

## **Minutes**

### **1<sup>st</sup> SJWS for the development of TYNDP 2017**

**Brussels, 13 January 2016, from 9:30 to 16:30**

**Thon Hotel EU, Rue de la Loi 75, 1040 Brussels**

---

#### **Introduction**

Céline Heidrecheid, ENTSOG Business Area Manager

Slides are available for download

#### **Story lines for demand scenarios**

Stefan Greulich, ENTSOG Adviser

Slides are available for download

#### **EUROGAS**

**R:** Demand depends on too many factors. Recommendation to keep some of the parameters fixed in the different scenarios (like economic growth or prices) for better comparison and conclusions.

**Q:** In Green Revolution, high tech scenario, gas can still play a higher role in it and has opportunities in power to gas. Slow Progression also has a gas potential, delivering more efficient heating

**A:** ENTSOG welcomes bilateral discussions with Eurogas. Scenarios look for a reasonable demand range to assess the infrastructure projects.

#### **White Stream**

**Q:** 3 scenarios are an average European approach, is there a consideration of different scenarios in different regions in Europe? For example Green Revolution in the north Slow Progression in the South East Europe.

**A:** ENTSOG provides storylines with general trends to the TSOs who then provide the data in their national views of the scenarios.

#### **Autorita**

**Q:** What is the concept of Gas before Coal in a Regulatory basis in the scenarios?

**A:** National regulations would close more polluting old coal plants in Blue Transition and Green Revolution. GR also shows the high CO<sub>2</sub> price effect.

#### **EDISON**

**Q:** Probability of scenarios to happen? Do the 3 scenarios have the some weight on the CBA methodology?

**A:** No probabilities are measured and all the scenarios are considered at the same level for the TYNDP assessment.

#### **Transgaz**

**Q:** Price of gas will affect the demand and the scenarios developments. Is there fuel to fuel competition?

**A:** There is a connection between green ambitions and economic growth. Fuel prices are considered in the scenarios.

#### **ENGIE**

**Q:** What is the current spot of the scenarios?

**A:** These are long term development storylines, the current situation would be slow progression, coal before gas in electricity.

#### **CREG Belgium Regulator**

**Q:** How do the different assumptions affect to the peak demands?

**A:** Peak demand will be considered at a national level expertise. The peak demand is collected in the contexts decided for network development; they pay special attention on gas to power and also the backup role of gas for RES in the different scenarios.

#### **CRE French Regulator**

**Q:** How can we cover the full scope of all the combinations of demand in the different sectors?

**A:** There is an overall climate goal for all sector so they tend to be aligned with this common target.

#### **GRTGAZ**

**Q:** Will EU goals go on expense of coal and oil only and not affect gas?

**A:** GR is looking at electrification of the energy mix and development of RES which will have impact on gas to power, but gas will still have room for heating and as RES back-up.

#### **Energy Community**

**Q:** What is there behind the member state cooperation?

A: National legislations could have different views on Coal or Nuclear sectors but there are overall ambitions in the European level.

## **Presentation of ENTSO-E TYNDP 2016 Scenarios**

Irina Minciuna, ENTSO-E

Slides are available for download.

### **CREOS**

**Q:** Do the visions limit the parameters in them?

**A:** Visions give guidance to the members but for each scenario justified figures at national levels outside the ranges are accepted.

### **GE ENER**

**Q:** Comments about the collaboration for the alignment of ENTSOs parameters in the scenarios and about the intentions to have harmonized scenarios in the future, what prevents this alignment?

**A:** ENTSG and ENTSOG sectors are different and timelines are also different but ENTSOs are already working to increase consistency from TYNDP 2017, in power generation specially. The cooperation between ENTSOs is increasing from one TYNDP to next one.

### **EUROGAS**

**Q:** V4 demand response is fully used and storage centralized, what are the infrastructure needs and how are storage techs developing in this scenario?

**A:** Storage figure for V4 shows an extra storage that would be centralized in the areas with higher potential. Needs in each scenario are different so there are also different flows and this is reflected in the infrastructures.

### **Web Question**

**Q:** Climate change contradictory approach, do we have to take the worse scenario for the future of natural gas demands?

**A:** Scenarios look at the broad range of futures, not to the probability of them to happen. The scenarios aim to give a higher probability to the new infrastructures to fit the purpose of the future stressing the system, so it helps us to decide because when they map more of these possibilities there is higher certainty of not being wrong.

## **Alignment – Scenarios/Visions**

Stefan Greulich, ENTSOG Adviser

Slides are available for download.

### **GRTGAZ**

**Q:** Concerns on not having scenarios in which gas demand would decrease

**A:** Green revolution has the higher potential decrease (ENTSO-E vision 4), at bottom line of the graph. Slow progression is somewhere in the middle, and blue transition the top line.

### **CRE**

**Q:** How do parameters reflect the total gas demand and how is the V4 top down approach channelled in the figures that gas TSOs will provide?

**A:** Bottom up approach is used for data collection with a consistency check of the national figures with the general storylines.

**Q:** What are the obstacles to have common scenarios?

**A:** ENTSO-E TYNDP 2016 scenarios development is already finalized. The feedback from gas stakeholders is not sufficiently included. ENTSGOs are working together for the definition of the common scenarios from the start in next TYNDP so next time the alignment will be higher.

### **CRESO**

TSOs for both gas and electricity, could there be different approaches or data for gas/ electricity?

**A:** Scenarios should be aligned with ENTSGOs. The same TSO sending data to both ENTSGOG and ENTSGO-E would give a higher consistency.

### **CRE**

Power methodology has 2 options, so if differences arise it should be explain why the one used has been chosen?

**A:** ENTSGOG keeps this remark for transparency and will check the data with TSOs.

**Q:** Is the thermal gap in the scenario Green entirely gas?

**A:** This is a max gas approach but even if coal is minimized it will still be used.

### **General conclusions on the Demand Scenarios morning session:**

- Objective of demand scenarios: assessment of the network in different futures
- Range of demand approaches is globally supported, but there is still the question on how large this range should be.
- More clarity on the peak demand.
- Eurogas (expertise), bilateral meetings.

### **Submission of infrastructure projects**

Adam Balogh, ENTSOG Adviser

Slides are available for download

#### **CRE**

**C:** Regarding the submission of projects, coordination between project promoters and TSOs, which are not directly but indirectly involved, is necessary.

### **Demonstration of the Project Data Portal**

Vincent Scherrer, ENTSOG IT Manager

#### **ENTSOG**

Live demonstration of the project data portal including the explanation of available alerts and reports. The alarms and reports enable project promoters to be aware of situations, which could raise questions from external stakeholders and can react to those issues. ENTSOG is not in the position to judge the submitted data. The project data portal will go live by mid-April.

#### **CREOS**

**Q:** Will the old credentials still be valid for the platform?

**A:** Credentials remain valid

#### **EC**

**Q:** Regarding possible non-coordinated submissions: What would happen, if a neighbouring TSO would not submit capacity increments?

**A:** This is the promoters' responsibility, a coordination should also be incentivized for the sake of the project. Diverging capacity information will be handled applying the lesser-of-rule.

**Q:** Is the information of other TSO's available to TSOs?

**A:** Project promoters and TSOs have only access to points, where they are connected.

**Q:** How are different commissioning dates handled by the system?

**A:** Application of lesser-of-rule

### **Ministry of FYROM**

**Q:** Involvement of authorities in the preparation of data necessary in addition to the respective project promoter

**A:** Project promoter submit projects

### **CRE**

**Q:** How are enablers treated?

**A:** Complex issue, which is easy to answer for 1-on-1 relations, but needs further clarification for more complex situations.

### **E-Control**

**Q:** Appearance of capacity mismatches at interconnection points is a new issue. How often does this happen and does this prevent the TYNDP from meeting the legal requirements?

**A:** These situations occur, project promoters can coordinate without the help of ENTSG.

**Q:** Is lesser-of-rule also applied at borders to non-EU countries?

**A:** If capacity information exists on non-EU side, yes. Anyway, resulting capacities are shown transparently. This transparency enables interested parties to investigate for them relevant points.

### **Belgian regulator**

**Q:** How are competing projects treated?

**A:** Lesser-of-rule will be applied.

### **EC**

**Q:** Clustering of enablers and projects: What is the consequence for the results? How is a project classified as enabler and by whom?

**A:** This is an important topic, which has to be clarified at a later stage.

### **CRE**

**Q:** For cross-border CBAs, the costs of enablers need to be split. It should be made clear in the submission, that there is a link between an enabler and the enabled project.

**A:** Seems already to be implemented in the system, enablers are under the current definition measures from the same TSO (not cross-TSO)

## **Introduction to consideration of projects in TYNDP 2017**

Céline Heidrecheid, ENTSOG Business Area Manager

Slides are available for download

### **CRE**

**C:** Depending on the philosophy of the national network development plan (restrictive / non-restrictive) view, the maturity criterion inclusion in the national network development plan could be handled different from country to country.

### **E-Control**

**C:** Projects could be in the TYNDP without being in a national network development plan, since not all countries have a national network development plan.

The commissioning date should be added as a maturity criterion.

### **Engie**

**Q:** Regarding the maturity of competing projects: Can several projects for bringing LNG to Europe be mature?

**A:** Maturity will be handled based on criteria.

### **Edison**

**Q:** How are clusters with projects of different maturity handled?

**A:** In general the lesser-of-rule is applied. The clusters are added based on the infrastructure case.