

# Nordic CCM SH Meeting – meeting minutes

February 9, 2023, 9.00-11.00 (Webinar)

Participants	
Total participation: 59, including the SI WG members.	

Text in non-italics are comments, statements, questions or claims from the stakeholder(s).

Text in italics are answers or comments provided by the Nordic CCM project.

<b>1. Welcome, EPR overview: progress, timeline, evaluation report (9.00-9.10)</b>
<b>2. Current status and overall timeline (09.10-09.30)</b>
<p><b>Comment:</b> We think that starting the period mid-December and communicate this 20 Jan is just not acceptable. It is not an issue to restart the period if you find issues, in general that is more a sanity check.</p> <p><b>CCM project:</b> <i>The Nordic CCM project decided to delay information to stakeholders and publication of EPR data until January. There was a need to be able to trust the stability of the system and processes before announcing the start. We also considered this a better timing due to the upcoming Christmas break, perceiving a desire from stakeholders to get the market report as close to the notification as possible.</i></p>
<b>3. Result elaboration DA (09.30-10.10)</b>
<p><b>Question:</b> Can you define what is meant by negative socio-economic welfare since that can never occur in an NTC model so why could it happen in a FB model?</p> <p><b>CCM project:</b> <i>the socio-economic welfare comparison in the Nordic EPR refers to the difference between FB SEW and the NTC SEW of the day-ahead timeframe, i.e. FB SEW – NTC SEW. When the CCM project refers to negative SEW, it means that the difference between the FB SEW and NTC SEW is negative. In other words, the NTC SEW is larger than the FB SEW.</i></p> <p><b>Question:</b> Is the Welfare only measured within the Nordics or also including Cross-zonal flows to continent and welfare in adjacent BZs outside of Nordic?</p> <p><b>CCM project:</b> <i>the following SEW values are measured/compared.</i></p> <p><i>Total SDAC MC region: The SEW in total SDAC market-coupling region.</i></p> <p><i>Nordic CCR</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Congestion Income (CI) on borders inside the Nordic CCR.</i></li><li>• <i>Producer and consumer surplus from the 4 Nordic countries.</i></li></ul> <p><i>Borders going out of the Nordic (Hansa/borders to Baltic)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>CI on the borders going from a Nordic TSO to the continent.</i></li><li>• <i>Half of CI will go to the Nordic Area while the other half will go to the neighbouring area.</i></li></ul> <p><b>Question:</b> Will you publish the FB topology for the market coupling simulations?</p> <p><b>CCM project:</b> <i>Yes. The FB topology will be published in the Nordic CCM and NRCC EPR data publication handbook.</i></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> the Week 2 results have some issues related to the date convention, e.g. some hours are US date format and some are EU format.</p> <p><b>CCM project:</b> <i>Thank you for letting us know. We will look into that.</i></p> <p><b>Question:</b> Can it in simplified terms be assumed that bigger surplus in Congestion Revenue means that there has been INCREASED price differences due to FB vs NTC?</p> <p><b>CCM project:</b> <i>No. CR is a result of flows and price differences. Both may change.</i></p>
<b>4. Result elaboration ID (10.10-10.50)</b>
<p><b>Question:</b> These graphical reports you mentioned, will you publish them afterwards for the weeks that have already passed, w50-w2?</p> <p><b>CCM project:</b> <i>Yes, the weekly graphical report will be published covering from week 46 on.</i></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> In general, for both DA+ID data, have you considered sharing the information in another format, for example a dashboard? I really like the graphs from the appendix of the reports, but at the same time they are a bit difficult to deep dive into, if they are only graphs. A PowerBI or a dash would be very useful to look into the details.</p> <p><b>CCM project:</b> <i>The TSOs will evaluate the request and get back to the SHs later.</i></p> <p><b>Question:</b> The numbers in MW are difficult to comprehend, e.g. how can DK2 ever in one MTU have a total of 8000 MW imp/exp (or even imp+exp)?</p> <p><b>CCM project:</b> <i>The presentation contains a mistake for double counting the HVDC capacity. This issue has been corrected after the SH event. The presentation slide deck (i.e. slide 6) is also updated to reflect the correct information. Indeed, the DK2 trading space in the ATCE results reaches around 6000MW.</i></p> <p><b>Question:</b> Could you please comment on how the non-intuitive flows are taken into the consideration in the analysis?</p> <p><b>CCM project:</b> <i>This question is not clear. The CCM project kindly asked the SH to provide clarity via email.</i></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> please keep the csv files or provide both xlsx and csv</p> <p><b>CCM project:</b> <i>The TSOs will evaluate the request and get back to the SHs.</i></p> <p><b>Question:</b> For example in week 2-2023 there is in the FB EPR an Adverse Price-Volume flow between SE1 and SE2 in 147 of 168 hours while the max scheduled exchange was only 2065 MW and that naturally is hard to understand. If the magnitude is as big as 147 out of 168 hours with Adverse Price-Flow across SE1-SE2 border needs checking, but at the same time it was observed at least one</p>

hour where there was zero (0) Scheduled Exchange but still a clear price difference between SE1 (higher price) and SE2 (lower price) which is hard to comprehend, e.g. see hour 06 (06-07) on 11 JAN.

**CCM project:** *What we find is that FB gives more capacity from the north to the south of the Nordic system (north being NO3, NO4, SE1, SE2 and FI). This is done by using production in SE1 instead of SE2, and NO4 and NO3 which loads the lines on the Norwegian side more than when production is in SE2. This also creates some of the non-intuitive flows that you see. So yes, the restriction is not necessarily between SE1-SE2, but determined by how flows are loading CNECs further south (this is one of the main trends, but of course does not hold for all hours). Please note that the CCM project strongly recommends that stakeholders use the flow-based allocated flow data when preparing for flow-based, not data on Scheduled exchange. Flow-based allocated flow is a result of the simulations (i.e. computed by PTDF \* NP) whereas Scheduled exchange is postprocessed computation that does not reflect the optimal solution found in the optimization and thereby not the expected flow in the system.*

**Question:** Can the Nordic TSOs coordinate with the neighbouring TSOs to ensure the capacity calculation methodologies of the neighbouring CCRs the same at the CCR borders?

**CCM project:** *The Advanced hybrid coupling is discussed within Hansa Capacity calculation region at the moment. The Nordic TSOs ensure that the Nordic CCM is harmonized with the CCMs of the neighbouring CCRs.*

## 5. AOB and closing remarks (10.50-11.00)

All participants are thanked for their constructive inputs!

Please fill in the short survey: <https://esmaker.net/nx2/s.aspx?id=aa2e48ea2142>

The presentations have been uploaded on the Nordic RSC website: <https://nordic-rsc.net/flow-based/documents-presentations/>

---