

Public Consultation on Capacity Offering and Use at the Gas Interconnection Points Located at the Borders of the EU and the Energy Community

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

1. Questionnaire

When providing your input to the questionnaire, please consider the following guidance:

- “Technical approaches” means engineering solutions, e.g. looping a pipeline or managing flows with pressure differentials;
- “Commercial approaches” means contractual terms and conditions, e.g. transferring the use of capacity rights to another IP for an agreed fee when the contracted capacity is not available;
- “Market design approaches” means rules that are typically part of network codes, e.g. setting up virtual interconnection points.

For each IP, you can select (by ticking the available box) more than one of the above approaches to improving the availability and the terms of use of capacity. Please provide in the text box any further considerations and recommendations regarding each of the approaches that you have selected. Please include your name, organisation, contact email, and country on your respondent sheet.

Replies to the consultation can be submitted by **30 June 2021 23:59 hrs (CET)**.

2. Personal data and confidentiality

I have read and understood ACER’s Privacy Statement (see below) and Data Protection Notice on Interactions with Stakeholders ([link](#)), as well as ECS’ Procedural Act on the Secretariat’s Data Protection Policy ([link](#)):

[ACER and ECS joint public consultation statement.pdf](#)

The response which I submit to the consultation shall be considered by ACER and ECS as (choose one):

- Non-confidential (public)
- Confidential (in accordance with [Article 9 of ACER’s Decision No 19/2019](#) concerning ACER’s Rules of Procedure)

3. Respondent information

Please specify your name, surname:

Position:

Organisation:

Organisation address:

Email

Country:

Activity of respondent:

- Trader/Supplier/Importer/Exporter
- Regulatory authority
- Other (please specify)

Please list the borders (IPs) between the EU MS and the EnC CPs and/or between EnC CPs that you are concerned with. Enter N/A when you are not currently active at any such border IP.

Please provide further details regarding your answers related to two previous questions, if any:

4. Topic 1: Fair and transparent terms of access to services, including capacity contracts, network codes and contracts for auxiliary services

1. In your view, what are the possible **technical approaches** to ensure adequate and expected free movement of gas between market areas to locations where it is valued by gas market participants? Your answer may consider any or all of the following.

- Looping(s)
- Pressure management
- Other

1.1. If looping(s), please indicate at which IPs:

2. In your view, what are the **possible commercial approaches** to ensure adequate and reliable free movement of gas between market areas to locations where it is valued by gas market participants? Your answer may consider any or all of the following.

- Capacity contract transfer to another IP (e.g. substitute alternative paths where the primary booked transportation route is not available)
- Capacity use shift by type and time, e.g. transferability (at no additional charge) of unusable capacity on an interruptible basis with priority determined by time of transfer (earlier bookings take priority)
- Capacity conversion right by user and release of converted capacity (if various types of capacity are offered by the TSO)
- Short haul services
- Time capacity swaps between users
- Greater firmness of virtual reverse flow capacity
- Capacity swaps between users for various types of capacity (firm, interruptible, direct, reverse, virtual, bundled) throughout the year or during periods of maintenance only
- Increased capacity availability on an interruptible basis
- Other

2.2. For Q2, please explain your choice(s) and indicate relevant IPs:

3. In your view, what are the possible market design approaches to ensure adequate and expected free movement of gas between market areas to locations where it is valued by gas market participants? Your answer may consider any or all of the following.

- Virtual interconnection points
- Firm backhaul capacity
- Increased transparency on contractual the terms and conditions at IPs (e.g. right information of the required type and scope, at proper moments, to all concerned parties, etc.)
- Increasing supply sources
- Reducing market concentration

Other

3.1 Please explain if other:

3.2 Please explain your choice(s):

4. In case you wish to report any other issues concerning market integration not covered in the questions above, please outline here the approaches and the issues they address:

5. Topic 2: Market Integration

5. In your view, what are the possible available and future instruments and frameworks which can be used to ensure that capacity demand is adequately met in order to better serve market integration?

- Using the tools provided by the 10-Year Network Development Plan (TYNDP)
- Using the tools provided to projects of common interest (PCIs) or Projects of Energy Community Interest (PECIs) or Projects of mutual interest (PMIs)
- Using both the tools available in TYNDP and PCIs / PECIs / PMIs
- Using the tools of the Network Codes
- A combination of PCIs/ PECIs/PMIs and Network Codes
- Other (please explain)

5.1. Please explain if other:

5.2. Please describe in detail the relevant aspects of the chosen selection(s):

6. Topic 3: Availability of capacity (capacity availability, allocation and use) and maintenance and gas quality issues (interoperability)

6. In your view, what are the three best approaches (possibly as indicated in questions 1-5 above) that will ensure that network users can benefit from reliable allocation of capacity offers and optimal use of existing network systems and capacity, including during times of planned and unplanned maintenance? Please indicate below:

7. In your view, what are the three best approaches (possibly as indicated in questions 1-5 above) to gas transmission system maintenance with the purpose of minimising disruption of flows? Please indicate the approaches and the issues they addresses:

8. In your view, what are three best approaches (possibly from the ones indicated in questions 1-5 above) to handling emergencies (transmission, supply cut offs, capacity)? Please indicate the approaches and the issues they address:

9. In your view, what are three best approaches to gas quality measuring rules, specifications and standards? Please describe the approaches and the issues they address:

Universal standard for fuel quality measurement by all transmission system operators, being part of national network codes.

10. In your view, what are the three best approaches to managing gas measurement rules and standards? Please describe the approaches and the issues they address:

Universal reference parameters for all member countries to measure GCV and NCV, which will be determined during international consultations and then implemented at each measuring point.

11. If you wish to note any other issue(s) related to the availability of capacity at IPs at EU/ EnC borders, and not already covered by the questions 6-10 above, please describe the issues and their potential solutions of technical, commercial or market design nature:

12. In your view, what are the three best approaches to ensure network users can manage the risks related to the firmness of transport contracts and balancing adequately?

13. In your view, what is the best approach the TSOs need to undertake to improve the exchange of information amongst market participants? Please choose one below:

- Common data exchange solutions
- Communication procedures during emergencies
- Communications in instances of interruptible capacity and transmission
- Other (please explain)

13.1 Please explain if other:

7. Topic 4: Issues related to Network Codes Topic

When commenting on a specific IP, please use the IP name and code provided in [Table 1](#).

14. The NCs are mandatory to be applied at the borders between two EnC CPs. In your view, which NCs should be implemented by which IP at the EU and EnC border? Please list separately each IPs and NC relevant to that IP:

Drozdovichi - Poland Network Code
Hermanowice - Poland Network Code

15. Regarding reverse flow modalities, in your view, are the firm physical bi-directional capacity available at the IP(s) sufficient under

- a) normal conditions
- b) maintenance conditions and
- c) emergency conditions?

Please indicate in your answer the specific IP(s) where at least one of the a-b-c above are not met (also indicating which one), and any additional comments you may have.

16. Regarding reverse flow modalities, in your view, are the firm virtual backhaul bi-directional capacities available at the concerned IP(s) sufficient under

- a) normal conditions
- b) maintenance conditions and
- c) emergency conditions?

Please indicate in your answers the specific IP(s) where at least one of the a-b-c above are not met (also indicating which one), and any additional comments you may have.

17. In your view, which IP(s) operate insufficient firm capacities one way only, and which way (1-2 or 2-1 – for reference see this table)? Please indicate in your answers the specific IP(s) being addressed and any additional comments you may have:

18. If you wish to comment on any other issue(s) related to the availability of capacity at the concerned IPs, please provide your comment(s) here:

8. Topic 5: Issues related to particular IPs

19. In your view, what are the best possible future approaches to ensure that network users enjoy fair and transparent access to capacity and other network services at the following IPs, on competitive market terms? Please consider using the definitions and the suggested breakdown of options as available in questions 1-3 above. You may also suggest other approaches.

20. IP Drozdovichi - Drozdowicze:

21. IP Hermanowice:

22. IP Uzhgorod / Velke Kapushany:

23. IP Budince:

24. IP Beregovu / Beredgaroc:

25. IP Beredgaroc / Beregovu:

26. IP Tekovo Mediesu Aurit:

27. IP Oleksiivka:

28. IP Ananiv:

29. IP Lymanske:

30. IP Iasi / Ungheni:

31. IP Grebenyki:

32. IP Kaushany - Caushany:

33. IP Kireevo / Zajecar:

34. IP Kuystendil / Zidilovo:

35. IP Loznica / Zvornik:

36. IP Kiskondorozsma - Horgos:

37. Other comments and suggestions.

Please provide below any other comments and suggestions you may have regarding the matter of the consultation.

Thank you!

Contact

[Contact Form](#)