

## MINUTES

### Interoperability Network Code Data Exchange requirements

#### Stakeholders' WS

25 February 2014, 10:00 – 16:00

at ENTSOG office, Av. de Cortenbergh 100

Company	Name	Company	Name
ENTSOG (chair)	Panousos Panagiotis	GTS	Egberts Sandrie
ENTSOG	De Keyser Jef	EuRoPol GAZ SA	Bolikowska Agnieszka
ENTSOG (presenter)	Kaldonek Monika	Fluxys (presenter)	Jehaes Sophie
ENTSOG	Aversano Licia	GasTerra BV	Meeuwis Peter
ENTSOG	Volzone Davide	GRTgaz	Le Grand Thomas
ENTSOG (presenter)	Thure Frederik	GRTgaz	Rodrigues Alice
ENTSOG	Glander Bijan	GRTgaz	Surut Jerome
ENTSOG	Gerus Victoria	IUK	Slack Carol
ENTSOG	Van den Brande Michel	Open Grid Europe	Sostmann Michael
ACER	Nitzov Boyko	Ponton GmbH	Merz Michael
EFET	Sleevwagen Filip	PRISMA	Kassen Thilo
Croatian Energy Regulatory Agency	Vistica Nikola	Plinacro	Bulatovic Goran
E-Control	Ischia Alessandro	PTL	Skillen-Baine Lauren
Enagás	Hildalgo Tejero Ana Maria	SNAM	Mazzotti Daniele
Enagás	Del Castillo Pedro	Sonnenglanz (presenter)	van der Eijk Pim
Enagás	Morales Jesus	Synergrid	Vinck Hilde
Eni S.p.A.	Pioltelli Marco	REN Gasodutos	Cachão Alexandre Tadeu
Eni midstream	Dordoni Francesco	REN	Vasconcelos Pedro
Energy Solution	Basso Giuliano	REN	Batista Helena
Eurogas	Regan Noel	RWE	Stolk Rainier
EuRoPol GAZ SA	Skolimowski Adam	TAG	Menditti Francesco
Gazprom	Rossi Riccardo	TAP	Francesse Cristiano

## \* Webex-telco

### 1. Opening

Mr Panagiotis Panousos, Business Area Manager System Operation and Interoperability Project Team Manager, thanked all stakeholders for their participation in the Workshop and encouraged them to continue their constructive engagement throughout the rest of the process. He especially invited all stakeholders to give their feedback on the CNOT process and BRS Nominations proposals through the Entsog website by March 14<sup>th</sup>. He also welcomed the participants taking part via webcast and invited them to give their feedback and comments via email.

### 2. CNOT process

#### > Presentation of CNOT development process (ENTSOG)

Ms Monika Kaldonek presented the Common Network Operation Tools (CNOT) process indicating phases of CNOT development, key deliverables, milestones and foreseen stakeholder's engagement.

#### > Role of EASEEgas – Implementation Guidelines development (EASEEgas- Sophie Jehaes)

Ms Sophie Jehaes presented the cooperation with ENTSOG to develop the Message Implementation Guidelines (MIG) based on the Business Requirement Specifications (BRS). Ms Jehaes highlighted that MIG can have a broader scope than the BRS since they have to take into account other operators' requirements (LNG, SSO, DSO) and also requirements needed for operational reasons, but not explicitly demanded in Network Codes.

#### > Question and Answers

Q (M. Pioltelli): What will be the process for implementation of changes to the existing MIG?

A (J.de Keyser): Change management process is proposed under the CNOT document process and will be implemented when required. It will depend on the type of the requested change whether the CNOT can be just adapted with minor impact or whether it has an impact on whole process and the BRS as well as MIG has to be changed. A dedicated Task Force will be established to rework the documents in the latter case.

Q (M. Pioltelli): Will the final MIG be published on the ENTSOG website? Will the reference to other parties also be included?

A (J.de Keyser): Yes, the final MIG will be published on ENTSOG and EASEE-gas website. The indication of what is mandatory for TSOs to be implemented due to Network Codes requirements will be highlighted in the supporting documents through a mapping table between BRS and MIG.

Q (S. Egberts) BRS will describe the necessary processes for the implementation of the NCs. Where will the processes that are beyond the scope of the TSOs be included?

A (J. de Keyser): They will be included in MIG, but not in BRS.

### **3. Current BRSs presentation**

#### **> BRS Nominations and Matching (ENTSOG)**

Mr Frederik Thure presented the business requirements specifications for nominations and matching process arising from BAL and INT NC.

#### **> Status of CAM process including CMP extensions (ENTSOG Sophie Jehaes)**

Ms Sophie Jehaes presented the current version of the CAM BRS and the extensions arising from CMP guidelines. Ms Sophie Jehaes explained the project set up to review the BRS and include those points.

#### **> Question and Answers**

Q (M. Pioltelli): Is it possible to choose whether to have single/double nominations at an IP? Problems can arise when at one side of an interconnection the responsible party is a non-EU TSO.

A (J.de Keyser): It is an obligation for TSOs to develop a single side nominations system option, but it is not an obligation for shippers to follow the schema.

A (L. Aversano): For any IP (within EU) all responsible TSOs at both sides have to develop their internal procedures so that they are compliant with the regulation.

A (B. Nitzov): It has to be clear that if a party has its commercial activity within EU, it has to respect the EU rules.

Q (S. Egberts): Currently there is no need to specify oversubscription scheme in Prisma platform. Do we still need to describe it in ENTSOG BRS?

A (S. Jehaes): We need to describe rules that can be applicable by any existing platform/users and the way how the schema will be implemented depends only on each individual party.

A (D. Mazzotti): From the technical point of view such a message looks completely different, so it has to be prepared from scratch.

A (S. Egberts): There is clear understanding that from IT point of view it is a completely new message, but maybe it is possible to develop technical solution that limits the impact on system.

A (S. Jehaes): Business processes require stability in order to ensure reliable operation.

A (M. Pioltelli): From the shippers perspective it is important to include oversubscription in the bidding process for capacity in order to be sure how to behave.

Q (J. de Keyser): In the case of single nomination, when do stakeholders expect that the nominations shall be forwarded by the receiving TSO to the other TSO? Currently it is foreseen to be forwarded within 15 min after the nomination deadline. Is there a preference to forward the nomination immediately?

A: (B. Nitzov): Information has to be symmetric to all involved parties. One party cannot have more information than the other. It is important to understand when the proposed schema can have a material impact.

A (J. de Keyser): The main reason why it is more convenient for the TSO to forward the single nomination after confirmation is to reduce the number of data exchanges. In case of renominations only the last nomination is sent instead of all the nominations when the current option is implemented.

A (F. Menditti): In some cross border transportation systems (e.g. Italy/Austria) you have on the one side of the IP a single Shipper's nomination whilst on the other side a balance group(s) nomination (aggregation of more shippers). In this case single side nominations cannot work, because at cross border IP the balance group(s) nomination on one side could be matched with more the one shipper on the other side.

A (S. Jehaes): You have to remember that forwarding of single side nominations doesn't mean only forwarding, but you have to change also all the identification specific informations. Now TSOs exchange information after the deadline in one document. If

the exchange has to be performed before the deadline, each single message has to be forwarded. This will mean that TSOs will have to rebuild their processes. We have to think if this is necessary.

Q (J. de Keyser): Regarding interruption notice, its purpose is to inform the network users on possible interruptions the soonest. If TSOs don't want to take any risk, they have to send the notice as soon as they have such an indication. But, then in some cases there will be a notice sent without any real need to interrupt. If TSOs take the risk to send the notice later, when they have more reliable indications of possible interruptions, they will avoid unnecessary cases but the users will not be informed well in advance. Shall the interruption notice be sent to the shippers as soon as potential interruption is foreseen by TSO or just before the gas flow?

A (M. Pioltelli): And what will happen if you provide the information earlier and the interruption will not be effective anymore?

A (S. Jhaes): You will see it through the confirmation notice.

A (M. Pioltelli): It is a new concept and we have to think this over.

A (P. Panousos): As we can see from the discussions not all questions can be answered in this workshop. ENTSOG needs to have an input from all the involved parties to make the rules implementable. We have to be aware that those rules are not binding, but it should be a strong recommendation to follow in order to achieve harmonisation of the market.

#### 4. AS4 protocol profile

##### > AS4 usage Profile (Pim van der Eijk)

Mr Pim van der Eijk presented the specification of AS4 protocol profile set up for gas business to exchange messages.

##### > Proof of Concept (Pim van der Eijk)

Mr Pim van der Eijk presented the proof of concept specifications for the AS4 protocol and related tests.

##### > Question and Answers

Q (M. Pioltelli): How can we communicate in order to give our comments for the AS4 protocol profile?

A (J. de Keyser): You can use the [interoperability@entsog.eu](mailto:interoperability@entsog.eu) e-mail to raise your questions or to contact any of the System Operation Advisers.

Q (S. Jehaes): Does this AS4 profile require the usage of the same certificates as it was set up for AS2?

A (P.V.D.Eijk): Most probably it will be possible to use existing EASEEgas certificates. AS4 describes requirements for the certificates used for the web services security (signing and encryption certificates).

Q (M. Pioltelli): Is it possible for the other parties than TSOs to take part in the proof of the concept?

A (J. de Keyser): For the time being only TSOs and platform operators are invited for the proof of concept in order to make sure that the tests will be done in a smooth way. The intention is not to set up and configure individual systems to be able to use AS4, but just to check whether communication is possible with the settings that are described in the document. Next weeks we will have to evaluate if we need to extend the scope also to other parties. But we do not want to be used by software providers for testing their products, or for explaining the rules of the gas market.

A (M. Merz): Ponton will be ready with AS4 product in one week, so if there is a need to use the software we can provide it for testing. We don't have TSOs as customers, but Prisma and traders.

A (J. de Keyser): We have asked Prisma to take part in testing, but for the time being there is no such decision.

Q (P. Castillo): It is really important to test product from different software providers and to have at least 5-6 parties taking part in testing. For the time being there are 2 TSOs willing to take part and 2 other trying to get ready for testing. If we will not have enough parties we should extend or postpone the testing period.

A (J. de Keyser): Tests are to prove that AS4 can be a working system also in Europe. We will have to demonstrate this in the foreseen workshop in May. We are also cooperating with ENISA for the security issues and hope to have their feedback by May. But they can only give their recommendations. Hopefully, we should be ready with our document by June or July. If we see that the foreseen period is not enough for the testing, then we might have to extend the period. But, we must have in mind that our work is important

for the TSOs to start preparing for the implementation of network codes.

## 5. Closing remarks

Mr Panagiotis Panousos thanked once again for the participation and the very constructive cooperation. He invited stakeholders to take part in the open Public Consultations for CNOT process and BRS Nominations.

Mr Panousos concluded that:

- > **CNOT Process:** Process in line with INT NC requirements; Stakeholders' feedback required through Public Consultations on-line form on ENTSGO website (until 14 Mar)
- > **BRS Nominations and Matching:** BRS to be finalised and transformed into MIG; Stakeholders' feedback required through Public Consultations on-line form on ENTSGO website (until 14 Mar)
- > **BRS CAM and CMP:** BRS process for CAM and CMP extensions has started, next step Stakeholders WS & Public Consultations --> May 2014
- > **AS4 Usage Profile:** Stakeholders' feedback to be given through e-mail exchange interoperability@entsog.eu
- > **AS4 Proof of concept:** Currently only TSOs to be part of PoC, depending on number of parties able to participate it can be extended to external parties and PoC period may be prolonged
- > **All the material will be published on the website (presented materials, list of participants, notes)**

Q (B. Nitzov): Please be aware that Art. 8.1 of the regulation 715 describes CNOT development as an ENTSGO responsibility but makes no further reference on their legal basis (necessary agreement between TSOs for implementation, origination of data, management system models). The topic will be discussed within ACER's task force..

A (P. Panousos): ENTSGO is aware that the proposed data exchange CNOTs are tools for supporting NC implementation requirements and can be used on a voluntary basis. Other CNOTs might be developed for other purposes. But, it is true, the regulation does not fully describe this ENTSGO responsibility.