

Responses to CAM Network Code – stakeholder support process

Consultation Response Sheet

Please complete the fields below and send via email using the subject title, “Response to the CAM NC consultation” to info@entsog.eu by 13 February 2012.

Name

First and Last Name: **Christine Ravnholt Hartmann**

Organisation

Company/Organisation Name: **International Association of Oil & Gas Producers - OGP Europe**

Job Title: **EU Affairs Manager**

Contact details

Email: crh@ogp.be

Tel: **+32 2 566 9150**

Mobile: **+32 496 126 059**

Address

Street: **Bd du Souverain 165**

Postal Code: **B-1160**

City: **Brussels**

Country: **Belgium**

Countries in which your organisation operates: **(in Europe:) Austria, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Spain, U.K.**

How would you describe your organisation?

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Association | (please specify type) International Association of Oil & Gas Producers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | End user | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Network user | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Trader | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other | (please specify) |

Question 1: Do you consider that the network code development process carried out by ENTSOG was appropriate, given the boundaries of the framework guideline? In particular, was the level of stakeholder engagement appropriate? If there is room for improvement, please inform us about possible suggestions for improvement.

| | |
|--|----|
| Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No |
| Comments: OGP commends ENTSOG for the professional approach they have adopted in the engagement of stakeholders during the network code development process. | |

Question 2: Following the EC request to shift the day-ahead auction to the afternoon D-1, please indicate whether a day-ahead auction held from 16.30-18.00 local time in central Europe can be supported (see section 4.7 of the CAM NC).

| | |
|--|----|
| Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No |
| If no, please give brief reasons and state how to consider this issue: | |

Question 3: Please complete the table below, indicating whether you support the relevant sections of the CAM NC, having regard to the process carried out and ENTSG's aim to reflect the views of the majority of users during the development process.

| Section | 1-2: Rationale and Application | 3: Principles of co-operation | 4: Allocation of firm capacity ¹ | 5: Cross-border capacity |
|----------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Support | X | X | X | |
| Do not support | | | | X |

| Section | 6: Interruptible capacity | 7: Tariffs | 8: Booking platforms | 9-11: Legal provisions |
|----------------|---------------------------|------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| Support | X | X | X | X |
| Do not support | | | | |

Please provide brief reasoning for your responses, if you wish

OGP has repeatedly expressed its objections to the forced bundling of existing capacity (sunset clause and default rule) that is laid down in Article 5.2 of the CAM Network Code. In our view this article should be removed from the final network code.

¹ Please consider article 4 except the day-ahead suggestion which is tackled already above.