TML023-11\_Rev\_1\_TM\_Workshop\_4\_Harald\_Stindl



# Target Model – Lessons learnt and next steps

Harald Stindl Board Member

Target Model Workshop 4, Brussels 28 June 2011

## **Delivering internal energy market functioning**



## **Critical interactions within current focus areas**

Some key elements that need resolution:

CAM – sunset clause CMP – renominations Tariff – short term v long term pricing Balancing – within-day constraints

Investment – "market test approach"



... current proposals must be given a chance

... CMP, CAM and Balancing proposals aimed at addressing current gas regime weaknesses ... developing a robust investment framework is perhaps the major missing link

# **Target Model must enable progressive evolution**





# 2014 Critical Issues – must understand and decide upon trade-offs

#### Policy choices required e.g.

- Short term versus longer term trade-offs?
- Market determined system and/or interventionist approach?
- Capacity rights an option to flow gas until what point in time?

#### Short v long term pricing implications

- Fixed costs must be recovered somewhere
- Prices need to be set to minimise distortions and inefficiencies

... interactions imply some regime parameters may be best determined as part of the early, or first, code development



### **GB** experience of short term capacity zero reserve price



... unfortunately substitutibility between long and short term capacity is observed and this may create material distortions and inefficiencies in regime functioning

# **Learning opportunities**

- Investment
- Zone mergers
- Market linkage



## **Learning opportunities - Investment**

### "Market test" to

- allow market signals
- establish a "trigger" for capacity release
- enable infrastructure investment
  - risk/reward framework for return/recovery of investment
- ensure no undue risks and cross-subsidies
  - cross-border cost allocation and recovery mechanism

## Tariff or subsequent code?

### "Political / SoS test"

- to allow investments where market signals won't satisfy "market test"
- to provide a cross-border allocation framework

Energy Infrastructure Program?



# Learning opportunities – Zone mergers

#### **Opportunities**

#### Enhanced trading opportunities

- Focussed liquidity
- Robust price indexes

#### Simpler transportation arrangements

- Less entry/exit zone bookings

#### Easier system user balancing

 Access to functioning balancing markets

#### Challenges

Increased contractual, tariff and operational complexity

Enhanced cross-border TSO cooperation

#### Risks of internal congestions

- changes in flows may expose new constraints
- Which options to manage risk

#### Establishment of "balancing market operator"

- New operational and settlement functions

#### ... free lunches do not exist; so how do we assess the tradeoffs?



## Possible methodology to assess potential for internal congestion costs arising from zone merger



# Learning experiences – Linking markets

### "Market coupling"

• an electricity approach developed taking account of electricity specificities

### "Linking markets"

- A gas concept requiring definition in the context of gas specificities
  - enabling either system users or a central arbitrager to link markets/exchanges
  - reflecting the continuous trading aspects of the gas regime?

... ENTSOG offers to work with stakeholders to pilot options for better linking markets in gas



## Conclusions

#### TM must

- be collaborative development
- be completed quickly
- provide a robust longer term vision

2011

Promote delivery of 2014 binding priorities

- CAM/CMP (plus essential tariffs)
- Balancing
- Interoperability

Pilots should focus on:

- Investment framework
- Zone mergers
- Linking markets

To 2014

Full roll-out of initial binding rules and further development towards a fully functioning internal energy market

After 2014

