**Consultation questionnaire**

1. What is your name?
2. What is your email address?
3. What is your organisation?
4. Do you wish that your response to this consultation would be treated confidential, i.e. published without disclosing the name?
5. Please provide your answers with explanation to the following questions on the TSOs’ proposal **“Principles for transmission capacity management in common Baltic gas market”.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | Description | Question |
| 1 | *The Principles for transmission capacity management in common Baltic gas market* describes that capacity allocation on interconnection points with other Member States (IPs) should follow the requirements of European network code on capacity allocation mechanisms (NC CAM) in gas transmission systems. In other entry-exit points all capacity products available at IPs also should be offered for booking. The range of capacity products should include both long-term and short-term products.  Capacity at IPs with other EU member countries (for example Poland) will be auctioned following the requirements of NC CAM. Capacity at other entry exit points will be allocated using Pro Rata principle and at the non-congested points – First Come First Served method could be used. | 1. Do you agree with the principles and the list of capacity products proposed for common Baltic gas market zone on slides 9-11?   Please provide your views on this section.   1. Do you agree that all standard capacity products available on IPs would be offered on entry-exit points other than IPs? 2. Do you have proposals for the provided capacity allocation calendar? 3. Do you agree that on non-congested entry-exit points First Come First Served capacity allocation method would be used? 4. Do you have any other proposals for the transmission capacity management in common Baltic gas market? |
| 2 | Regulation does not define how the tariff can be applied for domestic points and if the tariff should be capacity or energy based. *The Principles for transmission capacity management in common Baltic gas market* describes different schemes of capacity booking which could be applied for domestic points:   1. No capacity is allocated, only energy based tariff is applied; 2. The capacity is booked by network user; 3. The capacity is booked by the connected party (DSOs or directly connected consumption sites owners). | Please indicate whether you would prefer option a), b) or c) with your reasoning.  Please provide your detailed views on this section. |
| 3 | *The Principles for transmission capacity management in common Baltic gas market* lists the congestion management procedures and facilitation of the capacity usage. It is proposed that the surrender of contracted capacity, secondary capacity trading and interruptible capacity should be available at all entry/exit points, but only in IPs as required by regulation, over-subscription and buyback scheme, long and short-term use-it-or-lose-it procedures are foreseen to be applied. (Please see slides 13-15). | Do you see a need to use all congestion management methods as set in regulation also for non-IPs?  Please provide your detailed views on this section. |
| 4 | *The Principles for transmission capacity management in common Baltic gas market* describes that the capacity in Baltic gas market zone should be marketed in common booking platform, which should be managed by MAM, which would also act as a common gate for exchange of information, related to transmission services and balancing services. | 1. Do you support TSOs proposal that MAM could also act as a Capacity Booking Platform for capacity at entry/exit points in addition of MAM other core functions? 2. Do you have a preference regarding allocating capacity on entry-exit points: (1) capacity would be allocated on joint portal (capacity booking platform) operated by MAM, or (2) each TSO would allocate capacity of their country entry-exit points on their own capacity booking platforms? |

1. Please provide your answers with explanation to the following questions on the TSOs’ proposal **for MAM alternatives:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | The TSOs have evaluated several alternatives of MAM establishment from market, costs effectiveness, business and market development, business operation and management, and legislative perspectives, taking into account their advantages and disadvantages.  Based on conducted analysis of MAM alternatives, TSOs have identified two preferred options among all alternatives:   * The first option is a MAM as a new entity owned by TSOs. In this option, TSOs delegate their balancing responsibilities for one entity in a common market and newly created entity serves as a single contractual and contact point for all market participants for VTP operation and balancing. In addition, it would manage joint portal for transmission services. * In case of second option, TSO-TSO cooperation model, there would be one IT solution for the market participants, but contractual relations and responsibilities for balancing, VTP operation would remain with TSOs and would be shared in later agreed manner. | 1. Do you have a preference for any of the mentioned MAM alternatives? If yes, please specify why? 2. Please provide your views on this section for the options preferred by the TSOs. 3. Is there any other aspects, in your opinion, which should be considered when choosing a particular MAM alternative? |

1. Please provide your answers with explanation to the following questions on the TSOs’ proposal **„Concept Model for the Coordinated Balancing Zone“**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | Description | Question |
| 1 | Concept model describes the target model for the merged balancing zone. Balancing zone means an entry-exit system to which a specific balancing regime is applicable. To achieve the target the harmonised (single) balancing rules shall be developed and implemented, also single imbalance settlement management as well. | Do you agree that the proposed target model for regional balancing zone should be achieved?  Please provide your views on this section. |
| 2 | Concept model (slide 12) describes the functions that shall be provided centrally at least via single web interface solution. The proposal includes providing central functionalities as:   1. balancing group management, imbalance settlement, data provision, and operational balancing – as “MAM Basic” functions 2. Accepting gas flow nominations and allocating gas flow at entry and exit points from/for network users 3. Organizing entry and exit transmission capacity booking to network users – as “MAM additional” functions | Do you agree that all functionalities described shall be managed between TSOs centrally at least via single web interface solution?  Please provide your detailed views on this section.  Do you see any other functions that should be centrally managed? |
| 3 | Concept model (slide 14) describes the preliminary options for possible data exchange solution between market participants and TSOs (MAM).  Option A includes the vision that nomination by network user and trade notification by trading participant shall be aggregated by MAM (central platform) who shall submit the results to TSOs and balance portfolio managers (BPMs). This option would ensure the confidentiality for the network users on their trading operations.  Option B includes the vision that nomination by network user shall be submitted to MAM (central platform) via BPM and the trade notifications shall be provided to MAM (central platform) by BPMs for OTC trades or by gas exchange operator for the trades in trading platform per BPM portfolios. As a summary each BPM will have direct information about its portfolio and MAM (central platform) shall perform the imbalance calculation per BPMs. | Please provide your views on this section for both options. |
| 4 | TSOs proposal Concept Model for the Coordinated Balancing Zone slide 22 describes short-term standardised products for balancing purposes. | Please provide your views for short-term products that should be available for day ahead and within day purposes. |
| 5 | Balancing Network code sets out options for non-daily meter data provision. In slide 24 the different information models are described and as a result of the study Baltic TSOs propose to implement “Base case” model. | Do you agree that “Base case” model shall be implemented for Baltic gas systems for non-daily meter data allocation? |

1. Please feel free to share any other ideas and considerations regarding the topics.