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One market, two platforms – does it work? challenges | solutions | outlook
General legal requirements
Article 27 NC CAM

Requirements regarding the allocation of capacity (relevant for assessing the cooperation scenarios):

1. **One IP -> one platform**, Article 27(2)(e) (aim of the provision: shippers only need to register with one platform for booking capacity a given IP)
   - All products
   - Both directions
   - All capacity: bundled and unbundled

2. **Bundling of capacity, Article 27(2)(b) + Chapter IV**

On some IPs the TSOs are still struggling to find an agreement concerning the platform-selection

However some TSOs already found solutions for platform-bordering-IPs
Possible ways out of the dilemma …

**Target:** CAM-NC compliant solution in due time which is cost-efficient and user friendly!

Solutions proposed by Baringa:

- **Platform-tender** organised by the TSOs
- Using **rotating** platforms for undecided IPs as interim solution
- **Interoperability** where all three platforms are able to communicate directly with each other. This is not an easy approach – as a basic level of interoperability may be delivered at a reasonable cost but not deliver much benefit, and a fully interoperable system may be very complex, costly and take a significant amount of time to deliver.

Current proposal of the European Commission

- Amendment of CAM NC?
Case: IP Mosonmagyaróvár

IP between Austria and Hungary
- PRISMA used by Gas Connect Austria (GCA) on Austrian side
- RBP used by FGSZ on Hungarian side

Agreement to follow a joint approach
- Definition of relevant requirements by TSOs (and NRAs)
- GCA will ask for a quote from RBP
- FGSZ will ask for a quote from PRISMA
- Platform selection based on commonly defined set of evaluation criteria
- Cost sharing in order to distribute the burden of double-connection of one TSO with the consent of NRAs could be an option

In the last resort …
- If no agreement is concluded within due time, the decision could be delegated to ACER pursuant to Art 8 (1) ACER Regulation
Conclusion

• Reasonable level of platform interoperability not likely to be a cost efficient solution
  – Complex solution for only a very limited number of IPs/TSOs in Europe
  – Discussions between platform operators for more than a year without concrete results

• Agreeing on a joint platform to be used at an IP
  – Can be discussed bilaterally, including possible cross-border compensation of additional costs
  – Can be implemented rather quickly
  – Article 8 (1) ACER Regulation provides for the possibility that ACER decides in case of no agreement between NRAs regarding the access to cross-border infrastructure
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