



Meeting minutes – Stakeholder meeting 13/01/2025 on Transfer of Energy Design Note

Attendance list

Market parties

Name	First name	Organisation
Barbieux	Sébastien	Axpo
Celis	Chris	Febeg
Corradi	Jennifer	Energy pool
Cuypers	Katrien	Engie
De Corte	Emanuel	Colruyt Group
Deblocq	Vincent	Febeg
Demeyer	Valentijn	Scholt
Donnay de Casteau	Loic	Engie
Dubois	Pierre	Totalenergies
EID	Laura	Energy pool
Gelpi	Cédric	Engie
Gorlé	Sophie	Arcade engineering
Harlem	Steven	Luminus
Hubert	Benjamin	Next Kraftwerke
Jansen	Geert	Engie
Joye	Robbert	Next Kraftwerke
Laleman	Ruben	Engie
Lefebvre	Yves	Centrica
Mashlakov	Aleksei	Centrica
Mast	Pauline	Luminus

Meynckens	Geert	Centrica
Moreira	Débora	Energy Pool
Mouton	Victor	Accenture
Peeters	Stef	Centrica
Peirelinck	Thijs	Centrica
Somers	Wim	Ecopower
Van Bossuyt	Michael	Febeliex
Vandenabeele	Thymen	Accenture
Verhegge	Karen	Luminus
Vernaillen	Dries	Engie
Vossen	David	Engie
Vrolijkx	Kristof	Centrica

Regulators & public administrations

Name	First name	Organisation
Cousein	Cyril	Vlaamse Nutsregulator
De Deyne	Laura	Vlaamse Nutsregulator
Debrigode	Patricia	CREG
Flechet	Renaud	CWaPE
Haaker	Nick	Brugel
Marchand	Stéphane	CWaPE
Michiels	Marc	Vlaamse Nutsregulator
Uytterhoeven	Anke	Vlaamse Nutsregulator

System operators

Name	First name	Organisation
Adam	Louise	Synergrid
Benzennou	Daphné	Sibelga
Boisseleau	François	Synergrid
Bosschaerts	Caroline	Elia
Buelens	Roeland	Fluvius
De Schouwer	Stefan	Atrias
Decoster	Luc	Fluvius
Dessart	Delphine	Resa
Deweever	Philippe	Fluvius
Glorieux	Jacques	Synergrid
Koelman	Nicolas	Elia
Loos	Rob	Elia
Lopez Martinez	David	Ores
Macé	Odille	Sibelga
Malbrancke	Marc	Synergrid
Mettens	Sybille	Elia
Milis	Kevin	Synergrid
Motté	Arno	Elia
Serrarens	Simon	Elia
Van den Bosch	Sven	Fluvius
Vervloesem	Lode	Fluvius

Meeting minutes

The meeting was supported by a slide deck, available on the Synergrid website¹. The goal of the meeting was to give the market parties an overview of design note on ToE, and to announce the public consultation of this design note, which will run from 20/01/2025 until 28/02/2025. These meeting minutes aim to capture the interactions between the market parties and the system operators; for the general content of the meeting, please refer to the used slides.

General remarks

A first question pertains to the scope of the design note, as market parties wonder if congestion management is included in the scope of the design note. This is not the case, congestion management is out of scope for this design note.

Various members of FEBEG remark on the proposal of the system operators, which consists of a gradual roll-out of the central settlement model across all Elia balancing products and all voltage levels, with the corrected model with correction at invoice being available as an optional model at on the Elia grid. FEBEG has always been a proponent of the adaption of the corrected model with correction at source as a default model. A first remark that is made, is that the proposal put forward by the system operators means that the suppliers will want to reevaluate if they still want the corrected model if it will only be available as an optional model, as this means extra implementation for something that will only be available on a part of the market. The system operators wish to stress here that the roadmap contained within the design note only runs until the end of 2026, and that analysis are foreseen, of both the flexibility needs of the system as well as what the required steps are to unlock this required flexibility. That being said, making the corrected model available on any other grid than that of Elia, is not part of the roadmap, so will not happen before the end of 2026. No decision has yet been taken for what will happen after that date. Additionally, the system operators also wish to stress that the selected default model also needs to work on low voltage, and that the current maturity in energy matters of a low voltage consumer is different than that of a high voltage consumer, and that this consideration was also a factor in the arriving at the proposal currently made.

Secondly, members of FEBEG wonder why the proposal made by the members of Synergrid focusses on further extending an existing model, the central settlement model, when currently the Opt-Out and Pass-Through regimes account for an overwhelming majority of ToE contracts. In response to this second remarks, the system operators outline that it is a requirement to use the same ToE arrangement for an FSP-supplier couple for aFRR and mFRR. As aFRR only has the Opt-Out and Pass-Through Regimes available, this “forces” a lot of cases towards these two regimes. Additionally, the SO’s feel that the fact that the majority of ToE contracts currently are using the Opt-Out and Pass Through Regimes is not a problem in itself. The proposed ToE framework serves as an alternative for the cases where bilateral negotiations on an Opt-out regime fail to provide results that are acceptable to all parties. It should be clearly understood that it is not the goal of the system operators to “force” market parties to switch to the CSM, but rather develop CSM as an extra option to facilitate the market. Furthermore, the system operators note that the demand over the past few years of the members of FEBEG was to have a system put in place that would deliver data in support of financial compensation also for the alternative regimes. The system operators support the question and the possibility will be investigated.

¹<https://www.synergrid.be/nl/marktoverleg/pdg-flexibiliteit> and/or <https://www.synergrid.be/fr/concertation-du-marche/pdg-flexibilite>

Members of FEBEG also note that the proposed implementation choice for the Corrected model, the correction on the invoice will mean that a large part of the implementation workload rests on the suppliers.

Furthermore, market parties indicate that, once the corrected model would be in place, they feel that it would be far easier to expand to new clients or services than the central settlement model. The system operators respond that, even if this were to be the case, the need for flexibility in the system is growing at a rapid pace, so speed of implementation from the current status is also important, and has influenced the choice of model. Furthermore, implementation of the corrected model on low voltage will also require that certain customer protection related aspects are addressed, which will take time.

Centrica wants to know if there are any steps foreseen to facilitate FSPs in their prospecting: would it be possible to know for instance the supplier of a customer, or to get the load curve? The system operators state that there are privacy concerns surrounding these kinds of data, meaning that they can only be shared if proper contractual relationships exist between relevant parties.

Central settlement model and negotiations

Luminus remarks that the currently existing negotiation framework is an inherent part of the central settlement model, and furthermore that perhaps not all market actors would support a shortening of this negotiation time, as it takes some time to negotiate a balanced and fair contract. Furthermore, it is also pointed out that this procedure falls under the remit of the CREG. The system operators thank Luminus for their feedback, and stipulate that it is exactly for these reasons that the design note will be publicly consulted: to gather the feedback from market parties, and then to present this feedback, along with the proposal, to the various regulators.

Implementation related questions

Febeliec wonders how the corrected model will work in terms of data, what information will be shared with the supplier, and will the active FSP(s) be identified. It is clarified that, in case of the corrected model, in case of the CM, there is no need to send FSP-data towards the supplier. The supplier will get the uncorrected volume, the corrected volume and the delta between these two volumes. This will allow the supplier to draw up their invoice, while at the same time also not revealing the identity of any active FSP(s). Settlement of flexibility between the grid user and their FSP(s) is a separate track, that they need to manage between them.

Centrica wonders about the overlap with supply split, in how the grid fee billing will be handled. The system operators respond that they do not see this overlap: here, in the case of ToE, the grid fee is not split over multiple parties, which is different from the case of supply split, where the grid fee does need to be split across multiple parties.

Luminus wonders about how the impact on supplier/BRP forecasting will be handled in the corrected model: when there is no correction at the source, the received metering data will still be impacted by a third party action, thereby making it harder to accurately forecast customer behaviour. The system operators clarify that on high voltage, all relevant data (uncorrected & corrected volumes and delta between these two) will be sent in one message, in order to enable the suppliers and BRPs to take the corrected data into account. At the DSO, should the corrected model be rolled out in the future, data will be provided in a similar way. If there are specific information requirements, market parties are invited to include these requirements in their consultation reaction.

Luminus inquires if, at the high voltage level, it will be possible to have multiple models per customer. The system operators respond that a priori the grid user will be in charge of choosing which model to use with which FSP for which asset. Combination of different models for the same grid user needs to be investigated in further detail.

Closing remarks

The system operators and Synergrid thank all meeting participants for their presence and their input during the meeting. All market parties are warmly invited to respond to the public consultation on the design note with their remarks or comments.