Bringing market guidelines in the Energy Community
Agenda

I. Re-cap

II. Response to last meeting
General

- **Standard adaptations**
  - EC → ECS | ACER → ECRB | MS → CP
- **ad-hoc adaptations**
- **Implementation in one step**
- **Implementation deadlines**
- **Reciprocity relevant**
  - Title III
  - Alternative Title IV
Geographic scope
Methodologies

All TSOs / (NEMOs) & All NRAs

European terms & conditions / methodologies / platforms

Transfer through PHLG decision applicable on Title III (CP-CP, CP-MS)

Relevant TSOs / (NEMOs) & NRAs

Regional (CCR) terms & conditions / methodologies / platforms

Developed on regional level and applicable on Title III (CP-CP, CP-MS)

Example of a region

Relevant TSOs / (NEMOs) & NRAs

National (CCR) terms & conditions / methodologies / platforms

National implementation applicable on CPs

Example of a region
Questions

1. Voting examples
2. Role of ACER vs. ECRB
   - Voting role of Title III MS in ECRB
3. Representation of Title III MS in MC voting
Agreeing on methodologies: Voting

**European methodologies:**
- Qualified majority
  55% of MS + 65% of population of the EU

**Regional methodologies:**
- Qualified majority of the region
  72% of MS + 65% of population of the region

Region <5: consensus

**European methodologies:**
- Unchanged taken as part of EU acquis, applicable under PHLG decision requiring national transposition in CPs

**Regional methodologies:**
- Qualified majority of the region
  2/3 of the CPs/MSs of the region

Region <3: consensus
Voting

- 2/3
  - CCR SEE: min 8 out of 12 without IT-ME 7 out of 11
  - CCR Burstyn: min 3 out of 4
  - CCR UA/MD/PL: min 2 out of 3
- 72% of countries + 65% of population of the region
  - CCR SEE: min 9 out of 12 parties without IT-ME 8 out of 11 – equal voting powers
  - CCR Burstyn: min 3 out of 4 countries
  - CCR UA/MD/PL: min 2 out of 3 - UA+PL vs MD
1. Voting examples

2. Role of ACER vs. ECRB
   - Voting role of Title III MS in ECRB

3. Representation of Title III MS in MC voting