

## *MINUTES for external meeting*

### **Meeting TYNDP/CBA 2015 SJWS #2**

**18 February 2014, from 10:30 to 17:00**

**At ENTSGO Offices, Brussels**

Surname	Name	Company
Adam	Balogh	ENTSGO
Adam	Kondaszewski	Ministry of Economy of Poland
Adela	Comanita	ENTSGO
Andra	Jesinska	Latvijas Gaze
Alexandra	Meli	Enemalta Corporation
Andrea	Pompa	Edison Spa
Andrea	Nobili	Edison Stoccaggio
Carmen	Rodriguez	ENTSGO
Carola	Millgramm	E-Control

Cosimo	Avesani	EDISON
Florijana	Djedovic	Plinacro
Giuliano	Basso	Energy Solutions
Heikki	Lehtimaki	Plan Energy Ltd
Josselin	Schneider	GDF SUEZ INFRASTRUCTURES
Karoline	Entacher	E-Control
Marco	Gazzola	Snam S.p.A.
Maria Cristina	Barassi Sabelli	Edison spa
Marija	Marot	Plinovodi d.o.o.
Marion	Nikodym	GIE
Marion	Le Roy	Eurogas
Mark	Johnston	European Policy Centre
Nathalie	Cale	GRTgaz
Olivier	Lebois	ENTSOG

René	Döring	ENTSOG
Rosj	Camarda	Edison
Sébastien	Doligé	Eurelectric
Simon	Scicluna	Ministry for Energy and the Conservation of Water
Stefano	Astorri	Snam
Agata	Przadra	European Biogas Association
Valeria	Palmisano	EDISON
Vladimir	Durovic	Plinacro
Volker	Schippers	Open Grid Europe
Vytautas	Ruolia	AB Amber Grid
Björn	Thiele	Bayernets Gmbh
Tomon	Petricek	Plinovodi
Piet	Nienhuis	GTS
Jaques	Rottemberg	ELENGY

Aivar	Ritson	AS EG Vorgaturm
Nikos	Katsis	DESFA
Gregroy	Biet	TIGF
Chris	Thackeray	ENTSOE

## Main inputs from stakeholders

In italic are mentioned the comments made by ENTSG during the session. Such comments do not represent any form of acceptance or rejection of stakeholders' input.

### 1. Demand scenarios

- > The demand case labelled as Uniform risk, implying the high daily demand with an occurrence of 1-in-20 years could not be considered in next edition. The reason to do so would be the small difference of this case from the demand case labelled as Design case (3% in the scenarios of TYDNP 2013).

*Maintaining the Uniform risk was not requested or defended by any stakeholders.*

- > Peak Simultaneity: Until now the European peak demand has been defined with 100% simultaneity that is all the countries in Europe reaching the peak demand on the same day. The assessment of the simultaneities of the past four winters shows the simultaneity of the peak demands oscillating between 94% and 97%. Nevertheless, a mitigation of the peak demand to cover lack of simultaneity is requested in ACER's opinion.

Based on the evidence of the high levels of simultaneity in the peak demand, and considering the existence of infinite possibilities to share any potential demand mitigation between the different balancing zones ENTSG proposes to keep the peak demand under total simultaneity for the infrastructure assessment.

*Applying a diminution of peak demand to consider lack of simultaneity was not requested or defended by any stakeholders.*

### 2. Supply scenarios

- > *Algerian supply: Does the scenarios distinguish between Algerian pipe exports and Algerian exports as LNG?*

The scenarios for Algerian imports only refer to the pipe imports. The Algerian imports as LNG will be considered within the LNG scenarios.

That also applies to the other sources: Norwegian, Russian, and Libyan imports refer to pipe imports, while disregarding the LNG imports from these sources that will be covered within the LNG scenarios.

- > *The lower potential scenario for Russian imports presented is driven by the achievement of*

*the environmental targets. Why is not a similar reasoning applied for the other sources?*

The potential supply scenarios are defined independently from the demand scenario. The supply mix/es covering the demand will come out of the modelling and the application of certain supply constraints.

In the case of the scenarios for Russian imports, ENTSG propose the introduction of this lower import scenario in order to define a wide range of potential supply scenarios. The potential supply scenarios (for every source) are coming from literature. There is no scenarios equivalent to the lower scenario for Russia for the other sources, as this scenario comes from a report regarding the Russian exports.

> *Why not using directly exporting scenarios from the WEO?*

WEO includes projections for the gas consumption and in some cases production. Coming out of this balance the total exports of the country could be calculated. Nevertheless, the potential import scenarios for Europe refer only to the part of the exports of one country that are destined to Europe.

> *Linking the scenarios to the capacities contracted?*

When referring to transmission capacities contracted, the long term capacities contracted are not representative.

When referring to contracted volumes, ENTSG does not have access to such information.

> *Are the scenarios for domestic production of biogas or shale gas used in the modelling?*

Biogas and shale gas are already factored in the network model.

> *Are the scenarios considering new constraints in the production of Netherlands?*

The scenario for National production in the Netherlands will be provided by GTS and include the most updated production forecasts.

> *More detail on the sources is necessary: instead of quoting the source how the figures are derived from the source should be shown.*

> *Even when not used, the collection of more scenarios on Russian supplies to compare the potential supply scenarios would be valuable.*

### 3. Other data

#### Price scenarios

- > *For the application of the CBA and CBCA, the price scenarios should be based in actual prices. A source for actual prices could be the DGENER quarterly report.*

The price scenario will refer to the next 20 years. Even when the prices used are “actual” prices, the probability of them remaining the same on the long term is quite low. From this point of view, it could be more important that the scenarios for prices are transparent, and that every project promotor uses the same set of price scenarios.

#### Social discount rate

- > In the CBA methodology published in November, ENTSOG proposes the use of a social discount rate of 4.5%. Nevertheless the social discount rates used in CBA (literature) ranges between 3.5% and 5.5%.  
*A Social discount rate of 4% is preferred by the stakeholders.*