

CWE MC – Flow Based Users Group

Meeting minutes, 30th of September 2014

Version	1
Date	30-09-2014
Author	Zineb LAZRAK
	Name and company
MARKET PARTIES	
	<i>Thomas RINKE_Statkraft</i>
	<i>Kilian LEYKAM_Vattenfall</i>
	<i>Guillaume LANDENNE_GDF SUEZ</i>
	<i>Nicolas KUEN_GDF SUEZ</i>
	<i>Kalisch FRIEDER_EnBW</i>
	<i>Hervé ROBERT_ALPIQ</i>
	<i>Michael BONDE_EON</i>
	<i>Nicolas BARBANNAUD_EDF Trading</i>
	<i>Filippo PIROVANO_EDF Trading</i>
	<i>Patrick SALLEE_EDF Trading</i>
	<i>Yves SCHÖNENBERGER_AXPO Trading</i>
	<i>Matthias HEVELING_RWEST</i>
	<i>Régine MANDIC_Verbund Trading</i>
	<i>Benjamin AMSELLEM_Citadel</i>
	<i>Eric LEFEVRE_Noble</i>
	<i>Rund OTTER_Market Parties Platform</i>
	<i>Bohdan VRAZDA_ČEZ Trading</i>
	<i>Milan KUČERA_ČEZ Trading</i>
NRAs	
	<i>Joran DE KONING_ACM</i>
	<i>Youri VAN DER DRIFT_ACM</i>
	<i>Matthias RÜTZEL_BNetzA</i>
	<i>Adrien THIRION_CRE</i>
	<i>Alain MARIEN_CREG</i>
CWE PARTNERS	
	<i>Nicolas PIERREUX_APX - FB expert</i>
	<i>Philippe NOURY_RTE - FB expert</i>
	<i>Joël HOEKSEMA_APX - FB expert</i>
	<i>Philippe VASSILOPOULOS_EPEX SPOT - Head of product design</i>
	<i>Dietmar BECK_Amprion - Regulators referent</i>
	<i>Raphaël BOURGEOIS_Elia</i>
	<i>Pieter SCHAVEMAKER_E-bridge Consulting - FB expert</i>
	<i>Jérémie BARON_Eurogroup Consulting - PMO</i>
	<i>Zineb LAZRAK_Eurogroup Consulting - PMO</i>

Agenda:

1. Project Status
2. Parallel run performance study
3. NRA synthesis of public consultation outcome
4. Data publication for Go Live
5. Data publication after Go Live (common discussion)
6. Further exchanges with Market Parties
7. AOB

1 Project Status

CWE Project Partners informed about some major achievements since the last FBUG meeting:

Events

- The CWE Market Forum on June, 23rd which focused on the explanations for specific parallel run situations
- The NRA publication consultation from June 2nd to June 30th.

The outcome of this public consultation was included in the approval package that was published on CASC website.

- The final adjusted approval package was submitted to CWE NRAs on August, 1st
- **CWE Project Parties are currently working on the remaining requests from NRAs which are to be tackled before Go Live. The answering letter with approaches and timings will also be published on CASC website.**

Publications

- Shadow Auctions ATCs are published since April 18th.
- The fixed anonymized CBCOs are published ex-post as of July 2014.

Question/Concern from MPs: MPs observed that fixed anonymized CBCOs have not been published since July and request data to be actualized on a regular basis.

Answer: Since the data is updated manually, it takes some time to actualize the data. However, Project Parties will ensure that actualization is made at a more regular basis.

Question/Concern from MPs: can fixed anonymized CBCOs be published after Go Live on daily basis? The MPs request such publication to be done earlier than in D+2.

Answer: This data is foreseen to be provided on a daily basis at D+2.

- Centralization of LT Nomination values and publication on CASC website.
- The “Special investigations on Market Surplus losses” report was published in August.
- **Project Parties are currently working on the overview of the positive days.**

CWE Project Planning

Project Parties’ efforts are focused on the technical and operational implementation in order to meet the acceptance criteria.

- The last test phase (full integration tests between all systems) is currently being performed with TSO CS v1.1 including all functionalities in order to meet the technical readiness expected in November.
- Further full integration tests will be performed again in January with the Go Live TSO CS version supporting Italian borders functionalities

Question/Concern from MPs: Do you intend to rerun the limitations on import/export capacities including the impact of the integration of Italian borders?

Answer: Italian borders will not be part of the FB Market Coupling: no computation is planned with Italian borders..

- The final market operators training and member tests will be performed in February/March just before Go Live;
- Project Parties will then prepare for the Go Live in March 2015.

The shift of the CWE FB Go Live date to March, 31st 2015

- Elia has informed the project about the specific situation for Belgium this winter given the unexpected unavailability of a third of centralized generation capacity and the risk of load shedding. The Belgian market will therefore need to cope with an unprecedented situation leading to potential price spikes and even curtailment. While this risk exists even under normal winter conditions, it significantly increases in a scenario of extreme meteorological conditions.
- In the context of this exceptional outlook, the Flow-Based Go Live foreseen for November has been reconsidered within the project as the implementation of a fundamentally new capacity allocation methodology generally contains a risk, even if thoroughly prepared and tested.

As the Belgian market will already face a stressed operational situation related, for the first time, to generation adequacy, any additional factor increasing the uncertainty needs to be avoided. Therefore, CWE Project Parties have decided to “jump over” the winter 2014/2015 and to foresee a Go Live of Flow-Based on March, 31st.

Reaction from MPs: MPs express their lack of understanding of how the decision to postpone the BF Go Live relates to generation scarcity in Belgium and question whether there are other reasons supporting such decision.

Question/Concern from MPs: Is the Go Live shifted because of lack of confidence on the FB methodology and non-readiness of the FB project? MPs pointed out that the market behavior for winter 2015/2016 will not be predictable either and might lead to the same situation. The FB methodology should be an opportunity to provide more capacity and not an additional uncertainty.

Answer:

The technical and operational readiness maintained for November 2014 should be dissociated to the FB Go Live date in 2015. Although, the project decided to shift the Go Live due to the specific situation for Belgium during the coming winter, it should not prevent the project to meet the Go Live criteria as planned in 2014. The winter period will demonstrate how the market will behave in this specific scarcity situation and will enable Market Parties to gain further experience with the behavior of Flow-Based thanks to the extension of the daily parallel run.

Question/Concern from MPs: Will all transparency requests be met by November?

Answer: Project Parties intend to meet all transparency requests by November, except the lately formulated requests (as for instance the provision of all redundant CBs), for which Project Parties cannot commit on a target delivery date.

Question/Concern from MPs: This additional four months should be the opportunity to improve the systems and the harmonization of the GSK methodology. A MP considered that external constraints are too frequently setting the prices, which is considered unacceptable.

Answer: Project Parties will maintain their efforts in order to ensure the FB methodology performance. However the current FB methodology, currently described in the approval document and currently being in the formal approval process, will be the one implemented for CWE FB Go Live.

Question/Concern from MPs: Even if FB Go Live is shifted to 2015, can Project Parties guarantee that no days will be missed in the parallel run simulation during this winter?

Answer: During the coming winter, the operators might have to handle two processes in parallel (ATC MC and FB parallel run simulation) while also having to deal with others operational challenges related to difficult winter conditions. However, TSOs will put together their efforts to anticipate and level the risk in order to prevent any missing days.

Question/Concern from MPs: Will the decision to postpone FB Go Live impact other market coupling projects.

Answer: The Project Parties have no indication that market coupling projects in Eastern Europe would be impacted and has to check whether the coupling of Italy within the MRC market coupling would be affected.

- The timing for NRA approval that was planned for end of November/beginning of December 2014 is still under discussion.
- The next FBUG will be planned end of January/beginning of February 2015. The next Market Forum might be planned in March 2015 (still to be confirmed with NRAs).

2 Parallel run performance study

General Parallel run performance

- The daily parallel run data simulations are positive for the past weeks: no missed parallel run data since May, 22nd and only on day for which results were delayed (on September, 8th).
- On September, 8th the results were published with a two days delay due to a technical issue. This missing day would not occur in production because it is strictly linked to the parallel run simulation set up.

Question/Concern from MPs: Will the parallel run simulation days run with fallback process be notified in the future? If yes, how will it be notified?

Answer: Project Parties will notify to MPs the parallel run simulation days run with fallback process. How and when this will be notified still have to be specified.

Question/Concern from MPs: Why are there differences between prices in ATC from parallel run vs. ATC in production?

Answer: These differences are due to production set up in Euphemia algorithm: the computation and the algorithm are the same but the underlying hardware is not.

- The figures of the weekly day-ahead market coupling welfare demonstrate a general trend of higher welfare under FB than under ATC with no significant welfare drop recently.
- The daily welfare demonstrates that there has been an increase of the welfare days due to an increase of spread in the last past weeks.
- The price convergence overview illustrates a higher price convergence under FB/FBI vs ATC.
- After two years of parallel run simulation, differences are largely in favor of FB.

Presentation report

- Project Parties published on CASC website a first report on “Special investigations on Market Surplus losses” in August. The CWE Partners also presented the first results of an addendum to this report with the following aims:
 - Analysis of differences with ATC results, especially concentrating on some “highly positive days”
 - Study of specific reasons for using the “LTA coverage algorithm”
 - Further details on improvements and implementation roadmap
- The first results of this report have been presented during the meeting in order to provide more insight on FB behavior and the full report will be published on CASC website in October.

FB and ATC domains comparison

- Project Parties presented a graph representing the distance (remaining slack on margin of CB) between the FB domain and the ATC clearing point and underlining two observations :
 - The existence of negative values (i.e. ATC clearing point outside FB domain)
- The important variability of FB parameters when compared to ATC. The observations are motivations to better explain the FB methodology.

LTA inclusion

- TSOs use remedial actions to safeguard that LTA domain is covered by the FB domain: either directly via a specific load flow computation or implicitly using manual FAV. However, likely corners are sometimes not covered by FB. Therefore, TSOs use an algorithm to cover them (automatic LTA coverage) even though LTA coverage is primarily meant to cover unlikely corners.
- LTA coverage method consists in enlarging the FB domain so as to cover long term allocated capacities when they are not fully encompassed.
- The automatic LTA coverage can be implemented:
 - through using final adjustment value (FAV),
 - or through using the automatic LTA inclusion algorithm which creates so called virtual branches,
 - or by combining both options above.
- The use of FAV is more comparable to the method applied with ATC e.g. enlarging the FB domain by increasing margin in the FB domain.
- The use of virtual CBs is closer to the LTA corner and can mitigate the enlargement of the FB domain. TSOs rely more on the FAV method rather than the virtual CBs because they lose the representativeness of CBs.

- The final report which will be published in October will contain statistics reflecting the use of the automatic LTA inclusion algorithm in likely corners and justifications on why TSOs rely on this method. The main reasons mentioned are the following:
 - CBs without available remedial actions
 - RA applied, but insufficient to fix overload
 - Technical issues
 - D2CF issues
- A preliminary assessment of the welfare impact was done by focusing on hourly welfare differences (FB-ATC) and attributing this to either active virtual CB or active normal CB.
- The net effect of the hours with the active virtual is a loss of welfare of - 0.9 M€

Conclusion

- LTA domain should be structurally covered by the FB domain with the possible exception of the unlikely corners.
- Sometimes, long term capacities are not covered by the FB domain leading to use remedial actions by TSOs. However, the automatic LTA algorithm should only be applied on an occasional basis.
- For the likely corners, TSOs are continuously working on improvements to be implemented (e.g. base case improvements) in order to decrease the number of uncovered likely corners.

Question/Concern from MPs: Is there a pattern on overload CBs and use of remedial actions?

Answer: Indeed, some overload CBs are frequently used and will be detailed in the report.

Risk LTA inclusion + increased level of LTN

- Project Parties pointed out that there might be a risk of 0 day-ahead capacity with LTA inclusion and increased level of LT nominations.
- Under ATC, LTA is always covered and some additional day-ahead capacity is available. Under FB, for those hours where LTA corners are not covered, day-ahead capacity for some direction is lower than what is available today (NTC) and if on top MPs would increase their explicit nominations, this could lead to a situation of zero DA capacity (ATC).
- Some nuance should be provided when considering the situation where zero DA capacity is left assuming full LT nominations: the assumptions on full LT nominations consider all borders, not just the two for the market under consideration, i.e. the assumption is a strong one. The study demonstrates that LTA is automatically applied for 6.9 % of time in a direction where virtual CBs became active. The significant increase in explicit nominations depends on MPs' behavior. Therefore, whether this risk will materialize depends on the future behavior of MPs, which is likely to be influenced by the predictability of price spreads between the bidding zones.

Conclusion – Risk assessment and mitigation measures

- Project Parties will use the parallel run data to assess more concretely the FB domain before automatic LTA inclusion, e.g.:
 - The frequency with which each of the 16 corners was or was not covered;
 - The level of remaining capacities, with a special focus on the most sensitive markets (e.g. BE);
- Following this further analysis, mitigation measures will be presented with an action plan in case the risks are deemed unacceptable.
- MPs do not see the impacts/risks for them. Exceptional situations with full nomination of LT-rights and little capacity remaining for FB resulting in price peaks are seen as a normal market situation in stressed situations.
- MPs indicate that the LT capacities being deemed safe today, there is reason to reduce LT capacity as a consequence of the LTA not being covered by the FB domain. They also request more clarity on re-dispatch costs. Project parties reply that the LT capacities calculation is a completely separate process and that there are no facts today that might lead to induce any reduction in relation with FB implementation. This does not mean that the current levels of LT capacities are engraved in marble, just that there is no reason today to believe that FB implementation might bring about reduction of the latter.
- **Thanks to the parallel run data, Project Parties will assess more factually the risk where no additional capacity is available, and provide more precision and feedback to participants.**

Special welfare investigations: methodological differences between ATC & FB

- Project Partners reminded the fundamental differences between ATC and FB in six factors:
 - More harmonization and coordination
 - Physics of the Grid
 - Usage of the grid model "D2CF"
 - Monitored elements
 - Reliability margins
 - Remedial Actions (RA)

- The FB formalism allows for a more explicit application of TSOs' risk policies in FB than in ATC. This inevitably led to discrepancies in the results, sometimes under FB to the detriment of the market but in the clear majority of cases to its benefit.

Negative welfare days

- Project Parties provided a table categorizing market surplus losses linked with the six factors. This table enables to identify the way FB can be improved.
- Project Parties stressed the fact that MPs should not expect improvements on all factors because some of them are fundamental and linked with FB methodology. The FB model is more accurate and favorable for the market at the expense of a loss of welfare for a couple of days.

Question/Concern from MPs: MPs indicate they still do not understand the reasons for welfare losses and ask whether there will be any communication when improvements will be applied.

Answer: The improvements cannot be easily discernible on short term. However, improvements will be communicated to MPs. Changes implemented before August, 1st have been indicated in the annex of the Approval Package and any additional changes will be communicated to MPs.

NRAs stressed that in case of significant improvements, changes will be experimented by the project, approved by NRAs and even submitted to Public Consultation if needed. MPs' assessment will be part of the validation of the new change implementation.

Remarkable welfare gains

- An extensive study was conducted on four daily parallel run days where the FB MC resulted in the significantly higher market surplus (i.e. sum of DA Seller + Buyer welfare).
- The objective of the study is to assess the feasibility of this situation from a security of supply point of view to ensure these high capacities and the associated social welfare to be provided in operation.

Conclusion

- These business days are all characterized by the following aspects:
 - These days have relatively high RES infeed
 - In NTC, mainly the Dutch import and German export are lowered as a consequence
 - They are weekend days except for May, 8th
- In FB, the Dutch import and German export capacities are not lowered due to physics of the grid and difference in methodology with NTC. This is the main driver of the significant difference observed in social welfare between ATC and Flow based.
- The results from the Security of Supply assessment done for all these days support this as it can be concluded that the situations are manageable within Flow based.

Question/Concern from MPs: Were the security of supply limitations checked with non CWE borders? Will Project Parties check the dispatch between CWE and external borders? MPs suggest that the extra months are used to ensure the reliability of the results with the parallel run simulation for Eastern TSOs.

Answer: Project Parties conducted the study in CWE borders only, yet understand the concern raised by MPs. Project partners remain confident in this respect because on the one hand FB computations are based on the grid elements that are significantly influenced by CWE trades (and these elements are essentially located in the CWE area), and on the other hand TSOs (including non CWE ones) are relying on reliability margins in order to cope with all types of uncertainties, including the exchanges occurring on other within other regions/borders.

Foreseen improvements

- Project Parties presented the foreseen improvements in terms of inputs quality :
 - Individual CBCO selection : a "global alignment" of the CBs monitored in FB towards the current set monitored in ATC is not foreseen, despite local adjustments of the FB CB set.
 - D2CF: Individual base case and merging process: improvements on D2CF are currently being implemented both on a local basis by some TSOs and on a common basis within the merging entity. Final local improvements will be implemented by the end of October by the last TSO while the new merging process will be implemented by January 2015.
 - Remedial Actions (TSO only local inputs): under ATC, remedial actions available in real time are used implicitly based on the knowledge/experience in order to manage situations in operations. On the contrary, FB is more formalized and allows a strict application of existing risk policies.
- Project Parties also presented the foreseen improvements in terms of operational process and coordination between TSO

- Future usage of RA (within a coordinated framework between TSOs): while TSOs are currently working on further harmonization of the local principles for the application of RAs, it is expected to implement enhanced procedures (accompanied with appropriate sophisticated tools) in the course of 2015 (this initiative is not strictly related to the FB method. FB is rather a way to facilitate coordination between TSOs.)

Conclusion

- The investigations demonstrate that in some cases the differences between ATC and FB models result in variation in the application of FB policies followed by TSOs. However, FB offers opportunities to the market and more control on TSO risk via stricter application of their local policies. Therefore, CWE TSOs will maintain continuity in their global risk levels with the implementation of FB, but confirm their commitment to put into place an efficient, transparent and controllable process.
- Besides, Project Parties will also implement improvements within the TSO operational process in order to deal with discrepancies in CB monitored or RA considered.

Monitoring FB performance after Go Live

- As described in the approval document, the NRAs get a monthly monitoring report with many data items, to observe the capacity calculation and allocation.
- Project Parties presented the key indicators to monitor especially above described FB performance after Go Live:
 - Ex-post monitoring: NRA regular report, “distance” to LT capacities
 - Operational (process) monitoring : Delivering FB parameters in due time, use of Default/Spanned FB parameters, completeness of the input files “initial data gathering”, CWE FB Coordination process, Application Performance Indicators (API)
 - Operational (FB parameters) monitoring: IGM quality (D2CF before merging), system adequacy, coverage of individual TSO “targets”

Question/Concern from MPs: Would it be possible to have ATC results in order to be able to compare them with FB results after Go Live?

Answer: The daily ATC process will not be handled anymore after Go Live. Project Parties underline that MPs should have enough material to rely on after two years of parallel run data. NRAs pointed out that they have similar concern. Instead of reverse parallel run or rough estimation based on average historical ATCs, the distance to the copper plate (reported since the start of ATC MC) could be an indicator to monitor FB. NRAs pointed out that they have similar concerns and that they requested to get after FB Go Live ex-post quality indicators such as (proxy-)ATCs.

Question/Concern from MPs: How will the intraday calculation be performed after Go Live?

Answer: The intraday capacity calculation will be based on the remaining capacity after day-ahead allocation. Besides, Project Parties have an initiative to improve the capacity calculation taking into account new and more accurate hypothesis in the inputs data, even though this is not strictly related to FB Go Live.

3 NRA synthesis of public consultation outcome

NRAs presentation

- NRAs were invited to provide feedback on the CWE Regulator’s consultation.
- CWE Regulators organized the Market Players consultation from June, 2nd until June, 30th. They thanked the 16 respondents for their answer to the consultation.
- The main outcomes of the consultation are the following :
 - MPs’ perception on FB is improving
 - The main concern of MPs is to have a better robustness of the calculation process still considered not sufficient
 - Majority of respondent are in favour of intuitive FB
 - MPs have an intermediate understanding of FB model and of price formation
- MPs have also raised the following concerns : ability to bid in the new environment, transparency which is not satisfactory ; robustness and duration of parallel runs ; better analysis of interaction with LT rights and intraday
- MPs’ answers also led to CWE NRAs request provided to TSOs and addressed by them.
- Some MPs representatives questioned NRAs on how the responses from federations/professional organisations to the consultation had been counted. NRAs indicated that they were counted as one MP response.

Project answers on pending NRA requests

- Project Partners provided feedback on NRAs request in a formal letter on September, 7th. The letter was published on CASC website after FBUG meeting under CASC website: <http://www.casc.eu/en/Resource-center/CWE-Flow-Based-MC/Public-Consultation>
- Project Parties presented the project's answers on the main pending NRA requests.

Intuitiveness/Euphemia:

- Further explanation on the functioning of intuitive patch and its interaction with Euphemia was provided to NRAs with an additional annex "Flow-Based intuitive explained" on August, 1st, published on CASC website:

CASC link: <http://www.casc.eu/en/Resource-center/CWE-Flow-Based-MC/Public-Consultation>

Fallback simulations

- In order to prove TSO's ability to calculate Fallback parameters in tense situations and provide an idea of the results, NRAs proposed to MPs to perform simulations for two arbitrarily chosen business days of the daily external parallel run. Spanning (1st day) and default FB parameters (2nd day) would be used instead of normal FB parameters and no normal parallel run results would be provided for those two days.
- As the normal process is taking the full night, Project Parties cannot perform three programs in parallel (normal FB results, ATCs and Fallback parameters).
- **Therefore, MPs requested Fallback ex-post results on successful days to be able to compare them with the normal results. They also asked to perform Fallback process in the member tests.**

Question/Concern from MPs: How MPs will be informed of Fallback process results? Would it be possible to have a label in the PTDF matrix?

Answer: In case of publication of Fallback process results, Project Parties will inform MPs via a flag/label in the prices results.

Re-computation of missing days

- **In order to provide reference simulation results for missing parallel run days, Project Parties will provide results based on default FB parameters missing days and will be published on CASC website for October.**

Impact of FB on generation /demand adequacy

- **In order to explain the link between FB and short term generation/demand adequacy, Project Parties will provide a study assessing the respective import capabilities of CWE hubs in ATC and FB which will be published for October.**
- This adequacy study specially targets the Belgium question for the coming winter and is limited to the data provided by parallel run simulation.
- This study will contain conceptual approach, quantitative approach and TSO operational approach.

4 Data publication for Go Live

Overview of data publication (places and format) at Go Live

- CASC will remain the main platform to provide the same information as currently published in the parallel run (Today "CASC > Resource Center" – At Go Live "CASC > Market Data")
- The formats will remain the same and available in .csv and .xml
- Because of the importance of the size files for the publication of all redundant CBs, a dedicated new ftp via CASC website will be considered.

Question/Concern from MPs: Will redundant CBs be provided with fixed labels (same code, country and borders references)?

Answer: the proposal is to provide fixed anonymous CBs results plus precision on the location (border or country).

- Current PX ftp server will be maintained with parallel run results but will not be updated anymore after Go Live.

Summary of agreed transparency framework for Go Live

- Daily publication before GCT
 - Initial FB parameters at 8:00 (before LT nominations)
 - Long-term nominations at 10:30
 - Final FB parameters at 10:30 (Random anonymized CBs, PTDFs, RAMs)
 - ATCs for Shadow Auctions at 10:30
 - Initial Intraday ATCs available after FB MC
- Daily publication after GCT
 - Fixed anonymized CBCOs at D+2
 - On www.casc.eu: capacity allocated (used margin on CBs), congestion income, hub net positions, and / or
 - On www.europeanpricecoupling.eu: overview of the hourly CWE Hub prices for the day D+1, bilateral exchanges for the day D+1
- There has not been a commitment between all TSOs to publish the fixed, anonymized CBCO publication earlier than D+2. This additional publication balanced interests of MPs and TSOs (related to protect the infrastructure).

Question/Concern from MPs: Why do not Project Parties provide CBCOs earlier than D+2?

Answer: TSOs agreed commonly to provide fixed anonymized CBCOs 48 hours after the operational day in order to avoid manipulation risks linked to real physical elements.

- Following last FBUG, Project Partners agreed to publish aggregated information related to the D-2 common grid model.
- Aggregated hourly information (Vertical Load, Generation, Reference Bilateral Exchanges) will be published monthly ex-post.
- MPs requested this aggregated information :
 - On a daily basis for D+2 in order to use it for operation
 - Including also non CWE borders (assumptions for external flows)
 - Available before Go Live.
- **Project Parties will investigate MPs' request.**
- Project Parties will also publish ex-post the redundant critical branches which has foreseen to be published as of Q1 2015.

5 Data publication after Go Live

Common discussion on typical winter days and long term evolution

- The request for MPs to provide FB parameters on typical winter days and LT evolution on the grid was discussed with MPs in order to clarify and precise it.
- MPs agreed to re-use the scenarios proposed in the FBUG of March:
 - Including more concrete data (more figures),
 - Focusing on complete days and less scenarios situations (instead of individual hours scenarios),
 - Combining typical winter days and long-term evolution scenarios (two tables to be able to compare scenarios with and without long-term evolutions such as for instance the implementation of the new line).

Question/Concern from MPs: How and when MPs will be informed of long-term evolution grid such as the implementation of a new line?

Answer: Communication on long term evolution will be based on the transparency regulation EU-543 (the central ENTSO-E EMFIP platform, implementing article 9 in this respect). .

- **Project Parties proposed to provide one full-day scenario that would be submitted via email to MPs upfront next FBUG meeting (two weeks upfront ideally) and discussed during next FBUG meeting.**
- **In order to focus Project Parties' efforts on the most urgent data publication and given a timeline overview, Project Parties will ask MPs via e-mail to prioritize the remaining work on publications :**
 - **Fixed anonymized CBCOs at D+2**

- All redundant CBs
- Aggregated information related to D-2 common grid model
- Scenarios on typical winter day and long-term evolutions

6 Further exchanges with Market Parties

Proposal for creation of Stakeholder Committee after Go Live

- Following AESAG and NRAs' requests, Project Parties presented views on a possible organization of the Stakeholder Committee for after Go Live.
- The Stakeholder Committee is aimed to have a dialogue with MPs before changing the methodology or implementing any improvements, to discuss FB performance, transparency, FB extension to other regions, etc.
- The Participants should be: CWE NRAs, TSOs, PXs, MPs having a direct interest and adequate knowledge in FB implementation, possibly represented by their professional organization/federation. The format of the Committee could be readjusted if needed following the feedback on first meetings.
- The Stakeholder Committee will advise the JSC and AESAG.
- The meetings will be scheduled on an ad hoc basis and meeting minutes will be published.
- MPs would welcome the creation of the Stakeholder Committee. They stressed the fact that due to a large range of FB topics, continuous communication on the project must be ensured with a relevant sequence of meetings (regularly) and clear agendas to be discussed.

7 AOB

Question/Concern from MPs: When Project Parties will inform MPs on the exact CWE FB MC Go Live date?

Answer: For now, the CWE FB MC Go Live target date is set to March, 31st but the final date will have to be reconfirmed in Steering Committee one month before Go Live following technical readiness in November, NRAs approval and outcomes of remaining tests that will be performed just after Go Live. Besides, the technical readiness and the NRA approval will be communicated to MPs.

Next FBUG meeting: to be planned end of January/beginning of February 2015