

## MINUTES

### ENTSOG Interoperability and Data Exchange Rules Network Code Data Exchange WS

**23 April 2013, 10:00 – 16:00**

**at ENTSO-E Conference Centre, Av. de Cortenbergh 100**

Company	Name	Company	Name
ENTSOG (chair)	Panousos Panagiotis	Fluxys	Serruys Dirk
ENTSOG	De Keyser Jef	FLUXYS Belgium SA/NV	Remy Laurent
ENTSOG	Glass Heather	GasTerra B.V.	Meeuwis Peter
ENTSOG	Kaldonek Monika	Gasunie Transport Services B.V.	Coppens Michaël
ENTSOG	Aversano Licia	GDF SUEZ	Martinaud Jean-Louis
ENTSOG	Pollex Hendrik	GEODE	Brühl Stefan
ENTSOG	Sisman Nigel	German association public utilities VKU	Engelmann Falk
ENTSOG	Van den Brande Michel	GIE	Palada Philipp Daniel
Alliander N.V.	Gottmer Joost	GRTgaz	Bissauge Raphaël
DEPA S.A.	P.Schina Maria	GRTgaz	Surut Jérôme
E.ON Ruhrgas AG	Küllmer Björn	Hungarian Energy Office	Krinszki Adam (*)
Edison SpA	Immovilli Monica	Hungarian Gas Transit Ltd.	Bütösi Lajos
EFET	Sleeuwagen Filip	Marcogaz	de Ville de Goyet Benjamin
Enagas	de Castillo Pedro	National Grid	Hamilton Colin
Enagas	Meixus Fernandez Tania	NetConnect Germany GmbH & Co. KG	Schröder Barbara
Energy Solutions	Basso Giuliano	ONTRAS	Lochmann Mario

ENTSO-E	Retsoulis Ioannis	Open Grid Europe GmbH	Sostmann Michael
Eurogas	Cayford Tim	Ponton Consulting GmbH	Merz Michael
EuRoPol GAZ S.A.	Bolikovska Agnieszka	PSvdL	Jacobs Ernst
EuRoPol GAZ S.A.	Skolimowski Adam	REN	Tadeu Cachão Alexandre (*)
Federal Network Agency	Heidelberger Johannes	RWE Supply & Trading GmbH	Schäfer Andreas
FGSZ	Feher Robert	Sonnenglanz Consulting BV	van der Eijk Pim
FGSZ	Kovács Zsolt	Statoil	Rubini Davide
FGSZ	Pintér Tamás	Thüga Aktiengesellschaft	Deuschle Thomas
Fluxys	Jehaes Sophie	Thüga Aktiengesellschaft	Hennig Eva

(\*) Telco participant

### 1. Opening (P. Panousos) (10:00 – 10:20)

Mr. Panagiotis Panousos, Business Area Manager System Operation and Interoperability Project Team Manager, welcomed all participants and thanked all stakeholders for their participation in the network code development process. He emphasized the importance of the CBA (cost benefit assessment study) for the selection of the common solution for data exchange as defined in the Framework Guidelines issued by ACER in August 2012.

### 2. Presentation of the agenda, Introduction CBA and Data Exchange (J. De Keyser) (10:20 – 10:35)

Jef De Keyser, ITC Advisor in the Interoperability team, presented the main items on the agenda; current status of the CBA study, development of data exchange for other network codes & CNOT (common network operation tools) and as a last point the BRS (Business Requirements Specification) for the CAM network code.

### 3. Presentation of the CBA – emerging views (E. Jacobs - J. De Keyser) (10:35 – 12:35)

Mr. Ernst Jacobs presented the first results of the CBA study based on the first responses received on the Data Exchange questionnaire received on April 18<sup>th</sup>. On this questionnaire, 32 responses were received by ENTSOE from 11 EU member states for TSOs, DSOs, LSOs and Nus. Responses received by Friday April 26 will be included in the final CBA report. The aim is to publish a draft CBA for public consultation on May 16<sup>th</sup> till

June 10<sup>th</sup>. The CBA results presented during this workshop will be published on the website of ENTSOG and shall be distributed to all registered participants.

#### **4. CNOT common network operation tool & BRS Business Requirements Specification (H. Glass – J. De Keyser)(13:30-14:20)**

ENTSOG presented the proposed approach for the development of data exchange requirements of other network codes e.g. CAM and BAL NC. The methodology is based on the use of Unified Modeling Language tools to define the Business Requirements Specification and ultimately the message content formats for each exchange of data. This information would be made available on the ENTSOG website and developed as a Common Network Operation Tool document.

Heather Glass presented as an example the CAM BRS process and the first experiences

#### **5. Stakeholder presentation (Peter Meeuwis - EASEE-gas Excom chairman) (14:20-14:40)**

Mr Meeuwis presented the history of the Edigas-workgroup and the EASEE-gas organisation. He highlighted the acquired experience of the organisation at standardisation level and the level of representation at EU level with 94 members in 23 member states covering the whole gas market.

#### **6. Questions and Answers recorded during the workshop**

Q (IFIEC): Why does a VPN score low?

A (ENTSOG): VPNs have a limited accessibility to the whole EU market, therefore it has a lower score.

Q (Ontras): Internet seems to have the best score. Does this mean that TSOs should only use this or offer this as a possibility?

A (ENTSOG): Internet is the proposed network for the new network codes. It does not mean that we have to switch immediately to this solution. As stated in the draft NC, TSOs have to offer the new solution when the NC is into force but the existing solutions can still be used in parallel.

Q (Eurogas): Some criteria are not in the evaluation list e.g. security for the network.

A (ENTSOG): True, the criteria list presented has been agreed internally. If you think criteria are missing please feel free to propose additional criteria. Some criteria are part of other evaluation criteria.

Security has been taken into consideration in the technical evaluation of the protocols. This is one of the reasons why AS4 and ebMS have a higher score because of more possibilities regarding encryption.

Q (Ontras): Not only availability is important, e.g. security for nominations can be an issue to guarantee the origin of the sender.

A (ENTSOG): There are techniques to check the sender but 100% security cannot be guaranteed.

Q (Eurogas): I can take security precautions for myself but not for the other participants.

A (ENTSOG): Each party is responsible for the data it sends and has to take care of the confidentiality of the data it receives from other parties

A (NG): We must also work on the security part parallel to the technical part. This has to be done on EU level.

A (ENTSOG): ENTSOG is in contact with ENISA and ENTSO-E but no rules exist yet for the gas industry. We will take this also as an activity for ENTSOG in the future.

A (OGE): The NC contains minimum requirements for security and availability.

A (ENTSOG): The CNOT (common network operation tools – see second part of the presentation) shall contain more specific and technical details about the minimum implementation requirements to the set-up of the data communications.

Q (ESI): Internet can also run over ISDN, so the table can be misleading.

A (ENTSOG): True, ISDN can be used for internet access. We tried to analyze ISDN as a separate network but overlaps are possible (with Internet in the table is understood a permanent connection to the network).

Q (RWE): Internet backbones might be a problem, ISDN is straighter forward.

A (ENTSOG): This is an availability issue. Usually users can have fall back solutions through different connection nodes to reduce this risk. This can also happen when an ISDN provider has technical problems.

Q (Ontras): Format in websites can have different formats (than XML)?

A (ENTSOG): The format in websites is not defined; it depends on the data that are displayed, i.e. the application context.

Q (Eurogas): How did you evaluate the spread of format standards? Is this based on the processes defined in the NCs? Did you evaluate per country?

A (ENTSOG): It is based on the answers we received, so it is for all purposes.

A (FLX): Not all the formats are standards; XML is a structure, not a formatting standard.

Q (Eurogas- DSOs): How are the answers from DSOs evaluated, low responses from DSOs? DSOs (in Germany) do not use XML.

A (ENTSOG): The figures shown are based on the received answers. Please feel free to send comments or deliver additional information.

Q (DSOs): In each EU member state national rules are defined. How can we see such a high score for XML when DSOs (thousands in EU) do not use it?

A (ENTSOG): The results are based on the received data. We know what TSOs and NUs use in general, based on an ENTSOG questionnaire of 2012 to TSOs.

A (IFIEC): XML is used partly for balancing but also other formats are used for the same purpose.

Q (RWE): Spread in processing is missing (i.e. data format vs. application context) and XML is more complicated.

A (ENTSOG): The relation format – application context could have been part of the criteria but it would make the evaluation more complicated and confusing.

XML format has some more overhead than EDIFACT but this has only an impact on the message size, which is nowadays not an issue anymore.

Q (Eurogas-DSO): How is the number of necessary messages taken into account?

A (ENTSOG): The current situation is taken as a reference. The proposed solution has to be able to handle a multiple of the current number of messages.

Q (Eurogas-DSO): What is the life cycle?

A (ENTSOG): Every technology or solution has a limited life time when it becomes outdated and is replaced by a newer technology.

Q (FLX): AS2 has a lower security scoring than AS4, please explain?

A (ENTSOG): AS4 offers more possibilities for (stronger) encryption.

Q (Eurogas – DSO): Why are only these (AS2, ebMS, AS4) protocols considered?

A (ENTSOG): The protocols have been selected based on minimum technical criteria in a technical WG by ENTSOG. Some existing protocols were not taken into account for reasons of technology or for limited possibilities for security.

Q (Eurogas – DSO): As AS4 is not used today; is the scoring based on assumptions?

A (ENTSOG): The evaluation is based on available standards and technical documentation for the technical criteria. The purpose of the evaluation is not to score the past but to make a choice for the future.

Q (OGE): Big spread in cost is shown in the answers. This indicates that the cost for a new system highly depends on the currently installed IT infrastructure. If one has to set-up a system from scratch the cost is high. Also the size of the system is an important factor for the cost. Can we really calculate an average?

A (ENTSOG): Yes, we think this is a fair assessment since it shows an average case. In this presentation we tried however not to make a global assessment and to wait until the end of the evaluation period (26/4).

Q (FLX): What will be the approach once the cost for implementation is defined?

A (ENTSOG): We will take into consideration the life cycle cost in the final CBA report, based on different scenarios.

A (PvdE – consultant): The people who developed AS4 were the same who developed AS2. The main objective was to make a cheaper solution. The figures based on the answers are “strange”, perhaps because AS4 is still unknown to the market.

A (Eurogas – DSOs): What about companies that have just implemented AS2?

A (ENTSOG): This is also related to the life cycle of AS2. On the other hand, the longer we wait to replace AS2 by a solution that has a longer life time, the more cost we cause to the market since more and more parties will be impacted.

A (OGE): The cost for changing a protocol from AS2 to AS4 is not high (when a full IT infrastructure already exists).

A (FLX): Benefits in the CBA should be zero as it covers the same process. Benefits come from harmonisation (through lower operational costs).

Q (FLX): The evaluation shows a lower estimated cost for AS2. Will more data (answers on the questionnaire) change anything?

A (ENTSOG): We will use life cycle scenarios to evaluate the global cost.

Q (RWE): Should we not take into account the lifecycle for IT systems (3-5 years)?

A (ENTSOG): The timeline for implementation for TSOs is defined in the FG, one year after NC comes into force.

Q (NG): When considering the cost for a new communication system, users should also take into account that the new solution can potentially be used for other processes in the company. Usability is another factor for evaluation.

A (ENTSOG): This is true but it is very difficult to evaluate since every company is different.

Q (FLX): Does the format XML means Edigas-XML?

A (ENTSOG): A legal assessment about the use of Edigas is ongoing.

Q (DSOs): Will ENTSOG harmonize all the data contents?

A (ENTSOG): This process will follow the development of the other network codes. The required data format shall be defined in parallel (see CNOT part of the presentation).

Q (DSOs): How long will it take to develop the CNOT? It should be available before the implementation deadline.

How do we cope with different rules at national level?

A (ENTSOG): For the CNOT we will make a Business Requirements Specification document that is based on the Network code. If there are known additional needs we can take them into account as optional features, as long as they are not deviating from the NC.

ENTSOG has now the experience with the CAM and BAL NCs as pilot projects. The expected time for delivery of the BRS and corresponding messages depends on the complexity of the business process; it can vary around 6-8 months.

Q (ENTSOG): Do you see a role for ENTSOG in this process to develop the messages (data content structures)?

A (FLX): Yes but what is missing is the participation of the NUs.

A (OGE): CNOT is the bridge between NC and the messages that have to be implemented. This “bridge” needs to be standardized. It does not matter which body does this standardization. This could be ENTSOG together with another organization.

A (GTS): Stakeholders are already involved in the current process.

A (Eurogas- DSOs): All the parties involved have to be informed and have to participate in the discussions.

Q (ENTSOG): Edigas-XML versus XML. This is still under legal assessment for reference in the NC. Is there an added value to make a reference to Edigas?

A (EASEE-gas & OGE): Edigas-XML is based on the EDIFACT formatting standard for the message creation.

Q (DSOs): Will the CNOT include all national rules?

A (OGE): We have to stick to international message sets.

A (EASEE-gas): EASEE-gas is a voluntary organization supported by the Madrid Forum, without a legal basis or a mandate to work as a recognized standardization body. We work on CBPs (common business practices) basis to harmonize business processes as recommendations. We cannot impose their implementation.

Q (ENTSOG): Can we have different messages for the same need?

A (EASEE-gas): The workgroup evaluates requests and proposals for change and will cooperate with ENTSOG if changes are required.

A (Ontras): There should not be any competition between ENTSOG and EASEE-gas. Clear roles have to be defined.

Q (DSOs): How will NRAs be involved?

A (EASEE-gas): EASEE-gas does not communicate with NRAs, other organizations do it at national level.

A (NG): The governance for voluntary messages and obligatory messages should be different. The scope per message has to be clearly defined.

Q (REN – telco): Do TSOs have to make the three types of data exchange available?

A (ENTSOG): TSOs have to implement the document based data exchange one year after the NC comes into force. The implementation of other data exchange solutions will depend on the implementation schedule of the corresponding network codes for which data exchanges are required.

#### **7. Closing remarks (ENTSOG: P. Panousos/J. De Keyser) (15:45-15:50)**

ENTSOG thanked all participants for the active input and their participation at the workshop and highlighted the timing for the CBA process and reminded that the deadline for responding to the CBA questionnaire is Friday 26<sup>th</sup> of April.

ENTSOG also asked the participants to clearly express their opinion on the proposed approach for the development of data exchange requirements for other network code through the BRS process and the publication with the CNOT as a response on the public consultation of the draft network code.

All presented material and the minutes of the workshop will be made available on the ENTSOG website.