

Consultation Responses Report

Public Consultation on the Project Plan for the Interoperability and Data Exchange Rules Network Code

Note: This report covers ENTSG's analysis of responses and does not indicate any assessment of ENTSG's view as to the final Network Code proposal. The opinions expressed in this document are those of external respondents to the Public Consultation and those of ENTSG as regards the process to apply, rather than the content of the Network Code.

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Overview of consultation responses.....	3
3. Stakeholder level of participation.....	3
4. Summary of responses to consultation questions	6
5. ENTSOG conclusions from consultation	8
Annex I.....	11

1. Introduction

On 11th September 2012, ENTSOG received the European Commission’s Invitation letter to draft a network code on “Interoperability and Data Exchange Rules”. On 12th September, ENTSOG published a project plan and commenced a formal one month Public Consultation process on it.

On 26th September 2012, ENTSOG held a kick-off Workshop. During this Workshop the requirements of ACER’s Framework Guidelines, ENTSOG’s planning of the development process of the Network Code, as described in detail in the Project Plan (INT0161-120711), and Stakeholders’ initial views on Interoperability and Data Exchange Network Code development process were explained.

This report summarises the consultation responses received. It is intended to provide an accessible summary of the views on the issues raised in the Public Consultation. This report could be read in conjunction with the received non-confidential responses and the Project Plan, which are available on ENTSOG’s website¹.

2. Overview of consultation responses

ENTSOG received 37 responses from external Stakeholders to the consultation, four of which were marked as confidential. The consultation respondents are listed in Annex I.

ENTSOG notes, and welcomes, that also European Commission and ACER plan to attend ENTSOG’s workshops and Stakeholder Joint Working Sessions (SJWSs).

3. Stakeholder level of participation

Regulation (EC) 715/2009 requires that ENTSOG shall “conduct an extensive consultation process, at an early stage and in an open manner, involving all relevant market participants”. ENTSOG invited all stakeholders to indicate their intended level of participation, as presented in the table below.

¹ See <http://www.entsog.eu/publications/interoperability.html>

LEVEL	DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
1	Prime Mover	Committed to work on a bilateral basis and dedicate a lot of resources to assist, formulate and evaluate/refine ideas/proposals for SJWS consideration – commitment to be intensive and involving many days during intensive phases of the Network Code development
2	Active SJWS Participant	Expected to attend all SJWS and to read and review all material prior to meetings and to be prepared to explore detail within SJWS – commitment of around 3 days per month during intensive period of activity
3	Consultation Respondent	Will respond to consultations
4	Observer	Expected not to actively contribute to the development effort or to participate in the formal consultations

The number of stakeholders in each participation category is as follows:

Prime Movers

The following 5 stakeholders have expressed interest to be engaged in the process as Prime Movers:

Participant	Organisation and/or company	Name
1	EFET	Filip Sleeuwagen
2	OGP	Davide Rubini
3	OGP	Kees Bouwens
4	GIE	Pilipp Palada
5	CEDEC	Joost Gottmer

Active SJWS Participants

The following 19 stakeholders have expressed interest to be engaged in the process as Active SJWS Participants:

Participant	Organisation and/or company	Name
1	EconGas GmbH	Christian Sidak
2	Edison SpA	Monica Immovilli
3	GDF SUEZ	Noël Coupaye
4	VIK Germany: (IFIEC member)	Valentin Höhn
5	Thüga AG	Thomas Deuschle
6	Energy Solutions	Giuliano Basso
7	Eni	Valentina Garruto
8	Utility Support Group: (IFIEC & CEFIC member)	Dirk Jan Meuzelaar
9	VEMW: (IFIEC member)	Jacques van de Worp
10	EUROMOT	Paul Zepf
11	GEODE	Christian Thole
12	MARCOGAZ	Daniel Hec
13	Eurogas	Margot Loudon
14	Trans-Adriatic Pipeline	Cristiano Francese
15	GrDF	Catherine Martin Fournier
16	VCI: (CEFIC member)	Alexander Kronimus
17	EASEE-gas	Peter Meeuwis
18	GDF SUEZ	Jean-Louis Martinaud
19	Thüga AG	Eva Hennig

Consultation Respondent

The following 8 stakeholders have expressed interest to be engaged in the process as Consultation Respondents:

Participant	Organisation and/or company	Name
1	Sorgenia SpA	Valentina Giust
2	Energie-Nederland	Hein-Bert Schurink
3	IBERDROLA, S.A.	Rafael del Rio
4	EnBW Energie Baden-Wuerttemberg AG	Christian Nitsche
5	Eurogas	Ruud Wassen
6	DEPA S.A.	Maria Schina
7	Independent Consultant	Peter Taff
8	EURELECTRIC	Sébastien DOLIGÉ

Observer

The following 5 stakeholders have expressed interest to be engaged in the process as Observers:

Participant	Organisation and/or company	Name
1	EDF	Nabil Mezlef
2	INTER-REGIES	Marc Malbrancke
3	GA-MA AD	Maja Celeska
4	EDF	Bram de Wispelaere
5	GA-MA AD	Radko Manov

If any stakeholder wishes to change its level of participation then it may do so by sending an email to interoperability@entsog.eu.

4. Summary of responses to consultation questions

In the boxes below, ENTSG provides a high-level summary of the consultation responses received. To facilitate the reporting process, respondents' answers and remarks have been tallied in representative groups. For example, in response to Question 1, 13 stakeholders provided no response, 20 stakeholders considered that the plan provided sufficient basis for stakeholder involvement and 4 stakeholders expressed other views. As mentioned above, the summary should be read while referencing the responses documents for a fuller appreciation of stakeholders' views.

Sufficiency of stakeholder involvement in project

Question 1: According to your opinion does the project plan for the development of a network code on Interoperability and Data Exchange Rules contained in this document provide sufficient basis for a quality stakeholder involvement given the timelines within which this project must be delivered? If no please propose any improvements to be made.

13	No response
20	Paraphrased response: "Yes, the plan provides sufficient basis for stakeholder involvement."
4	Other

Project timeline

Question 2: What do you think of the proposed timeline, including frequency and number of meetings? Are any changes needed?

12	No response
20	Paraphrased response: “Fine. No changes are needed.”
1	Paraphrased response: “Acceptable. But ENTISOG should follow former approach to be open for informal additional meetings with stakeholders”.
3	Need for additional SJWS
1	Other

Topics for and scheduling of SJWSs

Question 3: What do you think of the proposed topics and scheduling for each Stakeholder Joint Working Session (SJWS)? Which other topics might be included?

13	No response
13	Agreed and made no comments
8	Agreed but proposed that capacity calculation should be tackled in INT NC
3	Agreed with other minor comments

Use of webinars and teleconferencing for SJWSs

Question 4: What is your view on our ideas regarding use of webinars, teleconferencing? Do you have any other suggestions that might enhance this process?

11	No response
23	Supported use of both webinars and teleconferencing and made no comments
2	Supported their use and gave additional comment and suggestions (need for bilateral meetings)
1	Other

Additional comments

Question 6: Do you have any other comments or observations you would like to make?

35 No comments/No response

2 Forwarded various comments [see below]

Selected comments

“We hope the process, despite its time constraints, is flexible enough for changes.”

“The network code on Interoperability and Data Exchange rules should be developed ensuring full compatibility with other network codes currently being developed by ENTSOG. In order to avoid double work and a re-opening of the process defined in the project plan under consultation, the full compatibility of the Network Code on Interoperability and Data Exchange rules with other network codes should be ensured before the process described in the project plan is concluded and the code finalized.”

5. ENTSOG conclusions from consultation

Based on the consultation responses, ENTSOG draws the following conclusions:

> **Stakeholder level of participation**

ENTSOG is pleased with the level of announced participation. The intended participation levels provide a good basis to the challenge ahead. Specifically ENTSOG looks forward to a good and regular attendance of those committing at the Prime Mover and SJWS participant levels. ENTSOG appeals to participants to devote sufficient time to deliver a successful outcome.

> **Extent of planned stakeholder involvement in project**

ENTSOG will maintain the number and schedule of SJWSs as in the original Project Plan. ENTSOG considers that this constitutes the minimum number of formal interactions to ensure a sound understanding of the content issues that will form the drafting of the Network Code. In case additional SJWS, Workshops or bilateral meetings are necessary during the Network Code development process, ENTSOG will not hesitate to organise these additional Workshops/meetings.

For Capacity Calculation, the European Commission is strongly considering making use of its right of proposal to put forward a text for comitology NC CAM taking into account the fact that this topic is addressed already in NC CAM and the close relationship of this topic with both NC CAM and the recently adopted guidelines on congestion management procedures. In the event that Capacity Calculation is not covered by the Comitology Process NC CAM and the European Commission invites ENTSG to include it as a topic in the Interoperability Network Code, ENTSG will take on board this issue as soon as possible in the development process of the Network Code Interoperability and Data Exchange Rules, with a possible change of the project timelines.

A ‘front loading’ of stakeholder participation is essential to ensure high quality dialogue and understanding during the SJWSs. The quality of stakeholder inputs (e.g. case examples and/or empirical analyses and/or reasoning for solutions) will be critical to the formulation of the draft Network Code for the formal consultation. Thus the process requires stakeholders to make relevant contributions and raise both ideas and solutions at the earliest opportunity in the code development process with proper reasoning. This will allow ENTSG to develop a robust draft Network Code for its later formal consultation with stakeholders. To assist stakeholders’ early input in the Network Code development process, ENTSG published its Launch Documentation on the 10th of October 2012 on its website².

> **Timeline for project**

Regulation 715/2009 prohibits a network code development period of longer than 12 months. The European Commission have therefore given ENTSG the maximum period for the process that is lawfully permitted. Based on responses to the Project Plan Consultation, ENTSG recognises that stakeholders are aware that this timeline is challenging, but they believe that when planning is efficient it can be managed. ENTSG is aware that in some cases bilateral meetings or regional meetings may be required to reach the target within the timeframe, so is open to any request for additional meetings.

> **Topics for and scheduling of SJWSs**

ENTSG will review the progress of key ‘milestones,’ such as each SJWS, to ensure that the project is running as planned and that all relevant issues are maintained within scope and are suitably managed within the process. On the basis of these reviews, ENTSG will refine

² See <http://www.entsog.eu/publications/interoperability.html>

the project plan as needed, for example, scheduling additional workshops, meetings and/or revising the list of topics to be treated. In this case ENTSOG will inform the Stakeholders.

> **Use of webinars and teleconferencing for SJWSs**

Given that a clear majority of respondents considered that webinars and live streaming of events might enable wider participation, ENTSOG will continue the procedure of using webinars for Workshops/SJWS. Some stakeholders also expressed a need for bilateral physical meetings with ENTSOG. ENTSOG is open to any such request for bilateral meetings and is willing to organize them.

> **Compatibility with other Network Codes**

Given that compatibility with other network codes was raised, ENTSOG will make every effort to ensure that this Network Code will be consistent with the codes already proposed by ENTSOG.

Annex I

Respondent	Organisation and/or company
1	EconGas GmbH
2	EDF Luminus
3	Edison SpA
4	Sorgenia SpA
5	EDF
6	EFET
7	VCI
8	GDF SUEZ
9	VIK Germany
10	Statoil
11	Thüga AG
12	energy solutions
13	Esso Nederland BV / ExxonMobil
14	Energie-Nederland
15	eni
16	GIE
17	IBERDROLA, S.A.
18	INTER-REGIES
19	Utility Support Group
20	EnBW Energie Baden-Wuerttemberg AG
21	VEMW
22	EUROMOT
23	Alliander
24	GEODE
25	MARCOGAZ
26	Eurogas
27	DEPA S.A.
28	Eurogas
29	Trans-Adriatic Pipeline
30	GasTerra BV
31	GA-MA AD
32	Peter Taff
33	GrDF
34	GDF SUEZ
35	GA-MA AD

36	EURELECTRIC AISBL
37	Thüga AG

