

# EU Tariffs Framework Guidelines – NGG Response



Debra Hawkin



1 November 2012

## Introduction

---

- ACER consultation on Tariff FG closes on 5 Nov.
- Comparison of ACER proposals and GB current regime.
- NGG has input to ENTSOG response – mostly in agreement but response has to cover a wider variety of views.
- This presentation outlines our proposed individual (NGG) response.

## Executive Summary

---

- ACER and NGG believe that Allowed Revenue is out of scope.
- NGG believes that the FG:
  - Lacks clarity on scope and application of Tariffs FG.
  - Needs to consider the whole package:
    - Several options possible but changing any element may require consequential change.
- Could limit scope of harmonisation only to essential elements.
- ACER proposed implementation timeframe (12 months) – ambitious.

## Draft FG: General provisions

---

ACER proposals	Potential issues for the GB regime
Scope: all entry and exit points (some aspects only apply at Interconnection Points “IPs”).	Lack of clarity where each aspect applies.
Implementation: 12 months	Too short - suggest 18-24 months

## Draft FG: Cost Allocation and Reference Price

---

ACER proposals	Potential issues for the GB regime
<p>Allowed Revenue “AR” recovered 50/50 from entry/exit.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>Scope: all entry and exit points (some aspects only apply at IPs).</p>	<p>None – existing GB regime.</p> <p>Agree for AR – but clarity sought on where each aspect applies.</p>
<p>Reference Price – National Regulatory Authority “NRA” approved methodology e.g. distance driver, cover at least fixed costs.</p>	<p>Continue with LRMC<sup>2</sup> methodology - clarity on fixed costs needed.</p> <p>(‘variable costs’ via SO commodity at present.)</p>

1. Deviations possible if justified. Note ENTSOG response differs from NGG since other TSO’s want other than 50/50 as a possibility

2. Clarification on reserve prices sought – note current administered exit charges include an allowed revenue adjustment.

## Draft FG: Flow based charges and storage

---

ACER proposals	Potential issues for the GB regime
<p>Costs mainly driven by flows:</p> <p>May be recovered via flow based charge (e.g. compressor fuel).</p> <p>Levied at TSO level (not applied to specific points).</p>	<p>'variable costs' via SO commodity at present.</p> <p>Need to be careful with commodity charges – note difference between TO commodity for under-recovery due to zero prices and commodity potentially for excess capacity.</p>
<p>Storage entry and exit may have discount.</p>	<p>Only if cost justified – as in SO commodity exemption in GB, or CLNG credit for transmission infrastructure savings.</p>

## Draft FG: Revenue Recovery

ACER proposals	Potential issues for the GB regime
<p>Reference price<sup>1</sup> set to minimise under-/over-recovery</p> <p>Single regulatory account</p> <p>Regulators decide:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ share of under-or over-recovery added to Regulatory Account, and</li> <li>■ frequency of reconciliation</li> </ul>	<p>Multipliers or commodity charges required</p> <p>TO/SO issue. For TO account take care to avoid cross subsidisation.</p> <p>Check ACER assumptions – incentives?</p> <p>Keep annual as now</p>
Option 1 Capacity <i>or</i>	
Option 2 – Capacity and Commodity	Preferred – but clarity sought on ACER intention

1. Does ACER mean reference or reserve price?

## Draft FG: Reserve Price on short-term and non-firm

ACER proposals	Potential issues for the GB regime
<p>Only applies to scope of CAM (i.e. IPs)</p> <p>Short-term reserve price <b>equal to or less than</b> annual product price (i.e. reference price).</p> <p>Seasonal factors may be applied</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- average price to be equal to or less than annual product price but in some seasons may be higher.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Revenue recovery issues with zero/low reserve prices – would need commodity charge which is not desired in Europe and discourages short-term trading.</b></p> <p>Seasonal factors may be helpful if multipliers used particularly for storage.</p>
<p>Multipliers up to 1.5 may apply where significant under-recovery expected.</p>	<p>1.5 is arbitrary.</p>
<p>Interruptible reserve price - Discount to reflect risk of interruption.</p>	<p><b>Agree but may be difficult in practice.</b></p>
<p>Backhaul reserve price - Discount to reflect marginal cost of service.</p>	<p><b>Disagree – same as interruptible.</b></p>



## Draft FG: Virtual IPs, bundled capacity and payable price

ACER proposals	Potential issues for the GB regime
Reserve price set using combination of reserve prices for individual points in the VIP.	Agree – ENTSOG differs – considers there are risks.
Bundled reserve price = entry reserve price + exit reserve price.  Unbundled capacity offered at unbundled reserve price.	Agree  Agree
Auction premium - Shared on basis of agreement between TSOs.  If no agreement, shared equally between TSOs.	Disagree – pro-rata to reserve price.
Payable Price: Reserve price at the time of capacity use + premium in auction when capacity allocated.	Not necessarily.