



Tranche 3

Information session 2 Q&A

Version: 0.9
Datum: 14 February 2024
Compiled by: BAS Implementation
Classification White



Table of contents

OVERVIEW DOCUMENTATION TRANCHE 3	4
REQUESTS FOR CHANGES (RFC'S) AND CHANGED DOCUMENTATION	4
Question 1: As of when will the modified BRS etc. be available?	4
Question 2: Will Topic documents/Issue documents also modified after the term "settlement" was modified to "reconciliation" in the BRS and the Business Services?	4
Question 2b: (continued from question 2) If this is the case, you cannot functionally determine what the total impact is using 1 source document?	4
Question 2c: And what about RFC's where the term "settlement" is used?	4
TRANSITION IC011B/IC257/IC252	5
Question 3: At which point can the receiving party make an objection if it does not agree with a provisional settlement IC011B which is immediately also the definitive settlement? For instance, IC011B catered for this with a distinction between a provisional and definitive settlement.	5
Question 4: And what should we do with DIM connections?	5
Question 5: Will the DSO then always possess month-transition readings in relation to point 2 (slide 30)? ..	5
Question 6: Do these agreements also apply to telemetry connections with profile 4A, and are they regarded as small consumption?	5
Question 7: If a metering notification is approved before 1-1-2025 but is corrected after 1-1-2025 (within 3 months), the original notification will not be handled in the old process but only the corrected notification will. Will this then be processed in the old or the new process?	5
Question 8: The transition-related sections in IC252 state that if something is being handled in IC011B then it will also be concluded there. This appears to be contradictory.	5
Question 9: If a MRP only supplies the correct readings for the start-up month of a new production unit after 4 months, will it be possible to settle them using the new model?	6
Question 10: If a new metering notification, which relates to September 2024, is received on 6 January 2025, will this be part of the new process? But it will be too late for the M+2, so will it go with the M+5?	6
Question 11: Should we not want the periods in IC011b and IC252 to run one after the other?	6
Question 12: How can the BRP make an objection if it does not agree with a provisional settlement IC011B which is immediately also the definitive settlement? For instance, IC011B catered for this with a distinction between a provisional and definitive settlement.	6
Question 13: I think the linker table with a cross had been agreed.	6
QUALIFICATION TENNET	6
Question 14: Only the Tranche 2 notifications are currently available in the TQF environment, and the Tranche 1 scenarios are missing. Will the currently available scenarios remain available when the Tranche 3 scenarios are added? And will Tranche 1 scenarios (ever) be added again?	6
Question 15: What if there is an overrun in the support offered to system operators and BRP?	7
Question 16: Can carriers also qualify a group of suppliers?	7
Question 17: Is there an overview of carriers? We are looking for one.	7
QUALIFICATION COLLECTION-SETTLEMENT REQUEST NOTIFICATIONS (VVV) – IC252	7
Question 18: Is qualification also needed for the WebGui for IC252?	7
PART 2 INFORMATION SESSION TRANCHE 3 - SUPPLIERS	7
IMPACT PER ISSUE	7
Question 19: Does this differ from the regular meter readings and consumption notification? Addition: monthly volumes per allocation point = regular meter readings and consumption notification that SUP receives from the DSO? I mean that volume/consumption is the same in these 2 notifications.	7
Question 20: is IC252 also settled on the basis of imbalance prices?	7
Question 21: What if there are differences between the consumption notification and the new notifications?	7
Question 23: In what percentage of monthly settlements for TMT connections do you expect differences between the monthly reading and the total for quarterly readings? This relates to contractual agreements with the final customer.	8



Question 24: IC257: "The data exchange between the system operator and the supplier is thus also completely informative; it enables the supplier to check the invoice of its 184 balance responsible party and whether it has been correctly charged to the customer."	8
Question 25: Why was the claiming party allowed to submit the invoice? Would it not be easier if this was always the system operator?	8
Question 26: IC275: "At the moment that the DSO supplies the "receipt SMA" to the SUP, the SUP will be able to check the settlement result 310 charged by the BRP against its own records (e.g. that which the SUP has invoiced to the customer). This makes it possible for the SUP to check the settlement result 311 and ensures that no unnecessary questions or disputes are encountered between the various market roles." ...	8
Question 27: A minimal difference has been agreed for IC011B in order to avoid whole lists of minimal rounding-off and transformer corrections. Hopefully, this will also be included in IC257 and IC252?	9
DEEP DIVE TENNET – MMC-HUB AND ONBOARDING PROCESS.....	9
Question 28: Why does the documentation from TenneT not appear on mijnMFFBAS under Releases for the Tranche 3 project?	9
Question 29: I/we already have MyTenneT account(s) as part of a BRP role ... Is an additional account required or will this role be linked?	9



Overview documentation Tranche 3

All necessary documentation about Tranche 3 can be found on mijnMFFBAS, under the menu Release -> Tranche 3. Here you will find several direct links to documentation that was addressed during the information session. In addition, there is a link to the general List of Abbreviations and Terms.

- [1. Issues, BRS, MSP](#)
- [2. Notification descriptions & Business Services](#)
- [3. RFC's](#)
- [4. Project management](#)
- [7. Information session](#)
- [BAS terms and abbreviations 05042023.xlsx](#)

Requests for Changes (RFC's) and changed documentation

Question 1: As of when will the modified BRS etc. be available?

They have already been published on the SharePoint mijnMFFBAS, under the menu option Release, Tranche 3.

Question 2: Will Topic documents/Issue documents also modified after the term “settlement” was modified to “reconciliation” in the BRS and the Business Services?

No, we will not be doing this. Now that the term has been changed in the BRS and the BS, the term “reconciliation” will only be used in the MSP Wholesale Electricity and the Code-change proposal. This means we will be using the same terms in sector documents that will come into effect upon implementation.

It makes no sense to also change the terms in Topic documents/Issue documents because they will no longer be needed after implementation.

Question 2b: (continued from question 2) If this is the case, you cannot functionally determine what the total impact is using 1 source document?

If the term “settlement” is used in a Topic document/Issue document relating to Tranche 3, then that can be interpreted as “reconciliation”.

Question 2c: And what about RFC's where the term “settlement” is used?

If the term “settlement” is used in an RFC relating to Tranche 3, then that can also be interpreted as “reconciliation”. The same applies to RFC's as it does to Topic documents/Issue documents, namely that RFC's will no longer be needed after approval and implementation.



Transition IC011B/IC257/IC252

Question 3: At which point can the receiving party make an objection if it does not agree with a provisional settlement IC011B which is immediately also the definitive settlement? For instance, IC011B catered for this with a distinction between a provisional and definitive settlement.

In practice, limited use is made of the objection possibilities for IC011B: the provisional settlement is often the same as the definitive calculation. That is why representatives of **all involved market roles** accepted the proposal to not use separate provisional and definitive settlements for a few months during the transition, which would make it simpler to transition from IC011B to IC257/IC252. The aim of this is to prevent both processes from running parallel.

Should an individual BRP still wish to make an objection, it can discuss the matter bilaterally with the concerned system operator.

Question 4: And what should we do with DIM connections?

They are not part of the reconciliation process described in IC257 and the settlement process described in IC252.

Volume differences relating to dimensioned connections can be settled bilaterally, in accordance with agreements made in the working group **IC281 Settlement dimensioned connections**. Extra process-related agreements will be included in the MSP-WE.

Question 5: Will the DSO then always possess month-transition readings in relation to point 2 (slide 30)?

Point two relates to the reconciliation process for large consumption TMT. Rather than month-transition readings determined by the system operator, this requires metering data supplied by the metering responsible party.

Question 6: Do these agreements also apply to telemetry connections with profile 4A, and are they regarded as small consumption?

The reconciliation process TMT described in IC257 only applies to large consumption connections. We do not have TMT connections in the small consumption segment, but there is SMA, for example.

Question 7: If a metering notification is approved before 1-1-2025 but is corrected after 1-1-2025 (within 3 months), the original notification will not be handled in the old process but only the corrected notification will. Will this then be processed in the old or the new process?

If an IC011B settlement process is started before 01-01-2025 in relation to a large consumption connection TMT, and has not yet been completed and new metering data (once again) becomes available on or after 01-01-2025, then the IC011B case that has not yet been completed will be terminated. The new metering data that was received on or after 01-01-2025 will then be used in the new process IC252.

Question 8: The transition-related sections in IC252 state that if something is being handled in IC011B then it will also be concluded there. This appears to be contradictory.

That is indeed what it says in IC252, but a transition working group - which discussed all issues concerning the transition (IC257, IC252 and IC011B) - decided that if there is a IC011B case that **has not yet been concluded** and for which new metering data arrives on or after 01-01-2025, it would be best to close the IC011B case.

Otherwise you will be settling metering data with two different market roles simultaneously, in relation to the same connection. Namely, via IC011B with the BRP and via IC252 with the supplier. The



transition working group thought that, in this case, it would be wiser to only settle the latest metering data via IC252.

Question 9: If a MRP only supplies the correct readings for the start-up month of a new production unit after 4 months, will it be possible to settle them using the new model?

We assume that this relates to a large consumption TMT connection. If so, the agreements in IC257 and IC252 will apply.

Question 10: If a new metering notification, which relates to September 2024, is received on 6 January 2025, will this be part of the new process? But it will be too late for the M+2, so will it go with the M+5?

A metering notification that is received by the system operator on 6 January 2025, but which relates to September 2024, will be part of the new process IC252 if it meets all criteria mentioned in the decision-making diagram.

In essence, such a metering notification cannot be concluded via IC257 because IC257 can only be used to process metering notifications with a consumption period as of 01-01-2025.

Question 11: Should we not want the periods in IC011b and IC252 to run one after the other?

The only limited overlap is the month of February 2025. This is where the last IC011B cases from December 2024 will be settled. This is also where process month January 2025 is handled via the process IC252.

This transition strategy was also realised in a working group containing all involved market roles.

Question 12: How can the BRP make an objection if it does not agree with a provisional settlement IC011B which is immediately also the definitive settlement? For instance, IC011B catered for this with a distinction between a provisional and definitive settlement.

In practice, limited use is made of the objection possibilities for IC011B. That is why representatives of all involved market roles accepted the proposal to not use separate provisional and definitive settlements for a few months.

Should an individual party still wish to make an objection, it can address the matter bilaterally with the concerned system operator.

Question 13: I think the linker table with a cross had been agreed.

No, that is the old process. The new, concise process is on the right. This can be found on slide 34 of the presentation.

Qualification TenneT

Question 14: Only the Tranche 2 notifications are currently available in the TQF environment, and the Tranche 1 scenarios are missing. Will the currently available scenarios remain available when the Tranche 3 scenarios are added? And will Tranche 1 scenarios (ever) be added again?

Yes, past scenarios will remain available, so that new parties can also use those scenarios to qualify, and so that market parties can perform an external chain test against the TQF if there are changes in their own systems. Tranche 1 will be added in time, together with all other scenarios that have been implemented but not yet included in the TQF.



Question 15: What if there is an overrun in the support offered to system operators and BRP?

If a single party experiences delays, we will be able to deal with this. But experience shows that the planning is realistic. In addition, the idea is that parties should also be able to navigate through the testing and qualification process without active support from TenneT.

Question 16: Can carriers also qualify a group of suppliers?

Each supplier must qualify in accordance with the Net code, but Carriers can go through the same process for all suppliers.

Question 17: Is there an overview of carriers? We are looking for one.

TenneT must remain non-discriminatory and is unable to offer an exhaustive list of commercial service providers. However, there are renowned parties that offer such services; in particular, enquire about this at fellow market parties.

Qualification collection-settlement request notifications (VWV) – IC252

Question 18: Is qualification also needed for the WebGui for IC252?

As far as IC252 VWV notifications are concerned, market parties must qualify for both the WebServices and the GUI. Details will be shared with to-be-qualified parties via a qualification plan at the start of Q3.

Part 2 Information session Tranche 3 - Suppliers

Impact per issue

Question 19: Does this differ from the regular meter readings and consumption notification?

Addition: monthly volumes per allocation point = regular meter readings and consumption notification that SUP receives from the DSO? I mean that volume/consumption is the same in these 2 notifications.

IC275 Reconciliation SMA: The existing consumption notification will continue to exist, and will be used for the distribution of month-transition readings and monthly volumes to SMA connections.

IC257 Reconciliation TMT: However, the notification per connection, which is sent as part of the reconciliation process TMT, is a new notification that is sent via the MMC-hub ().

Question 20: is IC252 also settled on the basis of imbalance prices?

Corrections within the IC252 process are settled using reconciliation prices per month that are calculated in accordance with IC279. These prices will be supplied by TenneT via an API.

Question 21: What if there are differences between the consumption notification and the new notifications?

For large consumption connections, the supplier currently receives (for billing purposes) the so-called consumption notification from the system operator, based on the metering data supplied by the metering responsible party.

After the implementation of IC257, the system operator will also use the metering data supplied by the metering responsible party (if relevant) for the reconciliation TMT. The volumes of the metering data used in the reconciliation should be the same as the volumes in the so-called consumption notification that the supplier already receives from the system operator.

There is no formal objection process for the supplier for cases where the volumes in the reconciliation differ from the consumption notifications. But, of course, suppliers are free to contact the system operator in case of deviations.

Question 22: A question about IC275: Is it also possible for the SUP to supply customer readings as a month-transition reading if a P4 reading is not available?

Strictly speaking, the process involves obtaining the month-transition reading from the meter (P4). If it is not possible to obtain a meter reading, the reading will be calculated by the DSO. This has been described in IC275.

However, there is a file and generic process where the SUP can transfer a meter reading together with another meter reading because the SUP is responsible for meter readings.

Question 23: In what percentage of monthly settlements for TMT connections do you expect differences between the monthly reading and the total for quarterly readings? This relates to contractual agreements with the final customer.

It is difficult to say anything about this because an analysis has not been carried out. As a BRP, you could perform an analysis based on the available metering data. For instance, a BRP currently receives all metering data needed to perform such an analysis.

Question 24: IC257: "The data exchange between the system operator and the supplier is thus also completely informative; it enables the supplier to check the invoice of its 184 balance responsible party and whether it has been correctly charged to the customer."

This suggests that it is compulsory for the SUP to check and retrieve the notifications, and thus to also qualify them. This seems to conflict with the Issue, which says they are completely informative.

The notifications sent to the supplier are indeed informative, because the supplier does not play a role in performing the process described in IC257. On the other hand, when IC257 was being designed, they stated that they would like to receive these notifications for information purposes.

That is why we expect suppliers to connect to the MMC-hub in order to be able to receive these notifications. After all, there is a reason for including this flow of data to the supplier in the process.

Question 25: Why was the claiming party allowed to submit the invoice? Would it not be easier if this was always the system operator?

To make the process simpler, the working group – which includes representatives of all involved market roles that designed IC252 – decided to have the system operator compile the collection-settlement request. The same working group then thought that it would be logical for the claiming party to send the invoice.

Question 26: IC275: "At the moment that the DSO supplies the "receipt SMA" to the SUP, the SUP will be able to check the settlement result 310 charged by the BRP against its own records (e.g. that which the SUP has invoiced to the customer). This makes it possible for the SUP to check the settlement result 311 and ensures that no unnecessary questions or disputes are encountered between the various market roles."

IC275 also shows that it need not be compulsory but SUP's can use the data that has been supplied ... But if this need is not present, there appears to be no obligation to retrieve and qualify the notifications.

The notifications sent to the supplier are indeed informative, because the supplier does not play a role in performing the process described in IC275. On the other hand, when IC275 was being designed, it was stated that they would like to receive these notifications for information purposes.

That is why we expect suppliers to connect to the MMC-hub in order to be able to receive these notifications. After all, there is a reason for including this flow of data to the supplier in the process.



Question 27: A minimal difference has been agreed for IC011B in order to avoid whole lists of minimal rounding-off and transformer corrections. Hopefully, this will also be included in IC257 and IC252?

For IC252, it is only possible to proceed to billing if the total sum of all settlement requests in a collection-settlement request is higher than 50 EUR (ex. VAT).

No minimum amounts have been agreed for IC257 and IC275.

Deep dive TenneT – MMC-hub and onboarding process

Question 28: Why does the documentation from TenneT not appear on mijnMFFBAS under Releases for the Tranche 3 project?

A link to the MyTenneT page will appear under the project SharePoint page. The TenneT testing and qualification plan will also be published on mijnMFFBAS. However, documentation about the MMC-hub and the qualification process can only be accessed via MyTenneT. This is because TenneT is the owner of this process, and to ensure that everyone always possesses the correct version.

Question 29: I/we already have MyTenneT account(s) as part of a BRP role ... Is an additional account required or will this role be linked?

The role will be linked; a new MyTenneT account is not necessary.