

Draft Comitology Guideline on Fundamental Electricity Data Transparency
ERGEG Public Consultation Paper
Cover Note and Consultation Questions
8 September 2010

Background

The European Commission's discussion paper on codes and guidelines of 18 September 2009 reviewed the priorities for preparing codes and guidelines and presented DG TREN view of the priorities. The note proposed transparency as one of the four identified priority areas for electricity. The preparation of codes and guidelines was discussed at the 17th Florence Forum in December 2009. The need for wider transparency was broadly supported by market participants. The Forum conclusions stated that "Regarding transparency rules, ERGEG agreed to give an advice to the Commission on a legally binding guideline by the next Forum in view of ERGEG developing a final draft by the end of 2010. This work shall be prepared in close co-operation with ENTSO-E and with full consultation of the stakeholders."

The European Commission in its letter of 18 January 2010 requested ERGEG give advice to the European Commission on this issue by the end of 2010 and prepare a draft guideline on fundamental electricity data transparency which would allow the European Commission to make the rules legally binding through Comitology.

This draft comitology guideline document (Ref. E10-ENM-02-07) is based on the Initial Impact Assessment document (Ref. E10-ENM-05-01) enclosed and on ERGEG's previous work on transparency. The previous work consists of the Guidelines of Good Practice on Information Management and Transparency (Ref. E05-EMK-06-10) and the regional transparency reports prepared within the context of the Electricity Regional Initiatives.

As requested by the European Commission in its 18 January letter, ERGEG has cooperated closely with ENTSO-E in the work process as well as taken into account the work done so far by ENTSO-E on the common European Electricity transparency platform. ENTSO-E has provided valuable input during the work, for example by developing definitions of the transparency requirements. Furthermore, a public workshop was organised in co-operation with ENTSO-E on 1 June 2010 to involve the stakeholder organisations in the preparatory work on the draft comitology guideline.

Invitation to respond

ERGEG invites all interested parties to respond to the consultation paper (the draft guideline) and in particular to the questions below. Any comments should be received before **28 October 2010** and should be sent by e-mail to electricity_transparency@ergeg.org.

Please, note that the initial impact assessment is not consulted upon but is enclosed for the sake of readability and understanding of the draft guidelines.

Any questions relating to this document should in first instance be addressed to:

Mrs Fay Geitona

Tel: 32 2 7887330

Fax: 32 27887350

Email: fay.geitona@ceer.eu

Questions for public consultation

(Please, feel free to justify your answers and to submit further observations)

General issues

1. Are there additional major problems or policy issues that should be addressed by the draft Comitology Guideline on Fundamental Electricity Data Transparency?
2. What timescale is needed to implement the Comitology Guideline on Fundamental Electricity Data Transparency seen from your organisation's point of view?
3. Do you see a need for more firm specification of the role of each market participant in delivering transparency data to the TSO/information platform in the Comitology Guideline on Fundamental Electricity Data Transparency?
4. Do you see a need for more firm specification of the role of the TSO in collecting data in the Comitology Guideline on Fundamental Electricity Data Transparency?
5. Taking into account the interface between wider transparency requirements and the costs of data storage, do you consider storage of basic data for 3 years, to be made available for free, as sufficient?
6. Are the suggested market time units for information reporting and publication requirements adequate and compatible with wider transparency in a European perspective?
7. How do you see the costs and benefits of the proposed transparency framework for fundamental data in electricity? If possible, please provide qualitative and/or quantitative evidence on the costs and benefits or ideas about those.

Load issues

8. Do you see a need for publication of load data linked to different timeframes or an update of load data linked to different timeframes than those suggested in the draft document?
9. The draft document suggests that the information on unavailabilities of consumption units is disclosed in an anonymous manner identifying the bidding area, timeframes and unavailable load. Do you consider these pieces of information sufficient for the transparency needs of the internal wholesale electricity market or should also the name of the consumption unit be published?

Transmission and interconnectors

10. Should the publication obligations regarding planned or actual outages of the transmission grid and interconnectors require the publication of the location and type of the asset (i.e. identify the part of transmission infrastructure that due to planned outage or a failure is facing a limitation in its transmission capacity) or should the information on transmission infrastructure equipment outage be non-identifiable? Please justify your position why either identified information would be necessary or why only anonymous information on the transmission infrastructure outages should be published.
11. The requirement to disclose outages in the transmission infrastructure is proposed to be placed on such events where the impact on capacity is equal to or greater than 100 MW during at least one market time unit. Do you consider this absolute, MW-based threshold appropriate, or should the threshold be in relation to e.g. the total generation or load of the bidding area, or alternatively, should the absolute threshold be complemented with a relative threshold? The relative threshold would mean, for example, that the publishing requirement would apply if a planned or actual outage of transmission infrastructure would equal to or be greater than 5 per cent (or any specified percentage value). This question on relative threshold stems from the fact that for some bidding areas the proposed 100 MW threshold may be relatively high. However, raising the general European threshold might in the majority of the European bidding areas lead to too low a threshold and a vast amount of information being reported.
12. With regard to publishing requirements on congestion (in paragraph 22 (d) and (e)), what kind of information do you consider important to receive and how frequently? Please justify your position.

Generation

13. Should unavailability of generation infrastructure relate to a given plant or a given unit? Please justify your position.
14. The draft document proposes that actual unit by unit output for units equal to or greater than 10 MW be updated real time as changes occur. Do you consider the 10 MW threshold for generation units appropriate?
15. The requirement to disclose hourly information on actual aggregated generation output is now related to generation type. Should this threshold be linked to fuel requirements or generation technology?

Balancing and wholesale data

16. The transparency requirements on balancing have been widened compared to the Transparency Reports prepared within the framework of the Electricity Regional Initiatives. Is the proposed list of data items sufficient - also taking into account the evolution towards cross-border balancing markets?
17. The transparency requirements on wholesale market data have been deliberately left outside the draft Guidelines as they will most likely be addressed by other legal measures that are currently under preparation. Should some basic wholesale data, i.e. information on aggregate supply and demand curves, prices and volumes for each standard traded product and for each market timeframe (forward, day-ahead, intraday) as well as prices and volumes of the OTC market still be part of the Comitology Guideline on Fundamental Electricity Data Transparency?