**Public Consultation – FUNC issue “****Missing harmonisation of interfaces on capacity platforms”**

**Introduction:**

Equinor ASA posted following issue in the Gas Network Code Functionality Platform <http://www.gasncfunc.eu/>

Extract of the reported issue

|  |
| --- |
| Issue identification number: 470-19-05-15-1056 Reporting party name: Equinor ASA The issue: Missing harmonisation of interfaces on capacity platforms Abstract: Today there are 4 capacity platforms (Prisma, Gaz System, GBS (Gassco booking site) and a Hungarian platform). There is also more to come. In addition, TSOs are also running some capacity processes like overnomination and interruptible capacities via their own sites. In the common data exchange solutions table from ENTSOG it was decided that for capacity interactive data exchange should be used. In our opinion this have created a situation where some of the processes is harmonised but the data exchange and platforms are completely different. This makes it difficult for network users (Balancing Responsible Parties ) to keep track of their capacity and to get an overview of options available for transporting the gas in Europe and also the cost involved to do so. Who should act: ACER, ENTSOGSuggested solution or action: Adjustment of implementation Other suggestions: Edig@s should be implemented. |

During the first Stakeholder meeting regarding the above mentioned FUNC issue including representatives of all Capacity Booking Platforms, ACER, EFET, several Network User and ENTSOG, it was agreed to launch a public consultation on this topic in order to have an understanding of the preference from the market participants of having a common format and protocol for communication to Capacity Booking Platforms.

Please note that the aim of the public consultation is focusing on data exchange between *Auction Office* and *Registered Network Users* as mentioned in the [Common Data Exchange Solution Table](https://www.entsog.eu/sites/default/files/2018-10/INT0994-161026%20Common%20Data%20Exchange%20Solution%20Table_final_0.pdf).

We kindly ask you to fill out this questionnaire by **14/02/2020**.

For any questions don’t hesitate to get in touch with ENTSOG (marin.zwetkow@entsog.eu)

Please provide your answer via the online survey form <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/YHDQZR6>

For your convenience please find below the links to the relevant websites hosting supporting documents for this public consultation.

**Supporting Documents:**

* [AS4 implementation documents](https://www.entsog.eu/interoperability-and-data-exchange-nc#as4-documents-for-implementation)
* [Edig@s Message Implementation guidelines](https://www.edigas.org/version-5/)
* [Gas Network Codes Functionality Platform](http://www.gasncfunc.eu/)
* [Interoperability Network Code](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32015R0703&from=EN)
* [Common Data Exchange Solution Table](https://www.entsog.eu/sites/default/files/2018-10/INT0994-161026%20Common%20Data%20Exchange%20Solution%20Table_final_0.pdf)
1. Your name:
2. Email address:
3. Company name:
4. Country:
5. I read, understood and I accept the terms of the [ENTSOG](https://www.entsog.eu/privacy-policy-and-terms-use) and [ACER](https://www.acer.europa.eu/en/The_agency/Data-Protection/Documents/DPN_Interactions%20with%20Stakeholders.pdf) privacy policies and I consent, in particular, on ENTSOG / ACER processing my personal data (abovementioned) for this public consultation.
6. My contribution

can be published with my organisation's information

can be published provided that my organisation remains **anonymous**

1. Please specify your Role

BRP Balance Responsible Party

CRP Capacity Responsible Party

TSO Transmission System Operator

Capacity Booking Platform Operator

Association

LNG Operator

Storage Operator

 Other - Please specify\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Which *formats* are you using today for the communication to:

Options:

* Capacity Booking Platforms
* TSOs
* Market Area Managers/Area Coordinator
* VTP-Operators
* SSOs/LNG-Operators
* DSOs
* Other NUs
* Other (please specify)

Possible answers:

* Edig@s 5.1
* Edig@s 4
* Edig@s (Edifact)
* Proprietary format
* NA
1. Which *Protocols* are you using today for the communication to:

Options:

* Capacity Booking Platforms
* TSOs
* Market Area Managers/Area Coordinator
* VTP-Operators
* SSOs/LNG-Operators
* DSOs
* Other NUs
* Other (please specify)

Possible answers:

* AS4
* AS2
* Web-services
* SFTP
* FTPs
* SMTP (email)
* Other
* NA
1. How many messages do you exchange to each counterparty?

Options:

* Capacity Booking Platforms
* TSOs
* Market Area Managers/Area Coordinator
* VTP-Operators
* SSOs/LNG-Operators
* DSOs
* Other NUs
* Other (please specify)

Possible answers:

* Less than one per day
* 1-5 messages per day
* 1-5 messages per hour
* More than 5 message per hour
* No message exchange

Others: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Please specify a counterparty and frequency of message exchange)

1. On how many Market Areas are you active?

1 Market Area

2-3 Market Areas

More than 3 Market Areas

1. For which communication do you see a potential for improvement in regards to data exchange and why is this improvement needed?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Do you have Edig@s-XML format / AS4 protocol already in place? If your answer is "Yes", please, indicate which processes and then proceed to question number 16
If your answer is "No" please provide us your answers on Questions 14+15

Capacity Trading Process

Settlement Process

Gas Trading Process

Balancing Process

Nomination and Matching Process

Transparency process

Facility Setting Process

General Service Process

Market Balancing Process

REMIT Reporting Process

Supply switching process

 Other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

No (please proceed to question Nr. 12 or 13, otherwise please continue with Question 14)

1. If Edig@s-XML / AS4 was considered but not implemented, please, indicate reasons why?

Format / protocol not provided by the counterparty

High implementation effort/costs

High operational/maintenance effort

Low trading volumes

 Other

1. If Edig@s-XML / AS4 was NOT considered, please, indicate reasons why?
2. How many Capacity Booking Platforms do you use?

1

2

3

4

Not active on Capacity Booking Platforms

1. Do you support a common format (Edig@s-XML) for all capacity booking platforms for the processes (data exchange between Registered Network Users and Auction Office) mentioned in the [Common Data Exchange Solution Table](https://www.entsog.eu/sites/default/files/2018-10/INT0994-161026%20Common%20Data%20Exchange%20Solution%20Table_final_0.pdf)? Please, indicate your preference as Yes (scale 1-5, 5 is max).

Yes (1)

Yes (2)

Yes (3)

Yes (4)

Yes (5)

No

No opinion

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Please elaborate on the reasons of your previous answer:

Costs for capacity booking platforms

Speed (implementation, processing messages)

Interoperability of messages

User-friendliness

Impact on the gas price for end-users

Impact on Network User’s margins

Impact on Network Users ability to enter new markets

 Other – please specify\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. IF Edig@s xml is chosen as common format for capacity platform for processes mentioned in the Common Data Exchange Solution Table that can be used all over Europe would you then want to implement the solution? Please explain your answer in the "Comments" field.

Yes

No

Comments\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. How much time it will take you to implement the new *format*?

Less than 6 months

1-2 years

3+ years

1. Please elaborate on the reasons for the implementation timeline (see question 20)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (mandatory answer)

1. Would you want the existing method of data exchange to continue despite a common *format* is offered? If YES please elaborate on the reasons by answering question 23.

Yes

No

1. Please elaborate on the reasons and desired timeframe

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (valid only if question 22 was answered with “yes”)

1. Edig@s XML covers the functionalities mentioned in the CAM NC, please, note that capacity booking platforms provide additional functionalities not covered by the Edig@s format. Which functionalities must be covered by Edig@s-XML before implementing it as a common format for capacity booking platforms?

Only activities covered by the CAM NC (basic activities like auction bidding, auction results and information add some examples)

Functionalities offered by capacity booking platforms, which are needed (additional activities like pulling balancing group information, pulling auction calendars etc.)

 Other, please specify\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Do you support a common *protocol* for all capacity booking platforms? Please, indicate your preference as Yes (scale 1-5, 5 max)

Yes (1)

Yes (2)

Yes (3)

Yes (4)

Yes (5)

No

No opinion

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. If you answered question 25 with ‘yes’, what is your main criteria for having a common *protocol*:

Costs for end-users

Costs for capacity booking platforms

Speed (implementation,)

Speed (processing messages)

Security (authentication)

Security (non-repudiation)

Interoperability (compatibility with other processes)

 Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. What would be your preferred *protocol* for communication to capacity booking platforms?

AS4 (as defined as defined in [INT NC \* Art. 21](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32015R0703&from=EN))

REST (as used by Prisma)

Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\*AS4 has been chosen as a protocol for the document-based data exchange after a Cost-Benefit and technical analysis considering i.e. the security parameters and interoperability of this protocol. The AS4 profile developed by ENTSOG narrows down the parameters of the protocol in order to meet only the relevant functionalities needed for the gas market.

1. From the perspective of every day operations, please, tell us what are the pros and cons for the protocol AS4

|  | Pros | Cons | No opinion |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Costs for end-users |  |  |  |
| Costs for capacity booking platforms |  |  |  |
| Speed (implementation) |  |  |  |
| Speed (processing message) |  |  |  |
| Security (authentication) |  |  |  |
| Security (Non-repudiation) |  |  |  |
| Interoperability (compatibility with other processes) |  |  |  |

Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. From the perspective of every day operations, please tell us what are the pros and cons for the protocol REST (as used by Prisma)

|  | Pros | Cons | No opinion |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Costs for end-users |  |  |  |
| Costs for capacity booking platforms |  |  |  |
| Speed (implementation) |  |  |  |
| Speed (processing messages) |  |  |  |
| Security (authentication) |  |  |  |
| Security (non-repudiation) |  |  |  |
| Interoperability (compatibility with other processes) |  |  |  |

Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. How much time it will take you to implement the new *protocol*?

Less than 6 months

1-2 years

3+ years

1. Please elaborate on the reasons for the implementation timeline (see question 30)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (mandatory answer)

1. Would you want the existing method of data exchange to continue despite a common *protocol* is offered? If YES please elaborate on the reasons see question 33?

Yes

No

1. Please elaborate on the reasons and desired timeframe

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (valid only if question 32 was answered with “yes”)

1. What are 3 the most important issues from your point of view regarding this reported issue?
2. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
5. In case you are already using Edig@s for business processes like Nomination & Matching, what other processes would you like to cover with this format?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Please, state any general comments

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_