



# **Draft Framework Guidelines on Capacity Allocation and Congestion Management**

**ERGEG Workshop on CACM**

18<sup>th</sup> of October 2010, Brussels

Alain Marien

ENM TF co-chair

# Welcome

- Workshop on Framework Guidelines on Capacity Allocation and Congestion Management (FG on CACM)
- Consultation on CACM FG : ends 10<sup>th</sup> of November 2010
- [http://www.energy-regulators.eu/portal/page/portal/EER\\_HOME/EER\\_CONSULT/OPEN%20PUBLIC%20CONSULTATIONS/draft%20Framework%20Guideline%20CACM%20Electricity/CD](http://www.energy-regulators.eu/portal/page/portal/EER_HOME/EER_CONSULT/OPEN%20PUBLIC%20CONSULTATIONS/draft%20Framework%20Guideline%20CACM%20Electricity/CD)
- Consultation documents:
  - Cover note and questions for consultation
  - FG
  - Also provided : Initial Impact Assessment (IIA)

- 3<sup>rd</sup> Package, August 2009
- Project Coordination Group (PCG) delivered the Target Model for Interregional Congestion Management at the 17<sup>th</sup> Florence Forum of December 2009: starting point
- Commission invited EREGEG for drafting a FG on CACM; letter arrived end March
- Creation in the 17<sup>th</sup> Florence Forum of an Ad Hoc Advisory Group (AHAG) to assist EREGEG
- A specific project team was created inside EREGEG ENM TF for drafting the IIA and the draft FG
- November & December 2010: evaluation of consultation documents and new draft of the FG
- EREGEG approval: begin 2011



# Content & objectives of CACM

- Overarching objective: an optimal use of power generation plants and transmission across Europe.
  1. Optimal Use of Transmission Capacity
    1. Capacity Calculation
    2. Definition of Zones
  2. Reliable Prices and Liquidity in the Day-Ahead Market
  3. Efficient Forward Electricity Market
  4. Efficient Intraday Market
- Not covered:
  - Balancing
  - Governance
  - Transparency

# General questions

1. Are there any additional issues and / or objectives that should be addressed in the CACM IIA and FG?
2. Is the vision of the enduring EU-wide target model transparently established in the IIA and FG and well suited to address all the issues and objectives of the CACM?
3. Should any of the timeframes (forward, day-ahead, intraday) be addressed in more detail?
4. In general, is the definition of interim steps in the FG appropriate?
5. Is the characterisation of force majeure sufficient? Should there be separate definitions for DC and AC interconnectors?
6. Do you agree with the definition of firmness for explicit and implicitly allocated capacity as set out in the FG? How prescriptive should the FG be with regard to the firmness of capacity?
7. Which costs and benefits do you see from introducing the proposed FG for CACM? Please provide qualitative and if applicable also quantitative evidence.



Thank you for your attention!

[www.energy-regulators.eu](http://www.energy-regulators.eu)