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## Executive summary

(1) ACER concludes that the implementation of the Inter-Transmission System Operator Compensation ("ITC") mechanism and the management of the ITC Fund in 2019 continues to be in line with the requirements set out in the Regulation.
(2) With regard to specific aspects of the implementation of the ITC mechanism in 2019, the major findings include the following:

- After being relatively stable between 2015 and 2018, the ITC fund significantly increased in 2019, from 256.5 million EUR to 289.8 million EUR, reaching its highest value ever since its establishment in 2011.
- This significant increase of the ITC fund is mainly explained by a $23 \%$ increase of the weighted average value of losses (from 40.25 EUR/MWh to 49.56 EUR/MWh, i.e. the highest change between two subsequent years ever since the ITC fund has been established). The volume of transmission losses due to transits remains stable ( $2 \%$ decrease) compared to 2018, after a sharp decrease by $14 \%$ the previous year.
- The difference between the lowest and the highest value of losses among both EU and non-EU ITC Parties significantly increased in 2019 compared to the previous year. In 2018, the difference was 26.51 EUR/MWh in EU ITC Parties and 20.56 EUR/MWh in nonEU ITC Parties. In 2019, the difference among EU ITC Parties increased to 39.63 EUR/MWh (68.06 EUR/MWh in Great Britain and 28.45 EUR/MWh in Sweden) and to 28.72 EUR/MWh (72.72 EUR/MWh in Switzerland and 44 EUR/MWh in Kosovo) among the non-EU ITC Parties.
- Among the EU ITC Parties, the highest relative increase in losses' value of $56 \%$ occurred in Austria (from 30.18 EUR/MWh in 2018 to 47.04 EUR/MWh in 2019). Among the nonEU Parties, the highest relative increase in losses' value of $58 \%$ occurred in Switzerland (from 45.91 EUR/MWh in 2018 to 72.72 EUR/MWh in 2019).
- In 2019, the Perimeter countries' fee increased for the second time in a row, after a gradual decrease between 2012 and 2017, reaching 0.8 EUR/MWh. ENTSO-E explained that the reason behind this development is a strong increase in losses costs due to higher market prices. Both absolute and relative contribution from Perimeter countries to the ITC fund increased in comparison to the previous year, changing from 15.1 million EUR to 20.9 million EUR or from $5.9 \%$ to $7.2 \%$.


## 1 Introduction

(3) Pursuant to point 1.4 of Annex Part A of Commission Regulation (EU) No 838/2010 on laying down guidelines relating to the inter-transmission system operator compensation mechanism and a common regulatory approach to transmission charging ${ }^{1}$ (the "Regulation"), the European Union Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators ("ACER") is responsible, since 2012, for preparing a yearly monitoring report on the implementation of the Inter-Transmission System Operator Compensation ("ITC") mechanism and the management of the ITC Fund. The data and information used for compiling this Report ${ }^{2}$ were provided by the European Network of Transmission System Operators for Electricity ("ENTSO-E").
(4) The ITC scheme defined by the Regulation was implemented on 3 March 2011. Under the Regulation, the ITC Fund was established by ENTSO-E for the purpose of compensating transmission system operators ("TSOs") for the costs incurred on national transmission systems due to the hosting of cross-border flows of electricity ("transits"). The ITC Fund consists of two parts which aim at covering, respectively,

- the costs of the incurred transmission losses,
- the costs of making infrastructure available.
(5) TSOs or groups of TSOs being treated as a single unit participating in the ITC mechanism ("ITC Parties") receive compensation from the ITC Fund based on the transits they carry and contribute to the ITC Fund based on their net import and export flows. Non-participating countries connected to the ITC Parties' networks ("Perimeter countries"3) pay a transmission system use fee for their scheduled imports from and scheduled exports to the ITC Parties' networks.
(6) The implementation of the provisions of the Regulation regarding the ITC mechanism and the management of the ITC Fund is carried out by ENTSO-E through the legal framework of the ITC Clearing and Settlement Multi-Year Agreement ("ITC Agreement") concluded on 9 February 2011. In 2019, it comprised 35 ITC Parties ${ }^{4}$. The ITC Agreement contractually sets out ENTSO-E's and ITC Parties' duties and entitlements. It also sets out detailed ITC procedures, including the submission, audit and validation of data, calculation of compensation and contribution amounts, and the clearing and settlement of the ITC Fund.
(7) ACER has reviewed the implementation of the ITC mechanism and the management of the ITC Fund in 2019 based on:
- the ITC Agreement and its amendments,
- relevant data and information received from ENTSO-E in relation to the implementation of the ITC mechanism in 2019.
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## 2 Alignment between the 2019 ITC implementation and the Regulation

(8) No major amendments to the ITC Agreement were introduced in 2019, as there were only annual and technical amendments, which do not affect the main elements of the ITC agreement. Amendments were made for:

- updated schedules due to yearly updates (Schedule P: ENTSO-E convention on Business Day),
- results of the last ITC audit (Schedule T: Yearly vertical loads, Schedule X: Table of losses costs, Schedule O: Ex-Ante Financial Spreadsheet),
- name and format changes (Schedule S: Contact details, Schedule U: Lines and measurement points, V: List of countries/ITC parties/Country control block co-ordinators, W: Geographical parameters).

ACER concludes that the general arrangements are still in line with the guidelines set out in the Regulation.

## 3 Accuracy of data

(10) Through the ITC Agreement, two TSOs (Amprion GmbH and Swissgrid AG) are appointed as "ITC Data Administrators" to manage relevant data and to carry out the clearing and settlement. The ITC Agreement includes yearly and monthly data audits and/or validation procedures involving all ITC Parties. Before the year's settlement begins, a yearly audit of the vertical load, the costs of losses and the capacity not allocated in a manner compatible with the Congestion Management Guidelines is carried out. During the year, before the monthly settlements are issued, several data validation procedures are performed involving all ITC Parties.

In a letter dated 3 August 2020, ENTSO-E submitted to ACER data relating to the implementation of the ITC mechanism in 2019, as well as some relevant descriptive information. ENTSO-E provided explanations or a description of the results for:

- the calculation of the Perimeter Country fee,
- transit reduction including the explanation regarding each border where transits are reduced due to the allocation of capacity on interconnections which is not compatible with point 2 of the guidelines of Annex 1 of Regulation 714/20095,
- results of the yearly audit process in terms of identified errors,
- the amendments of the ITC Agreement,
- the decisions on value of losses in non-EU countries.

In the same letter, ENTSO-E also informed ACER that the final settlements for 2019 (including the netted final settlement) had not yet been signed by all ITC Parties and the quantitative information should be considered as preliminary.

[^1]In an e-mail dated 8 September 2020, ENTSO-E informed ACER that in August, ITC Data Administrators identified an error in the settlements due to a mistake in the data of the reduced transits ${ }^{6}$. All ITC Parties were informed about this and the signature process was put on hold.

In an e-mail dated 6 October 2020, ENTSO-E submitted to ACER the final validated data related to the implementation of the ITC mechanism in 2019.
(12) Based on the information provided by ENTSO-E, the ITC Parties' own revision of the submitted data resulted in 7 changes in costs of losses values, for Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Northern Ireland, Netherlands, Romania and Serbia. Further on, ITC Parties sent 8 requests to other ITC Parties, including Switzerland, Netherlands, Bosnia and Herzegovina, to provide explanation on the information, all regarding the cost of losses in 2019. All ITC Parties' responses to the requests were satisfactory, except the one provided by Switzerland following a request from France. This case was discussed at the Market Committee meeting on 28 March 2019, but did not eventually result in a change of value.

ACER regards that the self-governance arrangement in the operation of the ITC mechanism is in principle an appropriate approach and ought to be sufficient for assuring the accuracy of the operation of the ITC mechanism. Therefore, ACER does not consider it necessary for its own review to conduct a detailed audit or validation of all the input and intermediate data used in the operation of the 2019 ITC mechanism.

## 4 Treatment of third countries

(14) ACER notes that the ITC Agreement has not changed regarding the treatment of the ITC Parties, including TSOs from those third countries, which have adopted and apply European Union law in the field of electricity as well as TSOs from third countries which have not concluded such agreements with the EU, but participate in the ITC through a voluntary multi-party agreement, thus the former findings of ACER are still valid. In 2012, ACER noted that the ITC Agreement makes no distinction between categories of ITC Parties, whether the latter participate on a compulsory or voluntary basis under point 2 of Annex Part A of the Regulation or through voluntary multi-party agreements under point 3. Therefore, ACER concluded that the requirements of points 3.2 and 3.4 of Annex Part A of the Regulation are met.

## 5 ITC fund

(15) In 2019, the ITC Fund amounted to 289.8 million EUR, consisting of 100 million EUR related to the costs of the transmission infrastructure which is made available for transits and 189.8 million EUR related to the costs of the incurred transmission losses due to transits. Of the total ITC Fund, 268.9 million EUR were recovered through contributions from the ITC Parties and the remaining 20.9 million EUR through the Perimeter countries' fees.
(16) As shown in Figure 1, the ITC Fund had been relatively stable between 2015 and 2018, but it significantly increased in 2019, when it also reached its highest amount ever since being established in 2011. While the sum of the infrastructure part of the fund, which is set by the Regulation, remained the same in 2019 as throughout the entire period, the losses part

[^2]significantly increased by $21.3 \%$ in comparison to 2018 , resulting in $13.0 \%$ increase of the total fund.


Figure 1: ITC fund size between 2011 and 2019
(17) An overview of the compensations drawn from, and contributions made to the 2019 ITC fund by the ITC Parties, is provided in Table 2 in the Annex. The table also presents contributions from Perimeter countries collected through their directly-connected ITC Parties.
(18) The final net positions of ITC Parties in 2019 are presented in Figure 2. Further on, Table 3 in the Annex shows the final net positions of each ITC Parties since 2011. ACER notes that for $18^{8}$ out of 35 ITC Parties or for $51 \%$ of all ITC Parties, the direction of the net balance has remained the same every year. For the remaining 17 ITC Parties, the direction of their net balance has changed at least once.
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Figure 2: Final net positions per ITC party in 2019

### 5.1 Contributions to the ITC fund

(19) Point 6 of Annex Part A of the Regulation sets out that each ITC Party shall contribute to the ITC Fund based on its share of the total absolute amount of net imports and net exports of all ITC Parties.

Point 7 of Annex Part A of the Regulation sets out that an ITC Party shall levy a transmission system use fee on all scheduled imports and exports between its national transmission system and that of a Perimeter country. Because the collection of the Perimeter countries' contributions is governed by a series of bilateral contracts, which are renewed annually in most cases, ENTSO$E$ is required to calculate this Perimeter countries' fee each year in advance based on projected flows for the relevant year.

### 5.1.1 Perimeter countries' fee

ENTSO-E's calculation of the Perimeter countries' fee was based on the equivalent losses and infrastructure compensation for historical flows of the previous year, which is, according to ENTSO-E, the best possible projection for flows in the subsequent year. The Perimeter fee has two elements: a losses-related and an infrastructure-related component. While the losses-related fee is calculated by dividing the "With-and-without transit" fund size by the sum of both net and scheduled imports and exports, the infrastructure-related fee is calculated by dividing the total "Framework Fund" contribution, which is still set at 100 million EUR ${ }^{9}$, by the sum of both net and scheduled import and export flows. The two components, summed and rounded to a single decimal place, create the Perimeter fee. This value is produced in January each year based on losses costs and vertical load data collected from ITC Parties. For timing reasons, it is calculated on the basis of unaudited data, but is updated after the data audit.

The Perimeter countries' fee for 2019 was calculated and approved by ENTSO-E at the value of 0.8 EUR/MWh, which is 0.2 EUR/MWh higher than in 2018. The evolution of the Perimeter countries' fee between 2011 and 2019 is presented on Figure 3, along with the Perimeter countries' contributions to the fund. ACER notes that the recent 0.2 EUR/MWh increase in Perimeter countries' fee represents the biggest absolute change between two consequent years. Further on, after it decreased from 0.8 EUR/MWh to 0.5 EUR/MWh in four years (from 2012 to 2016), it increased back to 0.8 EUR/MWh in only two years. ENTSO-E explained that the main reason for the latest increase was a strong increase in losses costs due to higher market prices and that the increase was not compensated by the small increase in flows ( 400 TWh compared to 389 TWh in 2018).

[^4]

Figure 3: Values of the Perimeter countries contributions and Perimeter countries' fee calculated by ENTSO-E between 2011 and 2019

### 5.1.2 ITC Parties' and Perimeter countries' contributions

(23) Table 4 in the Annex provides a summary of the annual Net Import, Net Export and the contribution amount each ITC Party paid into the ITC Fund in 2019, including the contribution it made on behalf of Perimeter countries with which it has a direct connection. Shares of contributions from ITC parties and Perimeter countries between 2011 and 2019 are presented on Figure 4. ACER notes that in 2019, Perimeter countries paid 20.9 million EUR to the ITC fund, which is their highest contribution ever since the fund was established. The Perimeter countries contribution constituted 7.2 \% of the ITC fund in 2019 compared to 5.9 \% in 2018.


Figure 4: Shares of contributions to the fund between 2011 and 2019
(24) Based on the review of the ITC Agreement and the final dataset submitted by ENTSO-E, ACER is able to confirm that the ITC fund contribution amounts were derived according to the requirements of points 6 and 7 of Annex Part A of the Regulation.

### 5.2 Compensations from the ITC fund

(25) Under the Regulation, the ITC Parties should receive compensation for losses incurred due to hosting cross-border flows and for making their infrastructure available to host these flows. The key input for the determination of the compensation amounts are the transits. More information on the transit consideration is provided in section 5.2.1 and on the compensations in sections 5.2.2 and 5.2.3 of this report.

### 5.2.1 Transit and its reduction

(26) Point 1.6 of Annex Part A of the Regulation requires that transit of electricity is calculated by taking the lower of the absolute amount of imports and the absolute amount of exports between national transmission systems. In addition, for the purpose of calculating transits, the amount of imports and exports at each interconnection between the ITC Parties must be reduced in proportion to the share of capacity allocated in a manner which is not compatible with the congestion management methods set out in Point 2 of Annex I of Regulation (EC) No 714/2009 ${ }^{10}$. Ultimately, these reductions lead to decreased financial net positions of the concerned ITC Parties.

ACER notes that ENTSO-E took the following steps in line with the definition in the Regulation related to transits reductions:

- The affected ITC Parties indicated, for each concerned border, the overall exports and imports, as well as the schedules allocated in a manner compatible with the Congestion Management Guidelines;
- The ITC Data Administrators translated this information into the amount by which the relevant transit needs to be reduced;
- The reduced transit represented the basis for calculating the compensation amounts relating to both the infrastructure and the losses parts of the ITC Fund.
(28) Table 5 in the Annex provides a summary of the transits through each ITC Party's network before and after such reductions. In 2019, the border between France and Switzerland was affected by the reduced transits in both directions as well as the border between Switzerland and Italy in the direction towards Italy, due to the existence of long-term priority contracts. Figure 5 presents shares of scheduled exchanges in 2019 that were allocated in a manner compatible and not compatible with the Congestion Management Guidelines .

In 2019, there was no decrease in capacity not allocated in a manner compatible with the congestion management methods, because none of the long-term contracts expired.

In 2019, the amount of transits was reduced by 4.8 TWh, resulting in 233.5 TWh. A comparison of transits before and after reduction in the period between 2011 and 2019 is provided in Figure 6.

[^5]

Figure 5: Shares of scheduled exchanges according to the manner of their allocation for the three borders affected by reduced transits


Figure 6: Amounts of transits before and after reduction between 2011 and 2019 (all values are rounded)

### 5.2.2 Compensation for transmission losses

(31) The key steps for calculating the amount of compensation received by each ITC Parties for the transmission losses incurred by carrying cross-border flows of electricity are defined under Point 4 of Annex Part A of the Regulation. They are summarised below:

- The physical amount of the relevant losses must be calculated by ENTSO-E based on the difference between actual losses with transits and estimated losses without transits on the ITC Party's network.
- The value of losses incurred by a national system as a result of transits shall be calculated on the same basis as those approved by the respective NRA in respect of all losses on the national transmission system. Where the relevant NRA has not approved the basis for the calculation of losses, ENTSO-E is required to estimate the value of losses for the purpose of the ITC mechanism.
(32) ENTSO-E sets out the detailed method for the calculation of the volume of losses in the ITC Agreement. Based on the review of the ITC Agreement and the dataset submitted by ENTSO-E,

ACER is able to confirm that this aspect of the implementation of the ITC mechanism is in line with the definition in the Regulation.
(33) The Regulation also requires ENTSO-E to publish the calculation of the volume of losses and its method. ACER notes that, on 1 October 2020, ENTSO-E published the calculation method and the results for $2019^{11}$.

For each ITC party, Table 6 in the Annex provides a summary of the volume of annual losses due to transits, the values of losses adopted by them and the compensation received from the ITC Fund in the two recent years. Further on, the evolution of the overall volume of transmission losses due to transits is presented on Figure 7. Although the impact of transits on losses volume decreased by $2 \%$ in 2019, the losses component of the ITC fund increased by $21 \%$, from 156.5 million EUR in 2018 to 189.8 million EUR in 2019, and thus reached its highest value. The increase is purely the result of an increased average value of losses. More information on the losses values is provided in section 5.2.2.2 of this report.


Figure 7: Volume of transmission losses due to transits between 2011 and 2019

### 5.2.2.1 Criteria for valuing losses and its approval

(35) Pursuant to point 4 of Annex Part A of the Regulation, the value of losses incurred by a national transmission system as a result of the cross-border flows of electricity shall be calculated on the same basis as the one approved by the regulatory authority in respect of all losses on the national transmission system. ACER shall verify the criteria for the valuation of losses at national level taking particular account that losses are valued in a fair and non-discriminatory way.

ACER's latest detailed review of the criteria for the valuation of losses at national level based on the information on the criteria for valuing losses received from all NRAs of the EU ITC Parties, as well as from the NRAs of Norway and Switzerland is provided in section 2.6 of the ACER's report on the implementation of the ITC mechanism in $2018^{12}$.
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### 5.2.2.2 Values of losses ${ }^{13}$

(37) Previous editions of the ITC monitoring report already describe that the differences of energy prices for different products in different markets and from auctions and bilateral contracts result in a broad range of values of losses for the EU ITC Parties. The summary of the losses values used for the purpose of the ITC implementation in 2019 and in 2018 is provided in Table $1^{14}$.
(38) Figure 8 presents average values of losses, weighted by their volume, for all ITC Parties between 2011 and 2019. ACER notes that the weighted average value of losses had been gradually decreasing between 2012 and 2017, but started to increase after 2017. In 2019, the weighted average value of losses increased by $23 \%$ in comparison to 2018, from 40.25 EUR/MWh to 49.56 EUR/MWh, which is also the highest absolute change in two subsequent years ever since the ITC mechanism has been established.


Figure 8: Volume-weighted average value of losses for all ITC Parties between 2011 and 2019
(39) ACER notes the difference between the highest and the lowest losses' value significantly increased for both EU and non-EU ITC Parties. Compared to 2018, the average value of losses, weighted by their volume, increased by $17 \%$ for EU ITC Parties and by $45 \%$ for non-EU ITC Parties. For non-EU ITC Parties, the average losses value weighted by their volume in 2019 was 44\% or 20.44 EUR/MWh higher than for EU ITC Parties.

Table 1: Comparison of losses values in EU and non-EU ITC Parties in 2018 and 2019

|  | EU ITC Parties |  | Non-EU ITC Parties |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2018 | 2019 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Maximum value <br> (EUR/MWh) | 56.13 (IT) | $68.08(\mathrm{~GB})$ | $51.32(\mathrm{BA})$ | $72.72(\mathrm{CH})$ |
| Minimum value <br> (EUR/MWh) | $29.62(\mathrm{SE})$ | $28.45(\mathrm{SE})$ | $30.76(\mathrm{NO})$ | $44.00(\mathrm{KS})$ |

[^7]| Difference between <br> the maximum and the <br> minimum <br> (EUR/MWh) | 26.51 | 39.63 | 20.56 | 28.72 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average value <br> weighted by the <br> volume of losses <br> (EUR/MWh) | 39.28 | 46.11 | 45.95 | 66.55 |
| Number of countries <br> with increased value <br> of losses compared to <br> the previous year | 20 <br> (an average <br> increase by <br> $16 \%$ ) | 23 <br> (an average <br> increase by <br> $24 \%$ ) | 7 <br> (an average <br> increase by <br> $69 \%$ ) | (an average <br> increase by <br> $37 \%$ ) |
| Number of countries <br> with decreased value <br> of losses compared to <br> the previous year | 6 <br> (an average <br> decrease by <br> $8 \%$ ) | 3 <br> (an average <br> decrease by <br> $2 \%$ ) | (an average <br> decrease by <br> $11 \%$ ) | (an average <br> decrease by <br> $5 \%$ ) |
| Number of countries <br> with the same value of <br> losses compared to <br> the previous year | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |

(40) Losses values of individual ITC Parties in 2018 and 2019 are shown in Table 6. Further on, relative changes of losses' values compared to the previous year are presented in Figure 9 for EU ITC and in Figure 10 for non-EU ITC Parties. Among the EU ITC Parties, the highest relative increase of $56 \%$ occurred in Austria where losses' value changed from 30.18EUR/MWh to 47.04 EUR/MWh. For the non-EU Parties, the highest relative increase in losses' value of 58 \% occurred in Switzerland, considering the values 45.91 EUR/MWh in 2018 and 72.72 EUR/MWh in 2019.


Figure 9: Changes of losses' values of each EU ITC Party in 2019 compared to 2018


Figure 10: Changes of losses' values of each non-EU ITC Party in 2019 compared to 2018

### 5.2.3 Compensation for infrastructure availability for cross-border flows

(41) The key parameters for calculating the amount of compensation an ITC Party should receive for provision of infrastructure to carry cross-border flows are defined in Point 5 of Annex Part A of the Regulation. They are summarized below:

- The annual cross-border infrastructure sum is set at 100 million EUR until determined otherwise by the European Commission.
- Transit factor and load factor are used to apportion the above sum to each ITC Party. The transit factor refers to the amount of transits carried by an ITC Party as a proportion of all transits carried by all ITC Parties. The load factor refers to the relative amount of transits measured by the square of transits divided by the level of the load plus transits in proportion to the relative amount of all ITC Parties' transits. In apportioning the infrastructure compensation amount for an ITC Party, the Transit Factor has a weighting of $75 \%$ and the Load Factor a weighting of $25 \%$.
(42) Based on the review of the ITC Agreement and the final dataset submitted by ENTSO-E, ACER is able to confirm that the compensation amounts relating to the provision of cross-border infrastructures were derived according to the above requirements.
(43) Table 7 in the Annex provides a summary of the annual amount each ITC Party received in 2019 based on their transit factors and load factors.


## 6 Annexes

Please note that while the actual ITC settlement is in Euro cents, the tables below present all monetary values in millions of Euros rounded to three decimal places.

Table 2: Overview of compensation and contribution to the ITC fund in 2019

| ITC Party | Compensation <br> (million EUR) |  |  | Contribution on behalf <br> of Perimeter countries <br> (million EUR) | Contribution from ITC <br> Party <br> (million EUR) |  | Final net position <br> (million EUR) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Iosses | infrastructure | Iosses | infrastructure | Iosses | infrastructure |  |
|  | 0.284 | 0.245 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 1.200 | 0.599 | -1.271 |
| Austria | 11.982 | 11.026 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 4.557 | 2.275 | 16.176 |
| Belgium | 4.895 | 3.720 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 3.725 | 1.860 | 3.030 |
| Bosnia | 1.467 | 1.132 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 1.832 | 0.915 | -0.148 |
| Bulgaria | 1.310 | 1.121 | 0.621 | 0.621 | 1.793 | 0.895 | -1.500 |
| Croatia | 1.935 | 2.251 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 2.988 | 1.492 | -0.294 |
| Czech Rep. | 16.379 | 4.812 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 5.937 | 2.964 | 12.291 |
| Denmark | 12.440 | 3.742 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 4.652 | 2.322 | 9.207 |
| Estonia | 4.381 | 1.537 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.773 | 0.386 | 4.759 |
| Finland | 8.165 | 1.577 | 3.026 | 3.026 | 5.765 | 2.878 | -4.953 |
| France | 15.869 | 3.964 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 27.238 | 13.599 | -21.004 |
| Germany | 12.287 | 12.034 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 22.337 | 11.152 | -9.168 |
| Great Britain | 5.594 | 1.072 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 10.366 | 5.175 | -8.875 |
| Greece | 0.657 | 0.349 | 0.263 | 0.263 | 3.440 | 1.717 | -4.676 |
| Hungary | 3.183 | 3.038 | 1.456 | 1.456 | 4.043 | 2.018 | -2.753 |
| Ireland | 0.074 | 0.118 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 1.341 | 0.669 | -1.818 |
| Italy | 3.598 | 1.457 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 18.127 | 9.050 | -22.122 |
| Kosovo | 0.621 | 0.761 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.588 | 0.294 | 0.499 |
| Latvia | 1.801 | 1.514 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.622 | 0.310 | 2.383 |
| Lithuania | 4.549 | 1.869 | 3.129 | 3.129 | 1.868 | 0.933 | -2.642 |
| Luxembourg | 0.026 | 0.033 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 1.886 | 0.942 | -2.769 |
| Montenegro | 1.178 | 1.726 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.518 | 0.258 | 2.128 |
| Netherlands | 8.719 | 5.961 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 4.483 | 2.238 | 7.959 |
| North Macedonia | 0.493 | 1.381 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.870 | 0.434 | 0.571 |
| Northern Ireland | 0.171 | 0.326 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.723 | 0.361 | -0.587 |
| Norway | 1.607 | 0.867 | 0.037 | 0.037 | 8.523 | 4.255 | -10.378 |
| Poland | 10.517 | 2.436 | 0.560 | 0.560 | 4.509 | 2.251 | 5.072 |
| Portugal | 0.488 | 0.390 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 4.801 | 2.397 | -6.321 |
| Romania | -2.115 | 0.788 | 0.224 | 0.224 | 1.714 | 0.856 | -4.345 |
| Serbia | 1.319 | 1.570 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 1.193 | 0.596 | 1.100 |
| Slovakia | 4.733 | 6.025 | 0.592 | 0.592 | 1.026 | 0.512 | 8.035 |
| Slovenia | 2.985 | 4.233 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 1.081 | 0.540 | 5.597 |
| Spain | 14.371 | 3.163 | 0.534 | 0.534 | 5.100 | 2.546 | 8.820 |
| Sweden | 7.077 | 3.921 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 12.141 | 6.062 | -7.205 |
| Switzerland | 26.784 | 9.843 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 7.621 | 3.805 | 0.000 |

Table 3: Final net positions of ITC Parties between 2011 and 2019

| ITC party | Final net position (million EUR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Albania | -2.176 | -2.320 | -1.518 | -1.607 | -1.364 | -1.239 | -1.878 | -1.624 | -1.271 |
| Austria | 11.144 | 17.915 | 11.263 | 6.223 | 7.136 | 5.526 | 9.817 | 7.650 | 16.176 |
| Belgium | 2.566 | -3.077 | -1.604 | -5.964 | -9.933 | 1.989 | 0.592 | -5.768 | 3.030 |
| Bosnia | 3.398 | 3.444 | 1.018 | 0.897 | 2.329 | 0.375 | 1.132 | 0.488 | -0.148 |
| Bulgaria | -4.265 | -2.815 | -0.713 | 0.002 | -2.691 | 0.907 | 0.137 | -2.333 | -1.500 |
| Croatia | 2.147 | 0.110 | 5.264 | 2.359 | 0.974 | 2.556 | -0.472 | 4.604 | -0.294 |
| Czech Rep. | -5.702 | -4.941 | -4.544 | 0.841 | 7.842 | 6.447 | 5.946 | 8.785 | 12.291 |
| Denmark | 4.600 | 13.108 | 12.675 | 11.154 | 8.674 | 5.411 | 9.356 | 7.640 | 9.207 |
| Estonia | -0.532 | 1.389 | 1.853 | 5.471 | 8.378 | 3.854 | 2.813 | 3.701 | 4.759 |
| Finland | 0.769 | -9.125 | -5.713 | -1.262 | 3.545 | -2.886 | -8.054 | -5.116 | -4.953 |
| France | -25.685 | -22.123 | -19.032 | -29.079 | -27.331 | 2.070 | -6.880 | -20.893 | -21.004 |
| Germany | 20.974 | 26.786 | 13.207 | 0.912 | -6.101 | -12.475 | -2.156 | -8.435 | -9.168 |
| Great Britain | -6.794 | -11.534 | -12.706 | -13.274 | -14.063 | -10.028 | -10.344 | -7.506 | -8.875 |
| Greece | 0.317 | 4.693 | 0.612 | -3.634 | -3.065 | -4.637 | -0.686 | 0.278 | -4.676 |
| Hungary | 1.765 | 2.507 | -4.412 | -3.910 | -3.938 | -4.034 | -2.745 | -5.058 | -2.753 |
| Ireland | -0.661 | -0.449 | -1.217 | -0.934 | -0.932 | -1.167 | -1.413 | -1.410 | -1.818 |
| Italy | -30.544 | -33.931 | -29.760 | -24.035 | -29.726 | -25.559 | -24.901 | -25.849 | -22.122 |
| Kosovo | - | - | - | - | - | 0.225 | 0.069 | 1.036 | 0.501 |
| Latvia | 0.764 | 3.185 | 3.676 | 2.995 | 3.548 | 3.126 | 2.798 | 2.966 | 2.383 |
| Lithuania | -4.969 | -5.447 | -4.359 | -3.719 | -3.371 | 1.454 | -0.397 | -1.858 | -2.642 |
| Luxembourg | -2.846 | -3.264 | -2.849 | -2.309 | -2.551 | -2.905 | -2.783 | -2.405 | -2.769 |
| Montenegro | 0.425 | 0.784 | 1.032 | 2.127 | 0.672 | 0.504 | 0.419 | 0.791 | 2.128 |
| Netherlands | -0.184 | -4.540 | -1.799 | 4.559 | 11.181 | 4.526 | 6.230 | 10.030 | 7.959 |
| North Macedonia | -0.833 | -1.031 | -0.695 | 0.395 | 0.803 | 1.096 | 0.218 | 0.349 | 0.571 |
| Northern Ireland | -0.305 | -0.896 | -0.818 | -0.664 | -0.619 | -0.539 | -0.729 | -0.315 | -0.587 |
| Norway | -10.870 | -13.643 | -9.100 | -6.274 | -5.813 | -12.794 | -11.978 | -10.358 | -10.378 |
| Poland | 2.635 | 5.013 | 2.853 | 10.106 | 15.532 | 8.342 | 5.775 | 3.381 | 5.072 |
| Portugal | -2.692 | -3.281 | -2.102 | -0.292 | 0.255 | -2.894 | -3.476 | -2.331 | -6.321 |
| Romania | -2.282 | -3.329 | -1.737 | -4.257 | -4.352 | -3.725 | -3.762 | -1.303 | -4.345 |
| Serbia | 3.297 | 2.015 | 1.461 | 2.012 | 3.740 | 2.221 | 2.473 | 3.785 | 1.100 |
| Slovakia | 6.994 | 11.415 | 6.985 | 7.722 | 7.737 | 5.298 | 6.573 | 4.218 | 8.035 |
| Slovenia | 4.130 | 3.808 | 4.023 | 4.624 | 5.919 | 5.186 | 6.612 | 1.360 | 5.597 |
| Spain | -1.064 | -5.317 | -0.191 | 0.989 | 1.195 | 4.972 | 1.249 | 10.312 | 8.820 |
| Sweden | 14.311 | 10.400 | 16.074 | 19.795 | 3.996 | 4.007 | 4.391 | 10.438 | -7.205 |
| Switzerland | 22.172 | 24.491 | 22.877 | 18.030 | 22.396 | 14.789 | 16.056 | 20.752 | 25.201 |
| TOTAL | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |

Table 4: Derivation of contributions to the ITC Fund

| ITC Party | Net Import (MWh) | Net Export (MWh) | Contribution to infrastructure (million EUR) |  | Contribution to losses (million EUR) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Perimeter countries | ITC Party | Perimeter countries | ITC Party |
| Albania | 2,513,928 | 107,917 | 0.000 | 0.599 | 0.000 | 1.200 |
| Austria | 7,511,437 | 2,444,422 | 0.000 | 2.275 | 0.000 | 4.557 |
| Belgium | 3,199,599 | 4,938,371 | 0.000 | 1.860 | 0.000 | 3.725 |
| Bosnia | 131,503 | 3,871,255 | 0.000 | 0.915 | 0.000 | 1.832 |
| Bulgaria | 1,345 | 3,916,743 | 0.621 | 0.895 | 0.621 | 1.793 |
| Croatia | 6,345,703 | 182,609 | 0.000 | 1.492 | 0.000 | 2.988 |
| Czech Republic | 113,511 | 12,856,152 | 0.000 | 2.964 | 0.000 | 5.937 |
| Denmark | 7,915,122 | 2,247,061 | 0.000 | 2.322 | 0.000 | 4.652 |
| Estonia | 1,482,173 | 207,385 | 0.000 | 0.386 | 0.000 | 0.773 |
| Finland | 12,589,739 | 3,795 | 3.026 | 2.878 | 3.026 | 5.765 |
| France | 1,918,703 | 57,585,868 | 0.000 | 13.599 | 0.000 | 27.238 |
| Germany | 7,145,571 | 41,651,985 | 0.000 | 11.152 | 0.000 | 22.337 |
| Great Britain | 22,192,003 | 453,468 | 0.000 | 5.175 | 0.000 | 10.366 |
| Greece | 7,439,072 | 75,186 | 0.263 | 1.717 | 0.263 | 3.440 |
| Hungary | 8,829,538 | 2,707 | 1.456 | 2.018 | 1.456 | 4.043 |
| Ireland | 1,792,219 | 1,136,415 | 0.000 | 0.669 | 0.000 | 1.341 |
| Italy | 39,548,013 | 52,900 | 0.000 | 9.050 | 0.000 | 18.127 |
| Kosovo | 784,653 | 500,981 | 0.000 | 0.294 | 0.000 | 0.588 |
| Latvia | 868,298 | 489,766 | 0.000 | 0.310 | 0.000 | 0.622 |
| Lithuania | 4,080,953 | 0 | 3.129 | 0.933 | 3.129 | 1.868 |
| Luxembourg | 4,121,002 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.942 | 0.000 | 1.886 |
| Montenegro | 610,669 | 520,304 | 0.000 | 0.258 | 0.000 | 0.518 |
| Netherlands | 5,147,396 | 4,645,973 | 0.000 | 2.238 | 0.000 | 4.483 |
| North Macedonia | 1,862,633 | 37,158 | 0.000 | 0.434 | 0.000 | 0.870 |
| Northern Ireland | 857,667 | 721,101 | 0.000 | 0.361 | 0.000 | 0.723 |
| Norway | 9,507,145 | 9,112,436 | 0.037 | 4.255 | 0.037 | 8.523 |
| Poland | 9,444,436 | 407,072 | 0.560 | 2.251 | 0.560 | 4.509 |
| Portugal | 6,944,124 | 3,545,055 | 0.000 | 2.397 | 0.000 | 4.801 |
| Romania | 2,013,324 | 1,732,080 | 0.224 | 0.856 | 0.224 | 1.714 |
| Serbia | 1,399,236 | 1,207,682 | 0.000 | 0.596 | 0.000 | 1.193 |
| Slovakia | 2,097,093 | 144,902 | 0.592 | 0.512 | 0.592 | 1.026 |
| Slovenia | 1,021,304 | 1,339,861 | 0.000 | 0.540 | 0.000 | 1.081 |
| Spain | 8,739,151 | 2,401,800 | 0.534 | 2.546 | 0.534 | 5.100 |
| Sweden | 88,846 | 26,434,870 | 0.000 | 6.062 | 0.000 | 12.141 |
| Switzerland | 5,382,375 | 11,267,088 | 0.000 | 3.805 | 0.000 | 7.621 |
| TOTAL | 195,639,484 | 196,242,370 | 10.442 | 89.558 | 10.442 | 179.381 |
|  |  |  | 100.000 |  | 189.823 |  |

Table 5: Reduction in transits

| ITC party | Transit before adjustment (MWh) | Reduction due to non-auctioned interconnection capacity (MWh) | Transit after reduction (MWh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Albania | 662,563 | 0 | 662,563 |
| Austria | 20,399,890 | 0 | 20,399,890 |
| Belgium | 9,551,986 | 0 | 9,551,986 |
| Bosnia | 2,693,454 | 0 | 2,693,454 |
| Bulgaria | 3,041,157 | 0 | 3,041,157 |
| Croatia | 5,053,963 | 0 | 5,053,963 |
| Czech Republic | 10,858,713 | 0 | 10,858,713 |
| Denmark | 7,946,331 | 0 | 7,946,331 |
| Estonia | 3,201,575 | 0 | 3,201,575 |
| Finland | 4,420,647 | 0 | 4,420,647 |
| France | 13,271,098 | 1,481,278 | 11,789,820 |
| Germany | 31,548,553 | 0 | 31,548,553 |
| Great Britain | 3,269,446 | 0 | 3,269,446 |
| Greece | 1,047,529 | 0 | 1,047,529 |
| Hungary | 7,265,735 | 0 | 7,265,735 |
| Ireland | 359,514 | 0 | 359,514 |
| Italy | 4,406,020 | 3,635 | 4,402,385 |
| Kosovo | 1,696,365 | 0 | 1,696,365 |
| Latvia | 2,981,753 | 0 | 2,981,753 |
| Lithuania | 3,924,666 | 0 | 3,924,666 |
| Luxembourg | 98,790 | 0 | 98,790 |
| Montenegro | 2,972,602 | 0 | 2,972,602 |
| Netherlands | 14,633,537 | 0 | 14,633,537 |
| North Macedonia | 2,870,823 | 0 | 2,870,823 |
| Northern Ireland | 873,587 | 0 | 873,587 |
| Norway | 2,555,528 | 0 | 2,555,528 |
| Poland | 6,785,377 | 0 | 6,785,377 |
| Portugal | 1,154,901 | 0 | 1,154,901 |
| Romania | 2,237,717 | 0 | 2,237,717 |
| Serbia | 4,020,013 | 0 | 4,020,013 |
| Slovakia | 11,430,863 | 0 | 11,430,863 |
| Slovenia | 7,999,969 | 0 | 7,999,969 |
| Spain | 9,139,878 | 0 | 9,139,878 |
| Sweden | 10,409,639 | 0 | 10,409,639 |
| Switzerland | 23,481,514 | 3,312,140 | 20,169,374 |
| TOTAL | 238,265,695 | 4,797,053 | 233,468,642 |

Table 6: Derivation of compensation for transmission losses in 2018 and 2019

| ITC party | 2018 |  |  | 2019 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Impact of transits on losses volume (MWh) | Value of losses (EUR/MWh) | Compensation (million EUR) | Impact of transits on losses volume (MWh) | Value of losses (EUR/MWh) | Compensation (million EUR) |
| Albania | 4,124 | 50.00 | 0.206 | 5,675 | 50.00 | 0.284 |
| Austria | 193,145 | 30.18 | 5.829 | 254,729 | 47.04 | 11.982 |
| Belgium | 69,248 | 44.44 | 3.077 | 110,155 | 44.44 | 4.895 |
| Bosnia | 37,363 | 51.32 | 1.917 | 21,029 | 69.78 | 1.467 |
| Bulgaria | 23,424 | 55.07 | 1.290 | 23,319 | 56.18 | 1.310 |
| Croatia | 106,716 | 47.67 | 5.087 | 34,132 | 56.69 | 1.935 |
| Czech Rep. | 274,065 | 42.32 | 11.598 | 296,515 | 55.24 | 16.379 |
| Denmark | 258,956 | 35.73 | 9.252 | 244,544 | 50.87 | 12.440 |
| Estonia | 86,994 | 36.30 | 3.158 | 92,103 | 47.57 | 4.381 |
| Finland | 155,273 | 35.23 | 5.470 | 237,347 | 34.40 | 8.165 |
| France | 304,755 | 40.37 | 12.303 | 394,054 | 40.27 | 15.869 |
| Germany | 391,983 | 29.64 | 11.618 | 335,798 | 36.59 | 12.287 |
| Great Britain | 65,624 | 54.34 | 3.566 | 82,164 | 68.08 | 5.594 |
| Greece | 41,015 | 53.30 | 2.186 | 11,586 | 56.70 | 0.657 |
| Hungary | 25,325 | 40.78 | 1.033 | 64,896 | 49.05 | 3.183 |
| Ireland | 53 | 47.55 | 0.003 | 1,148 | 64.14 | 0.074 |
| Italy | 928 | 56.13 | 0.052 | 57,146 | 62.96 | 3.598 |
| Kosovo | 21,371 | 46.17 | 0.987 | 14,112 | 44.00 | 0.621 |
| Latvia | 55,713 | 37.00 | 2.061 | 37,602 | 47.90 | 1.801 |
| Lithuania | 80,835 | 37.10 | 2.999 | 96,269 | 47.25 | 4.549 |
| Luxembourg | 617 | 31.86 | 0.020 | 627 | 41.45 | 0.026 |
| Montenegro | 3,718 | 48.52 | 0.180 | 18,704 | 62.99 | 1.178 |
| Netherlands | 200,540 | 42.99 | 8.621 | 144,458 | 60.36 | 8.719 |
| North Macedonia | 8,627 | 50.07 | 0.432 | 7,675 | 64.25 | 0.493 |
| Northern Ireland | 5,779 | 47.55 | 0.275 | 2,664 | 64.14 | 0.171 |
| Norway | 23,045 | 30.76 | 0.709 | 36,487 | 44.03 | 1.607 |
| Poland | 145,682 | 40.93 | 5.963 | 187,596 | 56.06 | 10.517 |
| Portugal | 31,602 | 51.44 | 1.626 | 8,001 | 61.00 | 0.488 |
| Romania | 8,263 | 42.15 | 0.348 | -49,023 | 43.15 | -2.115 |
| Serbia | 64,771 | 47.48 | 3.075 | 21,981 | 60.00 | 1.319 |
| Slovakia | 59,967 | 38.42 | 2.304 | 104,556 | 45.27 | 4.733 |
| Slovenia | 84,926 | 44.69 | 3.795 | 64,776 | 46.08 | 2.985 |
| Spain | 326,718 | 53.13 | 17.359 | 250,633 | 57.34 | 14.371 |
| Sweden | 323,429 | 29.62 | 9.580 | 248,752 | 28.45 | 7.077 |
| Switzerland | 404,419 | 45.91 | 18.567 | 368,316 | 72.72 | 26.784 |
| TOTAL | 3,889,010 | - | 156.548 | 3,830,524 | - | 189.823 |

Table 7: Derivation of compensation for cross-border infrastructure in 2019

| ITC Party | Transit <br> (MWh) | Load <br> (GWh) | Transit Factor <br> based <br> compensation <br> (million EUR) | Load Factor <br> based <br> compensation <br> (million EUR) | Total <br> Infrastructure <br> compensation <br> (million EUR) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Albania | 662,563 | 6,930 | 0.213 | 0.032 | 0.245 |
| Austria | $20,399,890$ | 30,727 | 6.553 | 4.473 | 11.026 |
| Belgium | $9,551,986$ | 67,395 | 3.069 | 0.652 | 3.720 |
| Bosnia | $2,693,454$ | 12,274 | 0.865 | 0.266 | 1.132 |
| Bulgaria | $3,041,157$ | 32,220 | 0.977 | 0.144 | 1.121 |
| Croatia | $5,053,963$ | 17,320 | 1.624 | 0.627 | 2.251 |
| Czech Rep. | $10,858,713$ | 38,095 | 3.488 | 1.324 | 4.812 |
| Denmark | $7,946,331$ | 21,239 | 2.553 | 1.189 | 3.742 |
| Estonia | $3,201,575$ | 7,865 | 1.028 | 0.509 | 1.537 |
| Finland | $4,420,647$ | 63,886 | 1.420 | 0.157 | 1.577 |
| France | $11,789,820$ | 420,477 | 3.787 | 0.177 | 3.964 |
| Germany | $31,548,553$ | 256,418 | 10.135 | 1.899 | 12.034 |
| Great Britain | $3,269,446$ | 264,504 | 1.050 | 0.022 | 1.072 |
| Greece | $1,047,529$ | 47,313 | 0.337 | 0.012 | 0.349 |
| Hungary | $7,265,735$ | 33,962 | 2.334 | 0.704 | 3.038 |
| Ireland | 359,514 | 28,661 | 0.115 | 0.002 | 0.118 |
| Italy | $4,402,385$ | 244,377 | 1.414 | 0.043 | 1.457 |
| Kosovo | $1,696,365$ | 5,628 | 0.545 | 0.216 | 0.761 |
| Latvia | $2,981,753$ | 5,807 | 0.958 | 0.556 | 1.514 |
| Lithuania | $3,924,666$ | 9,992 | 1.261 | 0.608 | 1.869 |
| Luxembourg | 98,790 | 4,251 | 0.032 | 0.001 | 0.033 |
| Montenegro | $2,972,602$ | 3,325 | 0.955 | 0.771 | 1.726 |
| Netherlands | $14,633,537$ | 78,759 | 4.701 | 1.260 | 5.961 |
| North Macedonia | $2,870,823$ | 6,990 | 0.922 | 0.459 | 1.381 |
| Northern Ireland | 873,587 | 8,447 | 0.281 | 0.045 | 0.326 |
| Norway | $2,555,528$ | 74,810 | 0.821 | 0.046 | 0.867 |
| Poland | $6,785,377$ | 91,932 | 2.180 | 0.256 | 2.436 |
| Portugal | $1,154,901$ | 38,330 | 0.371 | 0.019 | 0.390 |
| Romania | $2,237,717$ | 37,276 | 0.719 | 0.070 | 0.788 |
| Serbia | $4,020,013$ | 27,844 | 1.291 | 0.279 | 1.570 |
| Slovakia | $11,430,863$ | 19,088 | 3.672 | 2.353 | 6.025 |
| Slovenia | $7,999,969$ | 13,149 | 2.570 | 1.663 | 4.233 |
| Spain | $9,139,878$ | 193,278 | 2.936 | 0.227 | 3.163 |
| Sweden | $10,409,639$ | 92,828 | 3.344 | 0.577 | 3.921 |
| Switzerland | $20,169,374$ | 46,291 | 6.479 | 3.363 | 100.000 |
| TOTAL | $2,351,687$ | 75.000 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 25600 |  |  |  |

15 This is the total amount of electricity which exits the national transmission system to distribution systems and to end consumers directly connected to the transmission system, as well as to electricity producers for their consumption in the generation of electricity.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ OJ L 250, 24.9.2010, p. 5
    ${ }^{2}$ The previous ACER ITC Monitoring Reports are available at ACER's website: http://www.acer.europa.eu/Official documens/Publications/Pages/Publication.aspx
    ${ }^{3}$ Belarus, Moldova, Morocco, Russian Federation, Turkey and Ukraine
    ${ }^{4}$ TSOs from all EU Member States except Cyprus and Malta and from the following third countries: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, North Macedonia, Northern Ireland (as a separate ITC party), Montenegro, Norway, Serbia, Switzerland and United Kingdom

[^1]:    ${ }^{5}$ Regulation (EC) No 714/2009 was valid until 31 December 2019 and covers the entire monitoring period. Regulation (EU) 2019/943 shall apply from 1 January 2020.

[^2]:    ${ }^{6}$ According to ENTSO-E explanation, the values for the two directions between Switzerland and France were mixed up.
    7 For Hungary and Romania, the values were updated following NRA's approval. For Italy, the values were calculated on the basis of the weighted average clearing price and for Serbia, based on the weighted average market purchase price. The remaining jurisdictions provided no clear explanations on the change.

[^3]:    ${ }^{8}$ Net receivers in each year: AT, DK, KS, LV, ME, PL, RS, SK, SI, CH
    Net contributors in each year: AL, GB, IE, IT, LU, NI, NO, RO

[^4]:    ${ }^{9}$ In its Recommendation No 05/2013, ACER recommended the ITC infrastructure fund (Framework Fund) should be phased-out.

[^5]:    ${ }^{10}$ OJ L 211, 14.8.2009, p.15, Regulation (EC) No 714/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council on conditions for access to the network for cross-border exchanges in electricity and repealing Regulation (EC) No $1228 / 2003$. Point 2.1 of Annex I of Regulation (EC) No 714/2009 stipulates that "capacity shall be allocated only by means of explicit (capacity) or implicit (capacity and energy) auctions".

[^6]:    11 ENTSO-E ITC Transit Losses Data Report 2019, https://eepublicdownloads.azureedge.net/cleandocuments/Publications/Position\%20papers\%20and\%20reports/entsoe ITC Transit Losses Data report 2019 201001.pdf
    ${ }^{12}$ Report to the European Commission on the implementation of the ITC mechanism in 2018, December 2019, https://www.acer.europa.eu/Official documents/Acts of the Agency/Publication/ITC\%20Monitoring\%20Report\% 202019.pdf

[^7]:    ${ }^{13}$ The values reported in this section are the losses' values used for the implementation of the ITC mechanism, which are typically calculated or estimated ex ante (i.e. at the end of the previous year based on forecasted market prices) and they may not be the same as the "actual" losses' values, which are typically registered ex post (i.e. using the actual costs/market prices).
    ${ }^{14}$ As the United Kingdom was an EU Member State in 2019 for which year the monitoring of the ITC implementation is carried out, Great Britain and Northern Ireland are considered in this report as an EU ITC Parties.

