



FPS Economy, S.M.E.s, Self-employed and Energy

## **ECOFLEX**

*With the support of the Energy Transition Fund*  
**Report on the Advisory Board (AB) meeting 2**

Draft version, 05.05.2024

Version 1.0 23.07.2024

Final version 23.07.2024

Author(s): Rémy Cleenwerck (UGENT), Marc Vermeeren (Flux50), Jan Desmet (Ugent),  
Andy Putratama/VUB

### **Abstract for dissemination (PU)**

This document presents the second Advisory Board meeting of the ECOFLEX project.

## Contents

1. ECOFLEX AB members and roles .....	3
2. Second AB meeting .....	4
2.1 Outcome .....	5
2.2 Q&A session .....	5

*This document reflects only the views of the author. The Directorate-General for Energy is not liable for any use of the information contained therein.*

## 1. ECOFLEX AB members and roles

The ECOFLEX Advisory Board (AB) will offer broad expert and user consultation. It is assembled with different actors in the value chain in Belgium (TSO, aggregators, technical parties and knowledge partners) and its objective is to follow the project progress and steer the project planning. The members of the AB are:

Name	Company	E-mail	Comment
Alexandra Vanhuyse	Snowball		Not available the 26 <sup>th</sup> of March.
Anton Koninckx	VEKA		
Bart Vannoppen	VOLTA		
Guillaume Cambier	ORES		Not available the 26 <sup>th</sup> of March.
Thomas Buisseret	ORES		
Luc Huysmans	FEBEG		
Marijn Maenhoudt	CREG		Not available the 26 <sup>th</sup> of March.
Michel Verschuere	YUSO		Not available the 26 <sup>th</sup> of March.
Kevin Milis	Synergrid		
Simon Lachi	RESA		Not available the 26 <sup>th</sup> of March.
Simon Gerard	RESA		Not available the 26 <sup>th</sup> of March.
Eric Monami	Edora		Not available the 26 <sup>th</sup> of March.
Mathieu Waucomont	CWAPE		Not available the 26 <sup>th</sup> of March.
Jo Robbelein	FOD Economie SPF Economie		

Alan Delferiere	FOD Economie SPF Economie
-----------------	------------------------------

## 2. Second AB meeting

The 2<sup>nd</sup> AB meeting took place on March 26th, 2024, on the premises of the Green Energy Park in Zellik. The agenda included the following items:

- Welcome, Project & Partners introduction
- Project overview and feedback
- Break
- Q&A
- Next steps and closure of the meeting
- Guided visit Smart Village Lab

Project partners who supported and participated in the AB meeting:

- Stella Arapoglou (VUB)
- Andy Putratama (VUB)
- Maarten Messagie (VUB)
- Rémy Cleenwerck (UGENT)
- Xheni Zeneli (UGENT)
- Jan Desmet (UGENT)
- Marc Vermeeren (FLUX50)
- Antonio Sutura (Haulogy)
- Gilles Mahy (Flexcity)
- Victor De Colvenaer (Pluginvest)
- Philippe Judong (Cluster Tweed)

- Remy Balegamire Baraka (Cluster Tweed)

Advisory Board members who participated:

- Anton Koninckx (VEKA)
- Bart Vannoppen (VOLTA)
- Thomas Buisseret (ORES)
- Luc Huysmans (FEBEG)
- Kevin Milis (SYNERGRID)
- Alan Delferiere (FOD-SPF Economie)
- Jo Robbelein (FOD-SPF Economie)

## 2.1 Outcome

This second AB meeting covered the actual insights and the status of the project. The main work packages were presented and some topics, that related to questions from the first AB meeting, were explained more in detail.

During the presentations some questions popped up and were discussed immediately, leading to interesting feedback and knowledge sharing. Some questions were handled later during the Q&A session.

Finally the project also had some questions for the Advisory Board members.

The afternoon ended with a guided visit to the Smart Village Lab, with his Smart Home Lab, e-Charging station, Control Center and Neighbourhood batteries.

## 2.2 Q&A session

1. ***Currently aFRR is not allowed on low-voltage, do you have an estimation of the approval to activate aFRR services on LV? – Gilles (Flexcity)***

Synergrid: The design framework for the activation of aFRR on low-voltage is finalised (i.e. the technical documents) and public consultation took place. However, the approval has been denied by the legal party (i.e. the regulator).

Update by Flux50: on 24-03-2024 VREG has conditionally approved the request from Fluvius; so waiting for next step.

**2. How will you provide flex. with a high certainty, as you do not have control over the BMS of the EV, thus you cannot fully anticipate or forecast the flexibility that you can provide – Jan Desmet (Ugent)?**

VUB: From the current experience, the EV charging station needs to overrule the current flowing to the EVs, e.g. as a setpoint '10A'. In practise, for multiple reasons the BMS will only tolerate 8.9A, meaning there will always be a deviation. Unless it is DC-charging, you will always have an inaccuracy.

Flux50: This is why we need to look at the flexibility potential from e-mobility from the perspective of aggregation (i.e. effect of pooling). As the number of aggregated assets increases, deviations will be reduced. In other words, this will be a statistical approach.

VUB: Further, based on the information from the UI as well as the historical data from charging event, you can forecast the flexibility by using statistical approaches. Nonetheless, events can and will still cause an unexpected outcome.

**3. How can the project tackle both types of flexibility, (i) the local flex. (or DSO aspect) and commercial flexibility – Phillipe (Cluster Tweed)**

One will be included as a revenue stream with a cost (tariff) while the other will rather be included as a constraint in the optimization problem. Thus, the local grid constraint is included in the system as advantage for the grid but not linked to a specific cost as the DSO flex is not yet operable.

**4. How can we create an incentive for Drivers from our pilot site to start using the User Interface in practice during the project duration? – Victor (Pluginvest)**

You shouldn't target the EV driver but the charging point operator as they have the contract for the delivery of the electricity. The fleet manager should incentivise the EV-drivers. – Kevin (Synergrid)

Transparency of the prices should be visible on the charging point (EU commission), cf. dynamic tariffs active at the charging point. – Phillipe (Cluster Tweed)

The operational action to do the steering (imbalance) should be by the charging point operator, but the suppliers are getting the cashflows. – Gilles (Flexcity)

An idea would be to define some charging points as Flexible charging points., where a full load is not guaranteed. These have a lower tariff (in public charging). In case of a private company parking lot, the flexible CPs could be located closer to the entrance of a building, or use of them is awarded by some type of goody or advantage for the employee. Ask all users which incentive would be interesting for them -- Marc (Flux50)

**5. *Chargers have a limited load balancing capacity. What if a local EMS decides to keep the capacity lower than  $x$  kW as the capacity tariff is in vigour?* – Bart Vannoppen (Volta)**

The charging points that we control have a function to activate or disable the load balancing function. By default we unlock this functionality in order to be able to steer the charging points at our premises. – Victor (Pluginvest)

In that case we use the highest peak of the previous month (as a reference) for the max peak power that the charging point can deliver. – Gilles (Flexcity)

For the EV scheduler this will be seen as an extra safety to guarantee the user's preferences. – Gilles (VUB)

**6. *What is for you currently the main legal obstacle for a faster / broader rollout of flexibility services?* – Xheni (Ugent)**

First priority should be the suppliers: supply split makes sure they can use the implicit and explicit flexibility, more in the settlement in the setpoints (discussion with the DSOs).

Supply split on one meter, currently you need two smart meters, to have a flexibility contract for your flexible assets and a non-flex contract for non-flex assets. – Luc (Febeg)

Separate EMD meter that can communicate with the DSO should be possible -- Bart (Volta) à but EMD meters are not recognised by the suppliers.

Home e-chargers, where the employer compensates for kWhs loaded, are already equipped with a MID-certified meter. So the meter is there, but data communication to the DSO or metering company is not in place -- Marc (Flux50).

***7. What is the status of the traffic light system (for grid congestion monitoring) and is there documentation available? – Rémy (Ugent)***

Synergrid: The NFS (Net Flex Study), Synergrid C8/01, has gone through public consultation and should go live in the same period as aFRR for low-voltage. It is currently under regulatory framework

The concept is to conduct a study of an area in order to know if flexibility can be provided or not. Therefore in a first stage, two colours will be used to define the acceptance rate, (i) green and (ii) red. The transit phase (iii) orange is subject to later addition.

Unless otherwise specified, a green area remains valid until the NFS concludes otherwise, in that case the agreement for flex. delivery remains valid for 1 year. After that the zone changes to a red area. Zones with higher risk will be placed in a 'blacklist'.

The idea is to balance the network: operational stability of the grid from a DSO's point of view and also allow flexibility on the low-voltage.