Contribution ID: 582e278c-6e4a-4cd8-b1a4-76ff7519c0cf

Date: 07/08/2020 21:44:18

Public consultation on the ENTSO-E proposals for technical specifications for cross-border participation in capacity mechanisms

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Public Consultation ENTSO-E proposals for technical specifications for cross-border participation in capacity mechanisms

This consultation is addressed to all interested stakeholders.

Stakeholders are invited to fill out this online survey by 9 August 2020, 23:59 hrs (CEST).

For questions, please contact ACER at: ACER-ELE-2020-014@acer.europa.eu

Consultation objective and background

This consultation aims to gather stakeholder views on the proposed technical specifications for cross-border participation in capacity mechanisms.

On 3 July 2020, the European Network of Transmission System Operators for Electricity (ENTSO-E) submitted to ACER their proposals for technical specifications for cross-border participation in capacity mechanisms pursuant to Article 26(11) of Regulation (EU) 2019/943, and consisting of:

- a methodology for calculating the maximum entry capacity for cross-border participation;
- a methodology for sharing the revenues;
- · common rules for the carrying out of availability checks;
- common rules for determining when a non-availability payment is due;
- · terms of operation of the ENTSO-E registry; and
- common rules for identifying capacity eligible to participate in the capacity mechanism.

According to Article 26(11), ACER shall approve these proposals based on the procedure set out in Article 27 of Regulation (EU) 2019/943, amending them where required. In order to inform its assessment and if required, identify areas for amendment, ACER invites all interested third parties to submit their views on the proposals by responding to this online survey during a consultation period of 4 weeks.

Following this consultation, ACER will consider stakeholder feedback and expects to take a decision on the proposals, including potential amendments, within the next three months as required by Article 27 of Regulation (EU) 2019/943, i.e. by 5 October 2020.

Related documents

 ENTSO-E, Cross-border participation in capacity mechanisms: Proposed methodologies, common rules and terms of operation in accordance with Article 26 of the Regulation (EU) 2019/943 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 June 2019 on the internal market for electricity (recast), version of 3 July 2020

- (https://www.acer.europa.eu/Official_documents/Public_consultations/PC_2020_E_12/200703%20Single%20document%20for%20XB%20CM%20methodologies.pdf)
- ENTSO-E proposed methodologies, common rules and terms of reference related to cross-border participation in capacity mechanisms: Explanatory document, version of 3 July 2020 (https://www.acer.europa.eu/Official_documents/Public_consultations/PC_2020_E_12/200703%20Ex planatory%20document%20for%20XB%20CM%20methodologies.pdf)
- ENTSO-E, Public consultation on draft methodologies and common rules for cross-border participation in capacity mechanisms: Response to public consultation comments received during the consultation held from 31 January to 13 March 2020, version of 3 July 2020 (https://www.acer.europa.eu/Official_documents/Public_consultations/PC_2020_E_12/200703%20R esponse%20to%20public%20consultation%20on%20XB%20CM%20methodologies.pdf)
- Regulation (EU) 2019/942 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 June 2019 establishing a European Union Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (recast) (https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX%3A32019R0942)
- Regulation (EU) 2019/943 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 June 2019 on the internal market for electricity (recast) (https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/? uri=CELEX%3A32019R0943)
- ACER Guidance Note on Consultations
 (https://www.acer.europa.eu/Official_documents/Other%20documents/Guidance%20Note%20on%20 Consultations%20by%20ACER.pdf)
- ACER Rules of Procedure (AB Decision No 19/2019)
 (https://www.acer.europa.eu/en/The_agency/Organisation/Administrative_Board/Administrative%20B oard%20Decision/Decision%20No%2019%20-%202019%20-%20Rules%20of%20Procedure%20of%20the%20Agency.pdf)

\sim				
$(\ \) \cap$	nta	ct c	leta	ıle

*Name and s	surname	

Annika Kleine

*Company

Baltic Cable AB

*Address

Gustav Adolfs Torg 47, 211 39 Malmö

* Country

Sweden

*Phone

+46705690460

Privacy and confidentiality

ACER will publish all non-confidential responses, including the names of the respondents, unless they should be considered as confidential, and it will process personal data of the respondents in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 (https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/? uri=CELEX%3A32018R1725) of 23 October 2018 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data by the Union institutions, bodies, offices and agencies and on the free movement of such data, taking into account that this processing is necessary for performing ACER's consultation task. For more details on how the contributions and the personal data of the respondents will be dealt with, please see ACER's Guidance Note on Consultations (https://www.acer.europa.eu/Official_documents/Other%20documents/Guidance%20Note%20on%20Consultations%20by%20ACER.pdf) and the specific privacy statement attached to this consultation.

Article 7(4) of ACER's Rules of Procedure (RoP) (https://s-intranet/Drive/Departments/Electricity/ED%20Deliverables/Decision%20No%2019%20-%202019%20-%20Rules%20of%20Procedure%20of%20the%20Agency.pdf#search=rules%20of%20procedures)requires that a party participating in an ACER public consultation explicitly indicates whether its submission contains confidential information.

*Is your submission to this consultation con	fidential?
○ YES	
NO	

Consultation questions

ACER seeks the opinion of stakeholders with respect to the following elements of the ENTSO-E proposal.

Methodology for calculating the maximum entry capacity

1. Do you agree with the proposed methodology for calculating the maximum entry capacity for cross-border participation? If not, please explain which elements of the methodology should be changed or otherwise improved.

In general we have the impression that some of the stakeholder comments have already been taken into account after the first consultation, there are however still a number of points we wish to highlight below in order to increase transparency and clarity of the methodologies.

As regards to structuring we propose to change the sequence of Articles in this methodology to enhance clarity. Since the maximum entry capacity will be determined based on ERAA simulation results as described in Art. 10 (4), it seems more appropriate to move Art. 10 after what is now Art. 6. At the beginning of Art. 7 the maximum entry capacity is replaced by "the contribution" and used accordingly in subsequent articles. This is not enhancing clarity and should be amended to clearly differentiate cross-border contributions that a bidding zone can rely upon in moments of stress and the maximum entry capacity for cross-border participation in CRM for which the methodology is proposed here. Consequently "the contribution" should be replaced by the term "maximum entry capacity".

Moreover, the purpose of Art.11 remains unclear from the methodology. This Article describes how bilateral scarcity ratios are calculated, but neither the rationale for calculating them is explained nor what these ratios are used for. We therefore advocate to establish clear reference to how the ratios are used in the methodology.

2. Should the methodology allow for calculating capacity contributions from Member States with no direct network connection with the Member State applying the capacity mechanism?

In general this should be allowed where transmission capacity can help to alleviate adequacy concerns.

Methodology for sharing the revenues from the allocation of entry capacity

3. Do you agree with the proposed methodology for sharing the revenues from allocating entry capacity? If not, please explain which elements of the methodology should be changed or otherwise improved.

We support the notion as proposed by ENTSO-E that revenue sharing should serve the purpose of providing incentives to further develop transmission capacity in case the transmission capacity is deemed the scarce resource as this is also in line with how the value of transmission capacity is determined in the energy market.

We disagree however how the methodology for sharing the revenues from cross-border participation in CRM is designed. The methodology for calculating the maximum entry capacity takes into account the likelihood of concurrent moments of stress between two neighbouring bidding zones, thereby "de-rating" the transmission capacity that can contribute to alleviate scarcity situations. Art. 14 describes that depending on the likelihood of concurrent system stress between the concerned bidding zones the revenues (which are calculated based on the maximum entry capacity) are shared between the TSO of the Member State organising the capacity mechanism and the other concerned TSO(s). By effectively counting the likelihood of concurrent system stress twice the revenue to be shared with interconnector owners is inappropriately reduced. Such setup would not appropriately take into account the valuable role interconnectors play in stabilising the electricity system across bidding zones borders and would not provide the proper incentives for interconnector investment.

4. Do you agree with the proposed common rules for the carrying out of availability checks? If not, please explain which elements of the proposed rules should be changed or otherwise improved.

```
Yes, no further comment necessary.
```

Common rules for determining when a non-availability payment is due

5. Do you agree with the proposed common rules for determining when a non-availability payment is due? If not, please explain which elements of the proposed rules should be changed or otherwise improved.

```
Yes, no further comment necessary.
```

Terms of the operation of the ENTSO-E registry

6. Do you agree with the proposed terms of the operation of the ENTSO-E registry? If not, please explain which elements of the proposed terms should be changed or otherwise improved.

```
Yes, no further comment necessary.
```

Common rules for identifying capacity eligible to participate in the capacity mechanism

7. Do you agree with the proposed common rules for identifying capacity eligible to participate in the capacity mechanism? If not, please explain which elements of the proposed rules should be changed or otherwise improved.

```
Yes, no further comment necessary.
```

General provisions and other comments

8. Do you agree with the general provisions of the ENTSO-E proposals (Title 1)? If not, please specify which provisions should be changed or otherwise improved, and explain why.

Even though the term "Curtailment sharing rule" is defined in Art.2 cc it remains unclear what it means, in particular when reference is made to curtailment ratios between bidding zones. Since this concept is closely linked to the methodology for calculating the maximum entry capacity, a clearer explanation is required.

9. Do you have any other comments on the ENTSO-E proposals that we should take into account in our assessment?

```
No further comment.
```

Contact

ACER-ELE-2020-014@acer.europa.eu