Contribution ID: f42c0fdf-c9ae-4ebb-8d46-3d034f76c784
Date: 12/06/2026 09:40:34

ACER public consultation: Guideline on REMIT transaction reporting

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

Background

Regulation (EU) No 1227/2011 on wholesale energy market integrity and transparency ("REMIT") establishes a framework to ensure the integrity and transparency of wholesale energy markets across the Union.

In 2024, REMIT was revised, introducing new and updated data reporting requirements. These changes were further specified in Regulation (EU) No 2026/256 on data reporting (recast REMIT Implementing Regulation), which sets out detailed rules on data reporting obligations, market participant registration, inside information disclosure, and monitoring procedures to ensure consistent enforcement of REMIT across EU wholesale energy markets.

Scope of the Guideline on transaction reporting

The revised REMIT introduced a new possibility for ACER to develop guidelines and recommendations to national regulatory authorities or market participants (Article 16b REMIT).

ACER has developed the Guideline on REMIT Transaction Reporting to facilitate the understanding of the data reporting rules and requirements under REMIT and the REMIT Implementing Regulation. The purpose of the Guideline on REMIT Transaction Reporting is to separate the technical guidance on how to report data to ACER, addressed in ACER's Transaction Reporting User Manual (TRUM), from the more policy-oriented aspects of data reporting, now consolidated into the Guideline on REMIT Transaction Reporting.

You can download the draft Guideline on REMIT transaction reporting here:

DRAFT_Guideline_on_REMIT_Transaction_Reporting.docx

Objective of the consultation

According to the revised REMIT, ACER shall conduct public consultations regarding the guidelines which it issues.

The objective of this consultation is to gather valuable feedback, needs and views from the public to refine the structure and content of the proposed guideline.

The survey is structured in dedicated sections following the chapters of the proposed guideline. Respondents are invited to submit their feedback on each section via the open questions below and/or by uploading documents with revision proposals in the dedicated section at the end of the survey.

Contact and deadline

The contact point for this consultation is: REMIT.Consultations@acer.europa.eu

All respondents are invited to submit their comments by 12 June 2026, 17:00 (CET)

Related documents

- Regulation (EU) No 1227/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 on wholesale energy market integrity and transparency, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2011/1227/oj
- Regulation (EU) No 2024/1106 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 April 2024 amending Regulations (EU) No 1227/2011 and (EU) 2019/942 as regards improving the Union's protection against market manipulation on the wholesale energy market, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1106/oj
- Commission Implementing Regulation EU 2026/256 of 30 January 2026 on data reporting implementing Article 7c(2), Article 8(1a), Article 8(2) and Article 8(6) of Regulation (EU) No 1227/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council on wholesale energy market integrity and transparency and repealing Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1348/2014 http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2026/256/oj
- ACER REMIT Transaction Reporting User Manual (TRUM) Version 7.0 (published: 17 December 2024), https://www.acer.europa.eu/remit-documents/remit-reporting-guidance
- FAQs on REMIT Transaction Reporting (published: 30 September 2024), https://www.acer.europa.eu/remit-documents/remit-reporting-guidance
- 6.1 edition of ACER Guidance on the application of REMIT (published: 18 December 2024), https://www.acer.europa.eu/remit-documents/guidance-remit-application
- Questions & Answers on REMIT policy matters (published: 12 March 2025), https://www.acer.europa.eu/remit-documents/guidance-remit-application
- ACER's Manual of Procedures on transaction and fundamental data reporting (published: 17 April 2023), https://www.acer.europa.eu/remit-documents/remit-reporting-guidance
- ACER's Requirements for Registration of RRMs (published: 15 January 2021), https://www.acer.europa.eu/remit-documents/remit-reporting-guidance
- FAQs on REMIT Fundamental Data and Inside Information (published: 30 April 2021), https://www.acer.europa.eu/remit-documents/remit-reporting-guidance
- Open Letters on Data Quality, https://www.acer.europa.eu/remit-documents/remit-reporting-guidance

- Open Letters on REMIT Policy, https://www.acer.europa.eu/remit-documents/guidance-remit-application

Respondent's data

*** Name and surname**

This information will not be published

[redacted]

*** Email address**

This information will not be published

[redacted]

Name of organisation (if applicable)

ENERGY TRADERS EUROPE

Type of organisation (if applicable)

Multiple values are accepted

- [x] Market participant (including association)
- [ ] Organised marketplace (including association)
- [ ] Inside information platform (including association)
- [ ] Transmission system operator (including association)
- [ ] National regulatory authority
- [ ] Academia/research institution
- [ ] Other (please specify)

*** Country**

- (•) EU-27
- ( ) Other

Data protection, confidentiality and publication of results

Data protection

ACER will process personal data of the respondents in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2018/1725, taking into account that this processing is necessary for performing ACER's consultation tasks.

More information on data protection is available in ACER's data protection notice and on ACER's website.

ACER will not publish personal data.

* I have read and understood the Data Protection Notice on External Webinars / Online Events and Data Protection Notice on Interactions with Stakeholders.

I confirm

Confidentiality and publication

Following this consultation, ACER will make public:

- the number of responses received
- company names, unless they should be considered as confidential
- all non-confidential responses
- ACER's evaluation of responses. In the evaluation, ACER may link responses to specific respondents or group of respondents.

You may request that the name of your company or any information provided in your response is treated as confidential. To this aim, you need to explicitly indicate below whether your response contains confidential information.

* Do you consent to the publication of the name of the organisation?

- (•) Yes
- ( ) No

* Do you consent to the publication of the provided answers?

Please, note that your answer, without your name and organization, may be shared with the EU institutions and national authorities.

- (•) Yes
- ( ) No

* Does your submission contain confidential information?

Please note that submissions containing confidential information will not be published.

- (•) Yes
- ( ) No

Section I: Introduction and scope

This section covers the following topics:

- Legal framework
- Scope and purpose of the Guideline on REMIT transaction reporting
- Target audience
- Transaction reporting and market monitoring
- ACER contacts

Do you have any comments on the guidance provided in this chapter?

We welcome the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed amendments and clarifications to the REMIT reporting framework. Overall, we support the objective of enhancing transparency and consistency in transaction reporting. At the same time, we consider it essential that the framework remains aligned with the core REMIT principles of proportionality, legal certainty, and role-based reporting obligations. In several areas, the current drafting may lead to ambiguity, inconsistent interpretation, or unintended expansion of reporting obligations, particularly for final consumers and non-trading activities. We therefore suggest improving clarity and consistency, ensuring alignment with established REMIT principles, and avoiding disproportionate administrative burden where no corresponding market integrity benefit arises.

Section II: Reporting obligations

II.1 What to report?

This section covers the following topics:

- Transactions to be reported on a continuous basis
- Transactions to be reported on a periodic basis
- Transactions to be reported at the request of ACER
- Reporting requirements regarding transactions executed via a trade-matching system
- Definition of standard and non-standard contracts
- Distinction between product, contract and transaction for standard contracts
- Lifecycle events
- Back-loading requirement

Do you have any comments on the guidance provided in this chapter?

We provide the comments below; however, due to character limitations, we kindly ask ACER to consider our full proposal in the attached document.
Transactions to be reported on a continuous basis
1) Supply transactions (2.1.1.1):** Clarify that contracts with final consumers exceeding 600 GWh/year fall under the periodic reporting regime and are not subject to continuous reporting obligations, thereby avoiding inconsistent interpretation and potential double reporting.
2) Electricity storage transactions (2.1.1.3): Clarification is required on whether contracts covering production and consumption of batteries ≤10 MW fall within the limited reporting scope upon reasoned ACER request only. Battery injections and withdrawals should generally be reportable under Table 1 and/or Table 2. However, uncertainty remains regarding long-term tolling agreements and whether such arrangements are reportable. Where tolling agreements include energy delivery, the energy-related elements should remain subject to REMIT reporting. Further clarification is needed on the applicable reporting methodology, including use of Table 1 or

Table 2 and relevant fields.
Transactions to be reported on a periodic basis (2.1.2): Recall that “transaction” includes both executions and orders. The intended simplification for contracts with final consumers above 600 GWh/year is limited because execution reporting remains unchanged. Given the nature of these contracts, execution reporting should either be limited to cases upon ACER request or permitted through monthly invoice reporting or a rolling six-month aggregated execution report.
Transactions with energy-intensive final consumers (2.1.2.1)
1) Point (43):** ACER should provide a standardised declaration template confirming a consumption unit's capability to consume 600 GWh/year or more. Guidance should also require final customers to promptly notify market participants of their status and any changes.
2) Point (53):** Wholesale trading or resale by final customers remains REMIT-relevant and subject to continuous reporting. However, transportation or storage capacity linked to sub-threshold consumption units should remain outside REMIT reporting obligations, as these arrangements are consumption-related. Otherwise, exempt supply contracts could be accompanied by reportable ancillary contracts.
3) Capacity mechanisms (2.1.2.2):** Clarify reporting responsibility for transactions concluded through central platforms. Responsibility should rest with TSOs, SSOs or OMPs. ACER should also clarify whether such transactions are subject to continuous or periodic reporting and resolve the apparent inconsistency regarding capacity mechanism contracts already reported under the current framework.
4) Balancing services (2.1.2.3):** Contracts concluded with TSOs should be reportable by the TSO or, where applicable, the OMP hosting the auction, and not by other contracting parties.
5) Storage of natural gas (2.1.2.4):** For primary storage allocations, reporting responsibility should lie with the SSO or, where relevant, the OMP. Market participants should not report such allocations.
6) Intragroup transactions (2.1.3.1):** Clarify whether exposure reporting follows the same “full consolidation” criteria used for intercompany transactions.
7) Market-based redispatching measures (2.1.3.5):** If ancillary services fall within primary capacity allocations, the same reporting principles should apply.
8) Gas balancing services (2.1.3.7):** The clarification provided should also apply to electricity balancing services. Such contracts should be reportable only by the TSO or OMP facilitating the auction.
Definition of standard and non-standard contracts (2.1.5):
Point (87):** ACER should clarify whether brokers are PPATs or OMPs and indicate this in the published OMP list. Where platforms offer multiple services, classification should be specified separately by service type.
Point (88):** ACER should confirm that voice-brokered shaped/profiled non-standard trades are reportable by the broker where it qualifies as an OMP.
Features of standard vs non-standard contracts (2.1.5.1 – Figure 2):** ACER should add the relevant TRUM wording explaining standard contracts and non-standard contracts under Table 1.
Product (2.1.6.1):** Greater emphasis should be placed on distinguishing “Product” for reporting purposes from “Wholesale energy product” under REMIT.
Reference should also be made to former Q&A 3.3.24. Derivative contracts traded on a Union platform but relating to delivery outside the Union do not satisfy the condition “with delivery in the Union” and therefore do not trigger reporting under Article 3(1)(a)(viii) of Regulation (EU) No 1348/2014. However, they remain within REMIT scope and other REMIT obligations continue to apply.

II.2 Who shall report?

This section covers the following topics:

- Reporting parties
- Who shall report transactions concluded on an organised marketplace
- Who shall report transactions concluded outside an organised marketplace

- Who shall report transportation transactions
- Who shall report storage transactions
- Who shall report lifecycle events
- Wholesale energy products already reported in accordance with MiFIR or EMIR

Do you have any comments on the guidance provided in this chapter?

We provide the comments below; however, due to character limitations, we kindly ask ACER to consider our full proposal in the attached document.
Reporting Parties (2.2.1) On points (123),(127)and(128),the text states that order book data is reported by OMPs “on behalf of market participants”,while legal responsibility under Article 8 REMIT remains with market participants.At the same time,reporting parties are not responsible for failures attributable to another party in the reporting chain. This creates an inconsistency.Access by market participants and RRMs to OMP data has become increasingly constrained,while market participants remain subject to STOR obligations and feasibility checks requiring access to underlying order book data.Consequently,they retain regulatory responsibility without effective access to necessary data. We therefore recommend ACER clarify that: -OMPs must provide market participants and RRMs access to relevant order book data upon request;and -such access should be provided free of charge and without additional administrative burden. We also recommend reinstating data deliveries discontinued following ACER’s Spring 2024 Open Letter.More broadly,OMPs should provide access to sufficiently complete anonymised datasets to support effective self-surveillance.

Organised Market Places (2.2.1.2) Current OMP criteria create uncertainty regarding whether a platform or broker qualifies as an OMP,requiring case-by-case assessments of reporting responsibility and risking inconsistent reporting. We recommend ACER establish a general principle that transactions relating to primary capacity allocations and balancing energy should be reported by TSOs and SSOs directly,or by OMPs acting on their behalf.This reflects their role as “golden source” of data.Any exceptions should be clearly communicated to counterparties.

(162) We welcome the clarification provided and reiterate that: -auction and transaction data relating to primary capacity mechanisms should be reported by TSOs/SSOs or relevant OMP;and -balancing energy transactions concluded with TSOs should be reported by TSOs or relevant OMP.Any deviation should be explicitly notified to affected market participants.

Who shall report transportation transactions (2.2.4) (186) Where primary capacity allocations are not executed via a registered OMP,reporting responsibility should remain with the TSO and should not transfer to market participants.Where participants identify missing OMP registration or reporting,they should be able to notify ACER.Such situations should trigger clarification or corrective action at TSO/OMP level.

(187) Where single-sided reporting is accepted,reporting obligations for both counterparties should be deemed fulfilled.The guidance should confirm that: -primary capacity allocations are reportable only by TSOs;and -the same principle applies to secondary capacity allocations executed via an OMP platform.Reporting of secondary capacity allocations becomes effective 29 April 2026 per Question 9 of ACER Open Letter on Regulation (EU) 2026/256.OMPs should ensure reporting arrangements are in place by that date.Without clarification, uncertainty remains regarding duplication or residual obligations.

(188) Secondary capacity allocations via OMP platforms should be explicitly aligned with the above principle.

(191) We welcome consideration of single-sided reporting for secondary capacity allocations.More generally, extending single-sided reporting where appropriate would reduce duplication and improve consistency, completeness, accuracy and timeliness. Further clarification is required regarding: -transactions not executed

via OMP/capacity platform; and -which party (buyer/seller) bears reporting obligation. Clear allocation rules are necessary to ensure consistent application.

Section III: Start of reporting and reporting frequency

This section covers the following topics:

- Start of reporting
- Frequency of reporting

Do you have any comments on the guidance provided in this chapter?

With regard to paragraph (211), we reiterate our view that execution reporting for contracts with final customers exceeding 600 GWh/year should, as a general rule, only be required upon request by ACER. Such an approach would better reflect the lower market manipulation risk associated with these contracts and ensure that the periodic reporting regime achieves its intended simplification objective. As an alternative, should execution reporting remain mandatory, we propose allowing market participants to report execution data in an aggregated format aligned with the periodic reporting cycle. In particular, executions occurring after submission of the periodic (Table 2) report could be reported as a single aggregated execution file covering the relevant six-month period. Market participants should retain the flexibility to submit execution data on a monthly basis where this better aligns with their existing IT systems. This approach would reduce duplication and operational complexity while maintaining the availability of relevant execution data.
The introduction of additional periodic reporting categories further increases the complexity of REMIT reporting, with market participants now required to manage multiple parallel timelines. To reduce unnecessary operational burden, we would like to request clarification on whether ACER will allow continuous reporting for transactions that now fall under periodic reporting obligations.

Other comments and file upload

Are there any other proposals you would like to share with ACER? (e.g. topics that should be covered, amendments etc.)

As stated above, we would like to reiterate a broader structural concern regarding the interaction between the OMP definition and the allocation of reporting responsibilities, in particular in the context of balancing data and periodic reporting. We consider that transactions related to balancing services and similar centrally organised mechanisms should, as a general principle, be reported by TSOs directly, or by platforms acting on their behalf. TSOs are best placed to fulfil this role, as they act as the central counterparties and hold the most complete and accurate dataset (“golden source”). Requiring a large number of market participants to individually report such transactions would introduce unnecessary duplication, increase the risk of inconsistencies, and negatively impact data quality. We therefore recommend clarifying that reporting obligations for balancing-related transactions are assigned to TSOs (or relevant central platforms) independently of the OMP qualification, reflecting their role as central data providers. This approach would also be consistent with the evolution observed under REMIT, where system operators (e.g. SSOs and LSOs) increasingly act as primary reporting entities for centrally managed processes.

You can upload your proposals in Word or PDF here.

Please ensure that all your proposed amendments are in one document, clearly identifying each section affected. Track changed versions of the document are also welcome.

Maximum file size is 1 MB. If your file is larger, please use the functional mailbox: REMIT. Consultations@acer.europa.eu

d553e097-6ef0-4d31-8dba-4c15f00bc1c3
/Energy_Traders_Europe_Response_to_the_ACER_PC_on_REMIT_transaction_reporting_Guideline_-_12_June_2026.pdf

Thank you for your contribution.

Contact

Contact Form