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RBP Value Proposition

Affordable
From €48k/year

Performant
No auction / network point limit

Fast-adapting
New functions in 1-2 months
RBP Fast Facts

• Live operations since 10 December 2014 (RO-HU IP)
• At the moment, 5 TSOs use RBP from 4 countries - strong CEE/SEE coverage
  • Romania: Transgaz
  • Croatia: Plinacro
  • Slovakia: eustream
  • Hungary: FGSZ, MGT
  • Further TSOs in 2016
• RBP conducted the most CAM NC type capacity auctions among the existing platforms according to the platform’s publicly available data
  • 1 million capacity auctions surpassed on 1 March 2016
  • Performance designed to support the whole European capacity market
FGSZ is not only a TSO but a multi-platform operator

**Regional Booking Platform**
- Joint CAM NC capacity booking platform
- Primary capacity sales
- Secondary capacity trade

**Informatic Platform**
- Capacity and contract management
- Nominations and gas management
- Country specific services

**Trading Platform**
- Cleared, anonymous marketplace of BAL NC STSPs and
- Secondary capacity exchange

IT solution

Main functions

Underlying network code
2. What is the EC Target Model?
4.2.2 Improved wholesale market efficiency

**Current development state of Contracting Parties’ national wholesale markets**

At the moment, all Contracting Parties have national markets separated, with distinct price and national balancing zones. As a consequence, market participants willing to be active in more than one national market are facing various barriers, such as:

- **Operational barriers**: separated and different market mechanisms for nomination and capacity booking at interconnection points, separate balancing in every market, separate registration and licensing requirements in every market, deposit of securities to different operators, etc.
- **Commercial barriers**: contractual bottlenecks and capacity tariffs for transport of gas between markets which limit price alignment between the separated markets


---

**These were (are) not only the Contracting Parties’ issues**

How can you most efficiently lift these barriers?

...without problems where there are no operational and commercial barriers...

...subject to the supportive legislative environment...

...which requires a tremendous effort to create
Three Crucial Considerations

RBP Design Principles

CAM NC  CEE and SEE Regional Specificities  Business Requirements

1. Multi-language
2. Multi-currency
3. Licensing
4. Varying IT background of TSOs and network users

1. Multi-purpose solution
2. Easily understandable and usable („plug-and-play”)
3. Highest security standards
4. Performance & function scalability

Refurbished New IT solution

Years of legislative preparation with NRAs
## Design (CAM NC)-Baringa Assessment of RBP as of 19 August 2015

The platform receives an unweighted score from 0 to 4 based on the four aspects stated below.

### NC core and associated requirements
- In compliance with the criteria - 1 point
- Available in the live environment - 1 point
- Fully documented - 1 point
- Tested / demoed during this study - 1 point

### Enabling IT and user friendliness requirements
- In compliance with the criteria - 1 point
- Considerations - 1 point
- Available in the live environment - 1 point
- Maturity of implementation - 1 point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Unweighted</th>
<th>Weighted</th>
<th>RBP</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NC core requirements</td>
<td>Allocation of firm capacity</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Full compliance with CAM NC firm capacity allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocation of interruptible capacity</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Full compliance with CAM NC interruptible capacity allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bundling of capacity products</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Full compliance with CAM NC:1 capacity bundling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ascending clock auctions (yearly, quarterly, monthly)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Full compliance with CAM NC ascending clock auctions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uniform price auctions (day-ahead, within-day)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Compliance - live; no day-ahead or within-day auctions run yet in live environment**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Day-ahead bid roll over</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Function documented, to be implemented by November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support of kWh/h and kWh/d as capacity unit</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Partial compliance; TSOs do have access to function; kWh/d to be implemented by November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary capacity trading</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Partial compliance; OTC available in RBP, other secondary capacity on Trading Platform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Automated bidding</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Full compliance with automated bidding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting of platform transactions (bidders and public)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Full compliance with reporting platform transactions and auction results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bundling of capacity in 1:n situations</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No current plans to implement 1:n bundling***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Offer of competing capacity products</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No current plans to implement competing capacity products****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NC ass. req.</td>
<td>Surrender of capacity</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Function documented, to be implemented by November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buyback of capacity</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Function documented, to be implemented by November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>REMIT data reporting obligations</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Function documented, to be implemented by November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Enabling IT</td>
<td>Authorisation level management</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Full control over the management of user authorisation and access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Network point display and administration</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Full control over the management of network points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secure platform access for network users</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Secure access for both TSO and shipper users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peak service load</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>High capacity, high availability infrastructure – average load 1%, testing peak 6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Financial) insurance taken up to cover disruptions</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Platform specific insurance (€1-1.5m in place, FGSZ cover other losses via Hungarian Civil Code)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Data backup and security</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Platform specific data backup processes and security standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuing development (EU / national regulations)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Planned and documented development milestones for future capability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shipper and user registration on the platform</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Clear registration processes for TSOs and shippers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graphical user interface of the platform</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clear and easy to use GUI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Options for connection to the platform</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Clear registration processes for TSOs and shippers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>TSO and shipper automated communication</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>SOAP and Edigas* protocols in use and documented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>User friendliness</td>
<td>Multi-currency booking</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multi-currency supported though no conversion (or exchange rates data) within platform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Credit limit check</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Basic credit limit function in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost reflective fees</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alignment of fees to costs: see further slides on ‘Charging structures’ and ‘Governance’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost transparency for TSOs</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Transparency of charging structure: see further slides on ‘Charging structures’ and ‘Governance’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fast Adaptation - FGSZ Assessment of RBP as of 11 March 2016

The platform receives an unweighted score from 0 to 4 based on the four aspects stated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NC core and associated requirements</th>
<th>Enabling IT and user friendliness requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In compliance with the criteria – 1 point</td>
<td>In compliance with the platform specific criteria – 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully documented – 1 point</td>
<td>Platform specific considerations – 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available in the live study – 1 point</td>
<td>Available in the live Maturity of implementation environment – 1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Unweighted</th>
<th>Weighted</th>
<th>RBP</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NC core requirements</td>
<td>Allocation of firm capacity</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Full compliance with CAM NC firm capacity allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Allocation of interruptible capacity</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Full compliance with CAM NC interruptible capacity allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bundling of capacity products</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Full compliance with CAM NC 1:1 capacity bundling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ascending clock auctions (yearly, quarterly, monthly)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Full compliance with CAM NC ascending clock auctions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Uniform price auctions (day-ahead, within-day)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Full compliance with CAM NC uniform price auctions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Day-ahead bid roll over</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Function implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Support of kWh/h and kWh/d as capacity unit</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Full compliance with support of kWh/h and kWh/d as capacity unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Secondary capacity trading</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>OTC available, anonymous sec. capacity exchange on Trading Platform, same in RBP Q2 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Automated bidding</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Full compliance with automated bidding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reporting of platform transactions (bidders and public)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Full compliance with reporting platform transactions and auction results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bundling of capacity in 1:n situations</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>In development environment, going live in Q2 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Offer of competing capacity products</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>In development environment, going live in Q2 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NC ass. req.</td>
<td>Surrender of capacity</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Function implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Buyback of capacity</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Function implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>REMIT data reporting obligations</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Function implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Enabling IT</td>
<td>Authorisation level management</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Full control over the management of user authorisation and access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Network point display and administration</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Full control over the management of network points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Secure platform access for network users</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Secure access for both TSO and shipper users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Peak service load</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>High capacity, high availability infrastructure – average load 1%, testing peak 6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>(Financial) insurances taken up to cover disruptions</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Platform specific insurance (€1-1.5m) in place, FGSZ cover other losses via Hungarian Civil Code.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Data backup and security</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Platform specific data backup processes and security standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Continuing development (EU / national regulations)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Planned and documented development milestones for future capability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Shipper and user registration on the platform</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Clear registration processes for TSOs and shippers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Graphical user interface of the platform</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Clear and easy to use GUI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Options for connection to the platform</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>GUI, SOAP and Edigas connection to platform available for users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>TSO and shipper automated communication</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>SOAP and Edigas protocols in use and documented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>User friendliness</td>
<td>Multi-currency booking</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multi-currency supported though no conversion (or exchange rates data, excl. REMIT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Credit limit check</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>In place with the correspondent interface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Cost reflective fees</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alignment of fees to costs: see further slides on ‘Charging structures’ and ‘Governance’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cost transparency for TSOs</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Transparency of charging structures: see further slides on ‘Charging structures’ and ‘Governance’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improvements
3. How do you want to Achieve the EC Target Model?
Is Implementation Ready to Go?

4.2.2 Improved wholesale market efficiency

Current development state of Contracting Parties’ national wholesale markets

At the moment, all Contracting Parties have national markets separated, with distinct price and national balancing zones. As a consequence, market participants willing to be active in more than one national market are facing various barriers, such as:

- **Operational barriers**: separated and different market mechanisms for nomination and capacity booking at interconnection points, separate balancing in every market, separate registration and licensing requirements in every market, deposit of securities to different operators, etc.

- **Commercial barriers**: contractual bottlenecks and capacity tariffs for transport of gas between markets which limit price alignment between the separated markets.


*IT can facilitate market integration but cannot overcome legal barriers*
# RBP Implementation (Practical Experience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Estimated duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Letter of Intent to join RBP</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Review of the TSO Membership Agreement by TSO</td>
<td>1-2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Review of additional requirements</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Finalisation of the TMA</td>
<td>1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>Signature of the TMA</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Acquiring digital certificates from third party provider</td>
<td>1-3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>TSO training</td>
<td>1-2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Network user training</td>
<td>1-2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>Manual connection</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Automated connection</td>
<td>1-2 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items 1, 2a-d, 3, 4a-b and 5a-b can proceed in parallel, therefore a connection to RBP can be implemented in 2 months, including the legal and IT (server-server link) workstreams.
The fastest connection to RBP happened in 2 days
Connection Options

- Both for TSOs and network users
- Manual:
  - Graphic user interface
  - Excel upload / download (for bulk data)
- Automated:
  - edig@s 5.1 interface (xml) format, via SOAP protocol
  - RBP’s own interface (xml) format, via SOAP protocol
  - From Q2 2016, both interface formats could be used via AS4 channel as well
  - The legacy protocol of AS2 is not supported
Fast Change Request Management

• The basis of the development is the Annual Development Plan
  • RBP Operator prepares it based on the input of the TSO Members
  • Extraordinary (out of the ADP) development is also possible
  • ADP translated into the Technical Content of the Development Contract
• Change request handling
  • Initiator to RBP Operator: Change request form
  • RBP Operator to initiator: feasibility study
• Following of the legislative environment
  • European legislation automatically implemented (no RBP fee increase)
  • National requirements or additional TSO / NU business requirements only if the beneficiary bears the associated costs ➔ the beneficiary(ies) decide only
• Speed of developing the requested new functions:
  • Typically 4-6 weeks in case of smaller function development
    • Most RBP TSO requests have been like this so far
  • Major developments in quarterly cycles („milestones“)
4. You need Partners to Cooperate with
Can you solve these issues alone?

4.2.2 Improved wholesale market efficiency

Current development state of Contracting Parties’ national wholesale markets

At the moment, all Contracting Parties have national markets separated, with distinct price and national balancing zones. As a consequence, market participants willing to be active in more than one national market are facing various barriers, such as:

- **operational barriers**: separated and different market mechanisms for nomination and capacity booking at interconnection points, separate balancing in every market, separate registration and licensing requirements in every market, deposit of securities to different operators, etc.

- **commercial barriers**: contractual bottlenecks and capacity tariffs for transport of gas between markets which limit price alignment between the separated markets


All these parties have to cooperate...

- Ministries
- NRAs
- TSOs
- International organisations (EC, ACER, ENTSOG etc.)
- Network users
RBP Governance
Contractual Model of RBP
Contractual Model of RBP

- **Operational Rules**: describes the working of the RBP for the TSOs, RBP Operator and the Network Users
- **Network User Membership Agreement**: the agreement between the RBP Operator and the network users to use the services of RBP
- **TSO Membership Agreement**: the agreement between the RBP Operator and the network users to use the services of RBP
- **Cooperation Agreement**: the agreement between TSOs offering bundled capacities (optional)
- For the Operational Rules and NUMA please visit [https://rbp.eu](https://rbp.eu)
How about a Joint Venture?

- According to CAM NC Art. 27.1., TSOs can operate booking platforms
  - Themselves, or
  - via an agreed party
- History: FGSZ did not have a legacy booking platform operator company
- RBP Operator Joint Venture:
  - Findings of the joint venture study by FGSZ and Transgaz:
    - Overhead costs would increase the operational costs compared to the current situation ca. 40%, mainly due to
      - Corporate costs attributed to the legal entity
      - Management and additional staff costs
      - Higher OPEX
    - For current RBP TSOs, this was not a business case
- FGSZ is open to operate RBP in a joint venture provided that the interested company / companies contribute to the corporate costs
5. RBP Fees
(this is not an official commercial offer)
RBP Fees

RBP Core Services = the minimum set of CAM NC criteria

• Equally priced for all TSOs per contracted year (EUR 48,000)
• Includes:
  • Auctions for firm / interruptible, bundled / unbundled capacity products,
  • Ascending clock auctions (Y, Q, M), uniform price auctions (D, WD),
  • Support of kWh/h and kWh/d as capacity unit,
  • Secondary capacity trading (OTC),
  • Automated bidding,
  • Electronic contracting (as per Directive 2000/31/EC),
  • Reporting of platform transactions (for bidders and public),
  • REMIT data reporting obligations,
  • Surrender of capacity,
  • Multi-currency booking,
  • Credit limit check,
  • Shipper and user registration on the platform,
  • Authorisation level management,
  • Training at the TSO’s site
  • Incremental capacity auctions
**RBP Fees**

**RBP Additional Services** = Additional services which are not required by all TSOs

- Each additional service is equally priced for all TSOs using the given service per contracted year
- Include among others:
  - Allocation of domestic network points
  - Secondary capacity trading (anonymous)
  - Balancing group assignment,
  - RBP in (any) national language,
  - Customised auction result confirmations and email alerts,
  - Bundling of capacity in 1:n situations,
  - Offer of competing capacity products,
  - Buyback of capacity (OSBB)
So what are the Three Secrets?
The Three Secrets

1. You need to know what you want. Without a clear vision (target model) it is hard to implement anything
   • RBP: to implement and promote e-commerce in a new model of capacity allocation

2. You need continuous commitment to make the necessary steps towards your goals
   • RBP: existing (non-supportive) conditions can be challenged and changed

3. You need to cooperate to implement your vision
   • RBP: the cooperation and dialogue with NRAs, TSOs and network users enabled the success of RBP in the cross-border markets
Thank you for your kind attention!

For further information contact:
Balázs Tatár (btatar@fgsz.hu or +3670-938-7932)
or
rbp@fgsz.hu

Please visit the RBP Portal: https://rbp.eu/