



Amstelveenseweg 998

1081 JS Amsterdam

Phone: + 31 20 520 7970

Fax: + 31 346 283 258

Email: secretariat@efet.org

Website: www.efet.org

ACER - Agency for the Cooperation of the Energy Regulators

Trg republike 3

1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

1 September 2015

EFET Response to ACER Consultation on the Incremental Capacity Proposal and further NC CAM amendments

The European Federation of Energy Traders (EFET)¹ welcomes the opportunity to respond to the consultation on the proposed CAM amendments. EFET has long been a proponent of a market based approach to triggering release of additional capacity and it is good to see that the industry's efforts are now bearing fruit. Overall we believe the proposed amendments will enable network users to signal the need for additional capacity in a way that enables TSOs to invest and capacity to be allocated fairly to network users. Our detailed comments are below:

Article 2 – Scope.

We support the proposed amendments to Article 2. Consideration should be to extending CAM to points connecting storage and power plants to the network to enable them to access within day capacity.

Article 3 – Definitions.

We note the reference to the Economic Test in the Tariff Network Code (Art. 2 (19)), and also that the Tariff Network Code is still under development. EFET supports the Economic Test Approach but we will need to see the final drafting to know if the Tariff Network Code still works in harmony with the proposed CAM amendments. EFET also supports the availability of a fixed price option for tariffs for new capacity, but recognizes further work needs to be done on the Tariff Network Code to ensure this does not result in unreasonable cross subsidies between network users.

¹ The European Federation of Energy Traders (EFET) promotes and facilitates European energy trading in open, transparent, sustainable and liquid wholesale markets, unhindered by national borders or other undue obstacles. We currently represent more than 100 energy trading companies, active in over 27 European countries. For more information, visit our website at www.efet.org.



EFET supports the definitions for paragraphs 20, 21, 22, and 23 of Article 2.

Article 11 – Annual Yearly Capacity Auctions.

We support the proposed amendments to Article 11. We welcome the change to the auction timetable to ensure that network users will know what reserve price they are paying ahead of the auction, rather than after it.

Article 12 – Annual Quarterly Capacity Auctions.

We support the proposed amendments to Article 12. We welcome the change to the auction timetable to ensure that network users will know what reserve price they are paying ahead of the auction, rather than after it.

Article 13 – Rolling Monthly capacity auctions.

We disagree with the proposed amendment to Article 13. Bringing the monthly auction forward will substantially reduce shippers' visibility and is likely to result in a decrease in bookings of monthly products. Shortcomings and unintended outcomes of the new timetable strongly outweigh the expected benefits of having more time for running the monthly interruptible auctions, even though interruptible capacity is a useful product for shippers. ACER and ENTSOG should also note that monthly auctions lasting several days are a rare event, which could be avoided altogether by re-calibrating the size of the price step at points which are expected to be congested.

Article 14 – Rolling day ahead capacity auctions.

No comments on the proposed amendments.

Article 17 – Ascending Clock auction algorithm.

We note the dependence of the changes to paragraphs 20 and 21 on the drafting of the Tariff Network Code which is not yet finalized.

Article 18 – Uniform Price auction algorithm.

No comments.

Article 19 – Bundled Capacity Products.

EFET would welcome clarification from ENTSOG as to how many TSOs have implemented Article 19 (5). EFET remains concerned about the prospect of shippers having to “pay twice for capacity” where they have capacity on one side of the IP but are not able to buy capacity on the other side to complete the bundle. EFET has made more detailed comments on this issue in other discussions.



Article 20 - Bundling in case of existing transport contracts

EFET does not agree with the proposal to increase the scope of existing unbundled transport contracts which shippers should try to bundle through a 'bundling arrangement'. This is a voluntary effort and nothing in the existing text prevents shippers to try and bundle any post-2013 contracts. Moreover the proposed change has a number of deficiencies including its retroactive effect.

Article 20a – Demand Assessment.

EFET supports the proposed amendments subject to the following comments.

We welcome the approach of setting clear minimum timescales to which TSOs must adhere when assessing demand. We recognize TSOs' concerns that such demand assessment may prove overly costly if conducted every year, and therefore we believe that every 2 years is a good compromise. We welcome the option for TSOs to take account of indications of demand at other times, and would hope that customer focused TSOs would make use of this option as far as they are able. TSOs and network users have a mutual interest in that network users need capacity to sell gas, and TSOs need to sell capacity to network users to generate revenues. We hope that this context would lead to a pragmatic approach where possible by both network users and TSOs.

We also welcome the specification of information required in demand indications and the market demand assessment report which should make the process of triggering incremental capacity run more smoothly.

Lastly we welcome the condition that any fees charged by TSOs for activities related to non binding demand indications should be approved by the regulator and reimbursed if the economic test is passed.

Article 20b - Design Phase.

EFET supports the proposed amendments subject to the following comments.

We welcome the approach of setting clear minimum timescales, requirements to cooperate with relevant other TSOs and regulators, and requirements for consultation to which TSOs must adhere when conducting the design phase. The design phase consultation period for a minimum of 1 month is too short and should be (at least) 2 months. We also welcome the requirements placed upon regulators when making their decisions on proposed projects during the design phase. The design phase is crucial to ensuring that any projects are optimally sized and costed to minimize the risk that the allocation of incremental capacity is unsuccessful and thereby jeopardises the project's successful implementation.

EFET does not support the condition that, where regulators cannot agree on an alternative allocation mechanism for capacity, the auction mechanism shall be used. ACER, ENTSOG and other stakeholders have recognised that the auction mechanism is highly unlikely to work in cases where there are conditional bids and / or the proposed project connects more than two market areas. As this is the case, mandating use of a mechanism that is highly likely to result in a failed allocation does not appear to be sensible. In case NRAs cannot agree on an alternative allocation mechanism, the decision should be passed to the Agency to avoid that recalcitrant regulators will simply refuse to cooperate with their neighbouring regulators, an approach that has already been seen in the implementation of the Congestion Management Procedures.

Article 20c – Auctioning of incremental capacity.

EFET supports the proposed amendments.

Article 20d – Principles for alternative capacity allocation mechanism.

EFET supports the proposed amendments. EFET welcomes the pragmatic approach taken which allows an alternative allocation mechanism to be used which can be appropriate to the project concerned, whilst still ensuring that such a mechanism must be approved by regulators and must be transparent and non discriminatory. EFET also welcomes the ability to allocate capacity for a further 5 years in addition to the 15 year standard time frame.

EFET recognises regulators' concerns that the allocation mechanism should not be used in a way which unduly favours network users who wish to book large quantities of capacity (paragraph 4). EFET's view is the same as that expressed in paragraph 5, namely that any alternative allocation mechanism should ensure that all expressed capacity demand is satisfied where possible. For this reason we believe that the design phase is crucial in ensuring that interested network users have the opportunity to work with TSOs to size the project in the best way possible.

Article 26 – Tariffs

We have no comment on the deletion of this article, but would remind ACER that uncertainty of future tariff levels is likely to have an adverse effect on network users' willingness to book capacity for a sufficient period to ensure the economic test is passed.