

# **Ecodesign Transformers Stakeholders forum – Kick-off**

Feedback of the Belgian DSO's on the current EU Directive

Wim De Maesschalck - Eandis

16 september 2016

EU, Brussels

# Implementation of Ecodesign

## Implementation Ecodesign in **new tender**

- Tier I losses = minimum requirement
  - Impact: still to be assessed (new designs)
- Tier II losses = bonus requirement
  - TCO capitalisation of losses ~ Cenelec formula
  - Energy price + interest rate ~ actual values for DSO
- Dimensions: **no increase possible**
  - Limited by available space in substations
- Weight: **no increase possible**
  - Limited by load limits of structural elements (floor/pole)

# Evaluation of Tier I

- Implementation is ongoing by DSO's
  - Not possible to draw conclusions yet (new designs)
  - Results may vary...
- ***Focus of study should be evaluation of effectiveness of Tier I***
  - Projected costs & benefits achieved?
  - Is the transformer still “fit for use”?
    - Dimensions
    - Weight
    - Special types of transformers
- Evaluation of Tier I = base for Tier II

# Evaluation of Ecodesign

---

## Targets of DSO

- Balanced performance of assets
  - Costs >< Safety >< CML-Caidi-Saifi >< Environment
- Maintain open market with multiple vendors
- Enabler of new technologies
- Public responsibilities
  - National policies (e.g. safety, renewables, ...)
  - European policies (e.g. ecodesign, 20-20-20)

## Ecodesign transformers:

- evaluation based on these targets

# DSO – specific constraints

- Regulated market:
  - Budgets for investments are regulated
    - Limited ratio of replacement: typically 2% - 3% annually
    - Specific tendering process & long term contracts
    - Focus on Total Cost of Ownership
- Very large installed base
  - e.g. Belgium:
    - 60.000+ MV substations
    - trafos: +/- 2000 annually
- Transformers are part of a larger installation
  - Interchangeability is critical
    - Upgrade / Renewal
    - New functionalities

# Impact on MV substations

- Dimensions are limited:
  - Width → limited space for access & installation
    - Typical doorway: 90 cm
    - Limited floor space in substations
    - New functionalities require more space
  - Height → limited in buildings (ceiling)
    - Typical ceiling (basement/ concrete substation): 2m20
- Weight is limited
  - structural limit of substation
    - Total weight of ALL equipment COMBINED (trafo + switch)
      - Floor / Pole
  - Impact on logistics



## Sibelga - Brussels

Underground substation in sidewalk: very little space available & limited height



## Tecteo - Liège

Underground substation: very narrow acces to substation



### Mounted on 1 pole

350 000 units  
50-160 kVA  
Max. 550 kg



### Semi-rural substation

130 000 units  
Max. 250 kVA  
Max. 1500 kg

Floor space < 2,5 m<sup>2</sup> Height < 1,5 m



### Urban substation

270 000 units  
Max. 1000 kVA  
Max. 2500 kg

### Enedis (ErDF)– typical cases

Different standardised types have specific limits in weight & volume of transformer



## Liander - Amsterdam

Typical compact substation in the streets of Amsterdam. Impossible to install a larger building.

Soure: Alfen pdf-catalog: <http://alfen.com/sites/alfen.com/files/downloads/Peperbus.pdf>

# Impact on MV substations

- Replacing a substation is not an option
  - Not easy to obtain a “green field”
    - Available space / NIMBY
    - Permits
    - City Center?
  - Very high cost
    - Construction of new building or support
    - Cable works
- Retrofit is very important and must be possible!

# Impact on MV substations

---

- New functionalities requires additional space in substation
  - Smart meter equipment
  - Voltage regulator on transformers
  - Smart grid control bays

→ impact of other EU policies!

# Impact on Network

- How to improve energy efficiency?
  - Network efficiency vs. individual component
    - Investments where they yield most results
  - Optimisation of losses based on actual load profiles
    - Rated power  $I_n$
    - Efficiency  $I_o$  &  $I_k$
    - Actual prices & interest rates
  - Special transformers allow transformation of the network
    - Retrofit should remain possible
    - E.g. Voltage upgrade → less losses

# Impact on use in network

- Choosing the right **power rating** is key
  - Long lifetime: 30 to 50 years
  - Load profile and estimated evolution are important
    - Variations in time & season
    - Impact of new technologies
  - Global economics >< individual optimisation
    - Effect of eco-design on the transformer price
    - Price, losses, transport, stock, batch size, ...
- Optimisation of losses is required
  - DSO: specific load profile with high variation
    - Flexibility needed to have best combination of losses ( $I_o$  vs.  $I_k$ )

# Impact on use in network

- Choosing the right **type** is key
  - Different historic network lay-out
    - To change network structure → high costs
      - Modify all substation + cables
      - Limited budgets: only 2 - 3 % annually!!
    - Changes are gradual but effective
      - E.g. higher voltage for lower losses and higher capacity
        - 230 V → 400 V
        - 6000 V → 15000 V
- Special types are needed to facilitate transition

# Optimising the network vs. component

- Optimising of network requires global approach
  - Cables, substations, transformers, ...
- Specific network optimisation can yield much greater results
  - Upgrade LV / MV voltage → lower losses
  - Investment in bigger cables → lower losses & higher capacity in the network
  - Voltage regulators → allow higher capacity & renewables
- Too strict policies can yield opposite results
  - Dry type transformers vs. Oil type
    - Dry transformer = higher losses but more compact – possible loophole?
  - Overloading smaller transformers (higher total losses)

# Summary

---

## Ecodesign should

- Take into account feedback of Stakeholders
- Additional cash-out should result in benefits for users
- Allow retrofit and improvement of existing installation
- Be flexible to allow optimisation according the intended use and network system
- Encourage correct use of products

## Ecodesign should not

- create products which are no longer suited for use
- Result in higher cost with little benefits
- Limit new technologies
- Encourage the wrongful use of products
- Encourage proprietary technology