefers the CEFACT codes.

The question will be forwarded to NEG for discussion.

Roars question from previous meeting, which is related to the content of the *Header* (SOAP), was reopened. This includes:

- Acknowledgement request
  - Both ebIX and ENTSO-E have skipped this element. Instead it shall be described in the process documentation if an acknowledgement is to be sent or not. The element will not be used in the Nordic TSO XML format.
- Test flag
  - Denmark is not using a *test flag* today, while Norway and Sweden are using it. All three countries participating at the meeting seems however positive to add a *test flag*, either in the SOAP header or in the document header, or in both. Ove will also bring the question to the HG.
- Application reference
  - We assume similar information can be put in the *process* element in the ECP proposal (see below).
- Document type, Process type, Business type
  - Will not be used in the Nordic TSO XML, unless added by the HG, ebIX or ENTSO-E.

The following SOAP version 1.2 header elements have earlier been proposed in the project:

- ebMS version 3.0 extensions:
  - to
  - from
  - message Id
  - timestamp
- And with the following ECP extensions:

- ultimate receiver
- process
  - Is this on the level of ESS or ECAN (ENTSO-E process)... or on a broader level, such as NOIS and NorNed? We assume however that the lower level is intended, e.g. ESS or ECAN. And also that this element is similar to the *EDIFACT UNB Application reference* element.
- security data
- priority
- payload encryption
- time to live
- And Nordic TSO XML extensions:
  - responsible agency (e.g. NOIS, NorNed, Nordic TSO XML....)

On the previous meeting it was discussed how to handle a *Quantity quality* (metered, estimated...) and “no-value” or “nil”. Today this is joined in one status element. There was however no clear conclusion on the previous meeting, i.e. “A status will be added as one (two?) separate elements”. The item is put on the agenda for the next ebIX, ETSO and EFET Harmonisation Group (HG). The question was postponed until next meeting (after discussion in the HG).

**Homework:**

- Mikael will write some WS rules, to be agreed by mail.
- Ove will send the *Common Nordic XML rules and recommendations* document to NEG for approval (after agreement on the WS chapter by mail).
- Ove will send the discussion topic related to CEFACT or ENTSO-E codes to NEG.

**4 Review of acknowledgement document**

The acknowledgement process described in the Capacity process BRS was reviewed. The process description will be moved to the *Common Nordic XML rules and recommendations* document (the version after the one sent to NEG).

Denmark needs a *matching period* in the acknowledgement of the production schedules (operational schedules), where parts of an intra-day production schedule are acknowledged (a production schedule is confirmed from a given time). Today rejection/confirmation is done using the acknowledgement document within ENTSO-E and using APERAK in Denmark, Norway and Sweden. The solution may be:

- Addition of a confirm/reject document as an answer on an *operational schedule*, which includes a *matching period* element for stating the part of the production (operational) schedule that is confirmed.
- Addition of a *matching period* element in the *Acknowledgement document* for stating the part of the production (operational) schedule that is confirmed.

The agreed solution was to add an *Operational schedule confirmation* document in the BRS to handle confirmation and rejection of operational schedules.

Among other the following changes were made:

- Acknowledgment of processing will always be used between Nordic TSOs, but for communication towards/between other actors this will be specified in the relevant BRS.
- The general part of the detailed description of elements used will be moved to the Nordic TSO XML CC Library, while the specific parts, such as codes to be used, will be kept in the process model (in the *Common Nordic XML rules and recommendations* document).
- The class diagram was extended with a *Time series* level.

- The *Process type* was removed from the *Acknowledgement document*.

To be reviewed on next meeting.

## 5 Other technical questions

Code lists will be maintained in XML as separate code lists for separate code list responsible agencies. We will use *union* in XML to merge code lists when needed.

Ove had gone through the QDTs in the MagicDraw model and added a *code list responsible agency* and a *code list*.

## 6 Scheduling process

### 6.1 BRS (Business Requirements Specification)

#### *Homework from previous meetings:*

- Finland, Norway and Sweden should find out which rules that apply to resending of schedules, i.e. must all previously sent schedules be resent if changes to only on schedule, see 13.3 (9.3 after changes on previous meeting), 3<sup>rd</sup> numbered item?

**Conclusion:** The document was updated with:

Denmark: All time series in a document must be sent in all retransmitted documents. If a time series is left out, it is interpreted as the time series will be deleted.

Finland: TBD

Norway: If changes to a time series, it is enough to resend the changed time series. However, in the case of errors, the whole document (all time series in a document) will be rejected. There shall always be a whole day-and-night in a schedule.

Sweden: TBD

- All should verify the rule: “*A time series shall be suppressed by zeroing out all the time interval class quantities in the time series*”.

**Conclusion:** The rule was changed to:

An *Operational schedule* cannot be cancelled or deleted. However it is possible to send zero-value schedules.

- Finland and Norway should verify if the *Market schedule* sent from the *Balance responsible party* to *Imbalance settlement responsible* really is a part of the *Scheduling process* (or if it is a part of the *Trade process*).

**Conclusion:** The question was postponed. Note that the question relates to both the sequence diagram for market schedules in chapter 3.1 and the activity diagram in chapter 7.1

- It was proposed to remove *Classification type* from the *Market schedule document* – To be decided on next meeting

**Conclusion:** We keep it for two reasons; we want to be in line with ENTSO-E (ESS) and it might be a need for it.

In addition the *Classification type* was added to the *Operational schedule document*.

- What to do with the *Matching period start/end* will also be decided n next meeting, i.e. if we should add dependency rules or remove the elements.

**Conclusion:** *Matching period start and end* were deleted from the *Market schedule document*.

- Since *Capacity agreement Identification* and *Capacity contract type* only is used together with Business type *A03 External trade explicit capacity*, and there are no explicit capacity in the Nordic countries, these fields were proposed removed – To be decided on next meeting.

**Conclusion:** The elements are used in NorNed and might be needed for other exchanges external to the Nordic countries. However, since it's not used in the Nordic countries they were removed.

- Should we use UN/CEFACT or ETSO *Role codes*?

**Conclusion:** See questions to NEG in 10.1 under AOB

- All tries to fill in the messages sent and received today in the table structure shown above. Fill in the description, sender and receiver role and as many other characteristics as possible.

**Conclusion:** The table was filled in for several of the documents. The filling of the tables will be continued on the next meeting.

#### ***Other changes done to the BRS:***

- An *Operational schedule confirmation* document was added to handle confirmation and rejection of operational schedules.
- The *International system operator* was given the Nordic role code Z01. However, Ove will see if there is a suitable code in the UN/CEFACT code list.
- A *Contract type* was added in the *Operational schedule* from the ERRP Reserve Allocation Result Document
- The Document identification table was updated for the *Market-* and *Operational schedules*
- Dependency matrixes were made for *Market-* and *Operational schedules*
- The element *Business type characteristics* was added to the *Operational schedule* (wind, hydro, ...)

The rest of the business documents will be handled as a main item on the next meeting.

#### ***Homework:***

- Ove will see if there is a suitable code in the UN/CEFACT code list for *International system operator*.

### **6.2 RSM (Requirements Specification Mapping) (if time)**

The item was postponed.

### **6.3 XML schemas (if time)**

The item was postponed.

### **7 Agree on how to identify schedules**

The item was postponed.

## 8 Detailing of the communication rules (if time)

The communication rules were handled under item 3. These are as far as possible finished, but the item will be reopened when we have more information the Harmonisation group.

## 9 Next meeting

- October, Monday 19<sup>th</sup> and Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup>, Oslo (EdiSys)

## 10 AOB

### 10.1 Short status report to NEG

*Status:*

- There have been 3 two-day meetings since the latest NEG meeting (April 21<sup>st</sup>).
- The project phase 2 (schedules) are expected finalised (documents ready for approval by NEG) after next meeting (October 19-20).
- A main reason for the delay (phase 2 was planned finalised spring 2009) is that the project has made two extra documents, which has taken some extra time, but also will make later phases more efficient and faster, i.e.,
  - Nordic TSO XML CC Library
  - Nordic TSO XML Common rules and recommendations.In addition the project group has made a complete review and update of [www.ediel.org](http://www.ediel.org), including publishing of the first reports from the Nordic TSO XML project.
- Phase 3 is expected to be carried out within 2-3- meetings, probably early 2010 if the project group manages to find enough time for meetings.

*Requests to NEG:*

- NEG is asked to approve version 1 of the Nordic TSO XML Common rules and recommendations on their next meeting, including review the interchange agreement (IA) in appendix B. The IA seems not to be needed in Sweden, but is referenced in Norwegian Ediel documentation.
- NEG is asked to discuss if we should use ENTSO-E or CEFAC codes when both are possible, e.g. which codes to be used for *Code list responsible agency*?
  - **A01** ETSO (ETSO code)
  - **A10** EAN (GS1) (ETSO code)
  - **9** GS1 (UN/CEFACT code)
  - **305** ETSO (UN/CEFACT code)

For the time being the project group proposes to keep both possibilities, since ENTSO-E codes probably is needed towards TSOs south of the Nordic countries and CEFAC codes are needed in the Nordic downstream market. At a later stage the question should be raised to the ebIX/ENTSO-E harmonisation group (HG). The project group prefers the CEFAC codes.

## **Appendix A TO BE DISCUSSED AND AGREED**

1. Should the new principles for time series identification in Sweden influence this project?
2. Follow up on *Special rules related to NOIS*:
  - Reason codes have to be sent in a separate time series. The related quantities must always have a dummy value, but the value will be ignored by NOIS.
3. The Process area *Nominate capacity* (opposite to a schedule the nominations are referencing a contract) is suggested to be define in a separate document for the complete nomination process. A proposal for this new project activity will be forwarded to the next NEG SC.

## Appendix B EXTRACT OF THE OVERALL PROJECT PLAN

Phase 2 (spring 2009), Scheduling process covered by the ESS and ERRP documents from ETSO

- operational and financial
- balancing and reserves
- In addition phase 2 will include:
  - A document containing common rules and recommendations, *including* detailing of the communication appendix in the BRS for *Transfer Capacity*
  - A document covering a common *Domain model* for the Nordic market.
  - Agree on how to identify schedules, i.e. can the TSO XML project base its identification principle on the new principles for time series identification in Sweden?
  - Preparation for implementation verification of schedules between the Nordic TSOs.

Phase 3 (autumn 2009), Bid process,

- Bid to the Balance regulation market
- Activation messages
- Bid process to the Spot market (dependent on NordPool)

Phase 4 (spring 2010), Settlement process

- Metered data
- Settlement result, including prices

Phase 5 (autumn 2010), Prices and other Nord Pool messages (dependent on Nord Pool)

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 and a RSM (including related XML schemas) will be made for the relevant business process. The project group may chose to combine two or more business processes into one BRS and/or RSM, if this seems suitable.

Activity	Spring 2009	Autumn 2009	Spring 2010	Autumn 2010
Phase 2, Scheduling process				
Phase 3, Bid process				
Phase 4, Settlement process				
Phase 5, Prices and other Nord Pool messages				