

## Responses to Consultation on Draft Code on Balancing

Please complete the fields below and send via email using the subject, Response to Consultation on the Draft Code on Balancing, to [info@entsog.eu](mailto:info@entsog.eu) by 17:00CET on June 12<sup>th</sup>.

Please note that respondents are not required to respond to all questions below.

In sending your response submission by email, you are confirming that ENTSG can disregard any standard e-mail text about not disclosing email contents and attachments.

### Name

First and Last Names: Balancing Workgroup – Ruud Wassen

### Organisation

Company/Organisation Name: Eurogas Distribution Committee

Job title: Senior Regulatory Affairs Manager

### Contact details

Email: Ruud Wassen

Tel: 0032 2 894 4807

Mobile: 0032 479 471 583

### Address

Street: Avenue de Cortenbergh 172 Box 6

Postal code: B-1000

City: Brussels

Country: Belgium

**ENTSO-G seeks to publish response once the consultation has ended. Please indicate here whether your response is confidential (in whole or part)**

☐ In whole, meaning nothing to be published

☐ In part, meaning a version with your marked confidential sections excised by ENTSOG could be published

## **CHAPTER II. BALANCING SYSTEM**

**Question 1** – Do you concur that the implementation of a Virtual Trading Point via the inclusion of the Trade Notification and Allocation scheme in the Balancing Network Code will contribute to the delivery of a properly functioning market? If not, please propose an alternative and provide justification.

Response:

**Question 2** – in the context of the proposed Trade Notification and Allocation scheme, does the Draft Code provide sufficient harmonisation within? If not, what would be the preferred basis for any additional harmonisation?

Response:

## **CHAPTER III. CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION**

**Question 3** - Do you agree that ENTSOG should issue the review of the progress of harmonisation of balancing rules report at the latest two year after the implementation of the network code and then biannually thereafter? If not, please propose an alternative and provide justification to support your proposal (and /or counter Draft Code's approach).

Response:

**Question 4** – Do you agree with the proposed review process (including the issuing of a report (in the public domain)? If not, please propose an alternative and provide justification to support your proposal (and /or to counter Draft Code's approach).

Response: We agree with the proposed review process but we would to propose the following text:

Article 10:

2. In this process the TSOs shall consult stakeholders, in cooperation with the relevant DSOs where they are affected, on options for cooperation.

This would bring article 10-2 in line with article 44-2.

We would like to emphasise that the harmonisation of the balancing zones will probably also mean choosing the same model for the information provision (art 40-5), and probably the same reconciliation process. And also one format of data exchange between the two TSO's and the DSO's from the two originating balancing zones (art 45-3).

The justification is that unlike most stakeholders the DSOs operate in a regulated environment and therefore have an obligation to comply with these proposals, which will mean unbudgeted cost and resource implications.

#### **CHAPTER IV. OPERATIONAL BALANCING**

**Question 5** – Do you agree that TSOs should, under specific circumstances, be allowed to trade in adjacent markets? If so, please explain under what circumstances.

Response:

**Question 6** – Do you agree that the use of the expression 'economic and efficient' is a suitable criterion assessing TSO Balancing Actions? If not, please provide an alternative and an associated rationale.

Response:

**Question 7** – Do you agree with the choices in the Draft Code: (1) to limit standardised products for trading flexible gas to short-term products; and (2) to have only a small number of short-term standardised products? If not, please explain why.

Response:

**Question 8** – Do you agree that the Balancing Network Code should not prescribe exchange-based trading for the TSO and to leave this to the discretion of the TSO and the TPO? Should the network code provide criteria and factors to consider for the TSO to use an exchange based trading?

Response:

**Question 9** – Do you agree with the current level of services to be provided by a Trading Platform specified in the Draft Code? For example, the STSPs make no reference to a block size, meaning that this will be agreed on a local basis. If not, please explain where and why additional specification is needed.

Response:

**Question 10** – Do you agree with the current level of specification in the Draft Code on contractual structure and arrangements between the different parties? What changes (if any) would you advocate?

Response:

**Question 11** – Do you agree with the choices in the Draft Code to put the obligation to (re)nominate on the Originating Party? If not, what would your preferred alternative be and what benefits would this alternative have over the mechanism proposed in the Draft Code?

Response:

**Question 12** – Do you concur with the sequence of the tools in the merit order and the level of guidance it gives the TSO in choosing the most appropriate tool? If not, which changes, if any, would you advocate and why?

Response:

**Question 13** – What is your view on: (1) the criteria to be considered by the TSO when procuring Balancing Services; and (2) the gradual reduction of the use of Balancing Services as the liquidity of the wholesale market increases? Please provide a reasoned response.

Response:

**Question 14** – Do you agree with the proposal that the TSO shall be enabled to submit an incentive mechanism to the NRA for approval? If not, please explain why.

Response:

**Question 15** – Do you consider that the procedures set out in the Draft Code (excluding timing, which is covered below) for the submission of nominations and re-nominations, and the criteria for their rejection, are reasonable? If no, please present and justify your preferred alternative.

Response:

## **CHAPTER V. NOMINATIONS**

**Question 16** – Do you agree with the schedule for initial day-ahead nominations set out in the Draft Code? If not, please give a reasoned alternative schedule.

Response:

**Question 17** – Do you agree with the schedule for re-nominations set out in the Draft Code? If not, please give a reasoned alternative schedule.

Response:

**Question 18** – What are your initial views on these specific features on nominations (respectively re-nominations) for transition, system integrity and daily-hourly regimes of the network code? Please provide a reasoned response.

Response:

## **CHAPTER VI. DAILY IMBALANCE CHARGES**

**Question 19** - Do you support the Daily Imbalance Quantity determination proposed in the Draft Code? If not, please indicate your preferred approach and supply further rationale and evidence of the benefits of Daily Imbalance Quantities being derived on information based during the Gas Day?

Response:

**Question 20** – Do you have alternative views as to whether Locational and/or Temporal Market Products should feed into the derivation of the Weighted Average Price? If so what is your rationale for a different approach and what do you see as the benefits?

Response:



**Question 21** – Do you agree that day-ahead trades should feed into the determination of the Weighted Average Price, Marginal Buy Price and Marginal Sell Price? If so, then under what circumstances should they be used? Is there merit in allowing local discretion as to whether day-ahead trades influence the setting of the prices?

Response:

**Question 22** – Do you agree that the source of trades should be left to local discretion? What criteria should apply? Should there be an aspiration that the source of trades should be a single platform and if so why and how should the platform be determined? Please provide a rationale for your preferences.

Response:

**Question 23** – What should the effect of the small adjustment be: to encourage trading or to be sufficiently large to reflect a value for physical flexibility?

Response:

**Question 24** – Do you agree with the addition of cross border trade as a criterion to the derivation of the Small Adjustment? Are the criteria sufficient? If not, what else should be added? Please justify any proposals.

Response:

## **CHAPTER VII. WITHIN-DAY OBLIGATIONS**

**Question 25** – In your view, are the elaborations of the criteria in the Draft Code sufficient? If not, please indicate which ones and how.

Response:

**Question 26** – Do you believe that additional criteria for assessing WDOs are warranted? If yes, please specify which and why.

Response:

**Question 27** – Do you find the respective roles of a TSO and relevant NRA(s) appropriate in the approval of any WDOs? If not, please explain why and how you would re-define the roles.

Response:

**Question 28** – Do you agree that a six-month period is appropriate for a TSO to make a proposal for approval of an existing WDO, including a recommendation document? If not, please propose an alternative and provide justification.

Response:

**Question 29** – Do you agree that a six-month period is appropriate for the NRA to conduct its assessment and approval process? If not, please propose an alternative and provide justification.

Response:

## **CHAPTER VIII. NEUTRALITY ARRANGEMENTS**

**Question 30** – In your view, is the scope of the currently proposed neutrality section of the Draft Code appropriate? If not, please explain why.

Response:

**Question 31** – Do you find appropriate the proposed scope of the transparency elements of neutrality? If not, please explain your reasons why.

Response:

**Question 32** – Please indicate the level of granularity you would expect in the context of the breakdown of net Balancing Neutrality Charges cash-flows from both a temporal (e.g. daily, monthly, annual) and cost/revenue element split.

Response:

**Question 33** – Do you agree that there would be potential benefits of attributing Balancing Neutrality Charges to different pots and of recovering them over different classes of network users? If yes, please explain why.

Response:



**Question 34** – If you support multiple neutrality pots, how would these be defined? How could such different attribution processes be applied in practice?

Response:

**Question 35** – Is the level of specification in the Draft Code for cash-flow management appropriate? If not, how do you propose it be amended?

Response:

**Question 36** – An alternative to creating additional costs for invoicing systems and processes is to address neutrality sums via adjustment to transmission charges. Do you agree with such an alternative? If not, please explain why.

Response:

**Question 37** – Do you agree with the information provision models for offtakes proposed in the Draft Code fulfil the requirements of the FGs? If not, please explain.

Response:

## **CHAPTER IX. INFORMATION PROVISION OBLIGATIONS**

**Question 38** – Do you agree that prospective implementations of Variant 2 should be approved only after a consultation process? If not, please explain.

Response: We believe that all models should be treated equally. We see no reason for an extra hurdle for the implementation of variant Two as all variants originate from the framework guideline.

**Question 39** – Do you support the additional proposal that the cost-benefit analysis (CBA) should also examine the time taken to provide information to Network Users? Are there any other features that would strengthen the CBA process and why? If so, please explain why.

Response:

Other features that would strengthen the CBA process are:

- To assess the telecommunication options. In some EU member states, mobile telecommunication networks do not have 100% coverage. The more communication protocols that are necessary, the more complicated this becomes.
- To assess whether it is technically feasible?
  - At the customer's premises: the nearer an electricity connection is to a gas connection, the greater the feasibility.
  - ICT wise: handling this volume of data takes time. What are the technical limitations and how can these problems be solved? Sometimes these problems require organisational measures: i.e. a central data hub. This will only happen if the TSO takes the initiative and/or the DSO cooperates voluntarily. It is important to note that the level of cooperation between DSO's varies in each EU member state.

**Question 40** – Do you agree that the Balancing Network Code has to provide guidance on timing of information flows? If yes, do you agree with the proposals set out? If you do not agree with the Draft Code proposals what could the alternatives be and what would be the justification?

Response: Yes we agree. Although we would like to stress that the rules laid out in the Framework Guidelines are very ambitious for DSO's in many EU Member States. We see a twice daily information update for Network users as the maximum practical scheme for all EU Member States.

Furthermore it is crucial that the implementation period for DSOs is sufficient to allow them to develop appropriate systems to fulfil these requirements

**Question 41** – Do you consider that Transparency Guidelines requirements are sufficient to deal with system information? If not what should be included and what is the justification?

Response:

**Question 42** – Do you agree that the proposal is in line with input information requirements set out in the FGs?

Response:

## **CHAPTER X. LINEPACK FLEXIBILITY SERVICE**

**Question 43** – Do the proposed additional criteria that a Linepack Flexibility Service has to meet complement those in the FGs to make a sufficient set of criteria? Or are additional criteria required? Please provide a reasoned response.

Response:

## **CHAPTER XI. IMPLEMENTATION, INTERIM MEASURES AND ENTRY INTO FORCE**

**Question 44** – How should the short-term balancing market be defined? What account of temporal and physical flow considerations needs to be made? What measures should be used to assess liquidity in the short-term balancing markets?

Response:

**Question 45** – What other measures might be contemplated to enable wider access to short term gas flexibility? Are any of these approaches appropriate for inclusion in the Balancing Network Code?

Response:

**Question 46** – In your view, what would justify including LNG in the Balancing Zone in “small markets” and in short term transitional arrangements? Do you see any conflict with these reasons and the BTM to be established by the eventual Balancing Network Code?

Response:

**Question 47** – Do you agree that the tolerance used should be a price based tolerance? If not please explain your rationale and provide your preferred approach.

Response:

**Question 48** – In your view, should the reduced exposure involve the application of an average price? If not, please explain your rationale and provide your preferred approach.

Response:

**Question 49** – Do you support the Draft Code including provisions for the accuracy of forecast information provision to ensure timely phase-out of tolerances? If yes, explain how this can be best established.

Response:

**Question 50** – Does the Draft Code provide an appropriate mitigation of risk involved in servicing NDM demand? If not, please indicate an alternative approach and its rationale.

Response:

**Question 51** – Do you agree that the Draft Code provides an adequate basis to support the release of surplus TSO flexibility as a stimulus to the market? If not, please explain why.

Response:

**Question 52** – Do you agree that there is merit in including a reference to Balancing Platform trades in the interim imbalance cash-out price determination part, as suggested in the Draft Code? If yes, how should the approach be formulated and what merits would it have?

Response:

**Question 53** – Are there any other interim steps that should be considered beyond those envisaged in the table above?

Response:

**Question 54** – Are there any specific ENTSG monitoring and reporting activities that should be explicitly captured in the Balancing Network Code. If so, please identify them and their rationale.

Response:

## GENERAL ISSUES

**Question 55** – Do you consider that the level of detail in the Draft Code, as it has been tailored according to the topics treated, is appropriate for EU legislation? If not, please explain why with reference to specific topic chapters (articles, paragraphs, etc.).

CHAPTER I. GENERAL PROVISIONS	
CHAPTER II. BALANCING SYSTEM	
CHAPTER III. CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION	
CHAPTER IV. OPERATIONAL BALANCING	
CHAPTER V. NOMINATIONS	
CHAPTER VI. DAILY IMBALANCE CHARGES	
CHAPTER VII. WITHIN-DAY OBLIGATIONS	
CHAPTER VIII. NEUTRALITY ARRANGEMENTS	
CHAPTER IX. INFORMATION PROVISION OBLIGATIONS	
CHAPTER X. LINEPACK FLEXIBILITY SERVICE	
CHAPTER XI. IMPLEMENTATION, INTERIM MEASURES AND ENTRY INTO FORCE	

**Question 56** – After reviewing and/or replying to Chapter 5 which follow, do you find that there are other material issues that ENTSG should consider as it develops the Balancing Network Code?

Response:

**Question 57** – Do you find that this supporting document for the public consultation was 'respondent-friendly' in terms of its readability, style, etc.? Please explain how we can improve future consultations.

Response: