

Inclusion of projects in TYNDP 2016

ACER opinion on the TYNDP 2014

Sebastien Lepy
ENTSO-E System Development
Transparency Manager

ENTSO-E Public workshop
25 February 2015, Brussels

ACER released its Opinion on TYNDP 2014 on 29th January

The Opinion is “**positive**”

It acknowledges the improvements made in the TYNDP 2014 compared to the TYNDP 2012:

- ✓ a better involvement of stakeholders especially via the Network development Stakeholders' Group and the inclusion of non-ENTSO-E members projects.
 - + suggesting to better advertise stakeholders' inputs to the TYNDP
- ✓ better clustering of projects with less investments per project on average;
 - + suggesting enhanced clustering for the TYNDP 2016
- ✓ the assessment of project with the CBA standards against 4 long term scenarios;
 - + requiring an additional mid term 'best estimate' scenario for the TYNDP 2016
- ✓ the use of pan-European market studies to ensure the overall consistency of regional analyses.

TYNDP 2014 enhancements following ACER Opinion

The “description of the regional groups coverage” is now “in the main body of the report” (§1)
(and not only in appendix) ✓

The “losses” indicator is a yearly estimate and this is clarified in the appendix 1 ✓
(by mistake the legend of every assessment table didn't show it)

All workshop minutes and material have been uploaded on the website ✓
where they were missing

Recommendations for TYNDP 2016: projects presentation

to streamline the inclusion of projects in the TYNDP 2016 from all project promoters

to publish the list of all project candidates to TYNDP 2016 and why applications have been rejected

to streamline further the project clustering with some clear practical guidance

to publish costs at investment item level

to split projects into 3 time-frames: commissioning expected within 5 years; 6-10 years, >10years

to include a mapping cross-referencing of all projects in the NDPs and TYNDP

Recommendations for TYNDP 2016: scenarios

to continue investigating thoroughly four long term scenarios

to assess all projects also against a mid-term “best estimate” scenario (= by 10 years)

to publish the cross-border reference transfer capacities for every scenario and study year

Recommendations for TYNDP 2016: others

to publish how/which stakeholders feedback is actually accounted for

to further investigate security of supply risks

to be more transparent about the investigated cases as done by RG N Sea in their plan

to demonstrate in which extent appropriate incentives are lacking to build projects when TSOs complain about it