



Public Consultation on the methodology for implementation monitoring and evaluation of the impact of the gas Network Codes and Guidelines on the internal gas market

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

From 12 June 2015 to 10 July 2015 the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators ('ACER', 'the Agency') is running a public consultation on the future methodology for implementation monitoring and evaluation of the impact of the gas network codes and guidelines on the internal gas market.

Article 9 of Regulation (EC) No 715/2009 lays down rules for the Agency to monitor and analyse the implementation of the network codes and the Guidelines adopted by the European Commission. Under the article the Agency is responsible for assessing the effects of the codes in facilitating market integration, as well as on non-discrimination, effective competition and the efficient functioning of the market.

Based on Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 713/2009 the Agency presents for public consultation the consultancy study from Cambridge Economic Policy Associates (CEPA), commissioned by the Agency, which proposes a methodology to be used for implementation monitoring and evaluation of the impact of the gas network codes and guidelines on the internal gas market.

In order to test and improve the outcome of the study the Agency invites stakeholders to share their views on this work, in particular on the proposed indicators. Well founded comments which will lead to improvements of the report outcome in particular the proposed indicators will be taken into account by CEPA in its final compilation of the study.

The Agency invites stakeholders to reply to the following questions.

Contact details

*1 Family name, first name

*2 Email

3 Name of organisation

*4 Area of activity

- Shipper or energy trading entity
- Interconnector
- Storage
- LNG
- Distribution
- Producer
- End-user
- Transmission system
- Other

*5 Please specify

Consultancy Study

6 Do you consider the methodology well founded? If not, what should be improved? (Chapters 1-4)

7 Do you consider the **network code indicators** fit for purpose? (Please describe for which set of indicators you provide comments.) (Chapters 5,7)

- The proposed sets of indicators are **complete**
- The proposed sets of indicators are **incomplete** (please suggest indicators to be added)
- The proposed sets of indicators are **overcomplete** (please suggest indicators to be removed)

9 Please add any comments and suggest indicators to be added

1. Table 5.4. desired effect: we recommend the conversion of "primarily in CAM auctions" into "CAM auctions as default model"
2. We propose the conversion of the phrase "incremental and new capacity" into "incremental capacity"
3. We recommend adding the following indicators on the line dedicated to easier acquisition and use of IP capacity:
 - a. The availability of services on capacity booking platforms as required by NC CAM and other EU regulations
 - b. simplicity of booking platforms usage.
4. The comment "data should become available from PRISMA and other secondary platforms" from the same line shall be converted into "Data should become available from secondary platforms".

10 Please add any comments and suggest indicators to be removed

1. We recommend the removal of the following indicators included in the line dedicated to easier acquisition and use of IP capacity:
 - a. Number of platforms for (bundled) capacity bookings at IPs because the number of platforms is not relevant - art. 27 NC CAM allows the limited number of booking platforms
 - b. Average number of IPs/booking platform - the number of IPs is not relevant - there are systems which consist of 50+ IPs and systems with only few IPs
 - c. Volumes of bundled capacity sold on capacity booking platform - the volume is related to national demand, not to platform existence. We should not favour platform where products are offered by TSOs from countries where gas demand is higher.
2. We also suggest that the phrase "it would be desirable to have common platforms e.g. PRISMA" should be removed because according to art. 27 NC CAM one or a limited number of platforms shall be used in order to offer capacity.

11 Do you consider the **high-level policy goal indicators** fit for purpose? (Please describe for which set of indicators you provide comments.) (Chapters 6,7)

- The proposed sets of indicators are **complete**
- The proposed sets of indicators are **incomplete** (please suggest indicators to be added)
- The proposed sets of indicators are **overcomplete** (please suggest indicators to be removed)

15 Do you agree with the performance evaluation of the indicators? If not, please suggest an alternative evaluation. (Chapter7)

16 Do you consider the data sources proposed by the consultancy study adequate? If not, please suggest alternative data sources. (Chapter7)

17 Do you find the proposed implementation timelines of the methodology feasible? If not, please suggest how it can be improved. (Chapter 8)

18 Do you consider the description of the indicators in the Annex clear and the execution of the indicators easy to understand? If not, please suggest how it can be improved. (Annex A)

19 Overall, do you consider that the methodology would be suitable to meet the objectives of Article 9 of Regulation (EC) No 715/2009?

20 Are there any other views you would like to share with ACER in this context?

Background Documents

CEPA study (</eusurvey/files/4f0fdd27-3241-4363-bbe3-31a256747f1e>)

Contact

✉ gas_monitoring@acer.europa.eu
