

**Roundtable meeting with Associations of Energy Market Participants  
28th September 2016, 13:30-17:30 CET and 29th September 2016, 09:30-  
15:30 CET  
(6th floor, ACER's premises)**

**Minutes**

---

**Day 1**

**(Chatham House Rules, no names in quotes during the meeting)**

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Elio Zammuto	ACER
Marko Trost	ACER
Marketa Stuchlikova	ACER
Aikaterini Achinioti	ACER
Nadja Keraenen	Association of Gas and District Heating Companies
David Trevallion	Energy UK
Filip Sleeuwagen	EFET
Torsten Bsdurek	EFET
David Beier	BDEW
Alex Abbotson	IOGP
Michael Gurschler	Österreichs Energie
Tzvetelina Tzankova	Elcom
Geoff Boon	E-Control
Mahdi Shahrokhi Damavandi	ACM
Antonia Maedel	E-Control

## 1. Opening

Welcome address and introduction of the participants. The agenda and minutes of the previous roundtable meeting were approved.

## 2. General update

ACER provided updates on several topics.

They said the REMIT Annual Report 2016 would be published soon and that some REMIT data were used for the ACER Market Monitoring Report 2015.

The budget discussion was ongoing and the decision on budget would be finalized in November-December 2016. The EC's proposal on the budget had been adopted before the summer of 2016 and it included a 50% cut to the requested budget. The budget cut would have two consequences: CEREMP review would not be done the following year as initially planned and no sample extracts of MPs' data would be provided.

The Internal reorganization of the Market Monitoring Department was ongoing.

ACER was in the process of assessing data quality. RRM's would be contacted for data quality issues soon.

New editions of FAQs and Q&As had been published. Question 1.1.20 on the timing of non-standard reporting is of high importance.

The participants asked whether ACER would continue to publish the List of Standard Contracts and whether the No-Action Letter for Article 4 would be published again. ACER answered that the No-Action Letter would be published for one more year and that it is the obligation of ACER to maintain the List.

## 3. ACER presentation on Non-Standard complex contracts structure

ACER presented two slides on the topic.

Slide 1 - Discussion on the Election Sheet. The wording of the Election Sheet was amended for contractual terms. The first three blocks are Contractual terms, the last one is commercial.

Slide 2 – Needs to be amended. Stakeholders were asked to write up a paragraph on the distinction between reporting Table 1 and Table 2 for complex contracts.

## 4. The reporting of index trades

The first paragraph must be aligned with the newly published FAQ 1.1.20 and a short note will be added. Apart from this, stakeholders agreed with the examples.

## 5. Delivery Points for reporting parties

There was a discussion on the correct EIC code (EIC Y or Z) for Interconnection Points.

ACER informed the group that a reference table with EIC codes would be either published on the REMIT Portal or circulated to RRM's.

MPs should then use the codes from the mapping table, since related validation rules will be implemented.

## 6. LNG Questions

Scenarios were presented by the participants. A general agreement was reached and it was decided that Scenario 3 should be checked further.

ACER would further discuss fundamental data questions with LNG experts.

## 7. Update on the AEMPs/RRMs UTI-subgroup

There were 3 issues that were related to the generation of ACER's UTI: normalization of input field values for currency, normalization of input field values for quantity units and the population of price field with value 0 (not blank).

EFET ACER UTI Guidelines v1.0 were presented.

The group raised an issue that MPs—buyers and sellers—may report in different units (due to the different IT system implementation of MPs), which is why the generation of the UTI does not match among MPs.

ACER said that they had expected that counterparties would be reporting using the same units. ACER said they would explore whether it is necessary to clarify that each counterparty needs to report using the same units.

A participant stressed that a counterparty will do the invoicing using the units stated in the contract, regardless of whether the units are supported by the counterparty's system.

A participant requested that ACER provide a list of fields that have to match between a buyer and a seller. ACER answered that guidance is already provided in the TRUM and its Annexes.

With regard to the delivery end and start dates, there was a discussion about the UTC format, about whether to report 00:00 24:00 vs 23:00 for the UK and about which date to use for the UTI generation. A participant expressed that clear guidance could solve the situation. Another participant stressed that values and units reflected in the contracts should be used for reporting and the generation of the UTI.

Some contracts are only in paper format, so the change of IT systems (conversion to different units in order to align units between counterparties) would not solve the situation.

The participants agreed that the Agency should share the anonymized EFET ACER UTI Guidelines v1.0.

## Day 2

(Chatham House Rules, no names in quotes during the meeting)

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Elio Zammuto	ACER
Marko Trost	ACER
Marketa Stuchlikova	ACER
Aikaterini Achinioti	ACER
Nadja Keraenen	Association of Gas and District Heating Companies
David Trevallion	Energy UK
Filip Sleeuwagen	EFET
Torsten Bsdurek	EFET
David Beier	BDEW
Alex Abbotson	IOGP
Michael Gurschler	Österreichs Energie
Tzvetelina Tzankova	Elcom
Geoff Boon	E-Control
Mahdi Shahrokhi Damavandi	ACM
Antonia Maedel	E-Control

Stakeholders were asked to flag the questions that should be prioritized for publishing in the FAQ.

The participants asked to receive the documents with answers drafted during the meeting. ACER said they would circulate the documents after the roundtable.

## 8. FAQs recently received with draft answers document & RRM\_usergroup\_webinars

There was a discussion about individual questions for which no draft answers had been prepared. Some additional text was added for some draft answers. The participants were asked to provide a definition of a full supply contract (complex contract) by the following week.

## 9. AOB

ACER asked participants whether they would be interested in a roundtable on data quality. A new open letter for the AEMP Roundtable registration for 2017 would be sent out soon.

A new REMIT Portal [testing version], which supports searching across published documents, was shown.