

E-TRACK Project

Minutes of the 2nd Consultation Workshop

Vienna, 18 May 2006, 10:30-15:30

Participants

Timo Riess	E-Control (Austria)
Herbert Ritter	Austrian Energy Agency (Austria)
Blaz Bratina	Borzen (Slovenia)
Peter Dickinger	BMW (Austria)
Karl Dörler	VKW (Austria)
Michael Heidenreich (excused)	arsenal (Austria)
Wolfgang Jank (excused)	BMLFUW (Austria)
Stefan Kastner (excused)	oekostrom ag (Austria)
Ursula Lackner	E-Control (Austria)
Andreas Lugmaier (excused)	arsenal (Austria)
Peter Nemcek	Borzen (Slovenia)
Borut Rajer	Borzen (Slovenia)
Andrej Spec	Energy Agency of the Republic of Slovenia
Gorazd Skerbinek	Energy Agency of the Republic of Slovenia
Endre Slenker (excused)	Hungarian Energy Office

For all agenda items, see the PowerPoint-Presentations in the annex of these minutes.

1 Background and objectives of the project and findings from WP1 & WP2

See attached presentation (01)

Issues from the discussion

- Take a look to the Website to be up to date
- Disclosure is the main driver for tracking
- Tracking should facilitate the market
- AIB work on an "international residual mix" (IRM) for Europe
- The preferred tracking system should feature an efficient mechanism for explicit tracking, preferable based on certificates plus residual mix.

2 Recent developments

Austria

- New energy law and eco electricity law is on the way: Introduction of more detailed provisions on disclosure and introduction of GOs for HE-CHP.
- GO-registry was further developed and an interface to EECS (former RECS) was implemented; GOs can now be cross border traded. EECS is the platform for administrating RES-GO, RECs and disclosure certificates. Other types of certificates can now be handled.
- Is it possible to convert a RECs-certificate into a GO? No. A certificate, which has the attribute RECs and GO in the Austrian registry will be also a RECs and GO after transfer. - At the moment GOs gain importance due to legal framework conditions and RECs loose importance.

It is planned to integrate the RECs-database into the Austrian GO-registry in the near future and to harmonise the systems.

- Disclosure report was published, analysing the Austrian system; main finding: more the 90% of information used for disclosure is based on GOs or certificates, 90% of the GOs and 30% of other certificates are issued electronically. (http://www.e-control.at/portal/page/portal/ECONTROL_HOME/OKO/DOWNLOADS/BERICHTE/Stromkennzeichnung)
- Reference values for separate production of heat and power will be published soon.

Slovenia

- New legislation for REGOs, GOs for HE-CHP, GOs for co-firing plants is in place; electronic issuing is possible (voluntarily); usage of registry is mandatory and Borzen operates the registry.
- Registry information is used for disclosure (when used, they are redeemed); all other sources are tracked based on contracts.
- Usage of exchange mix, country mix or UCTE in principle possible for electricity not tracked (if applicable).
- Disclosure inclusive CO₂-emissions and nuclear waste is legally implemented: national figures will be defined for CO₂-emissions and nuclear waste.

3 Evaluation criteria for tracking options

See attached presentation (02)

Issues from the discussion

- The “feasibility” criteria includes/considers costs .
- For the cost assessment we take in consideration actual cost of different existing systems (ETS, RECS, etc)
- Discussion on the depth of tracked information: Is it sufficient to limit the fuel source information to 3 categories (renewables, fossil, nuclear) or do you need a full list of all type of fuel sources (PV, solid biomass, small hydro, big hydro, etc).
- Attribute “national origin” might be important, to serve regional market demand.
- The conversion of contract based attributes into GO based attributes should be possible, also bilaterally, e.g. from Germany to Austria.
- Confusion on supplier and product mix. Is product information more important than supplier mix information to the final consumer?
- What happens with the project results? Who uses this results, when national schemes are already in place?

4 Tracking options (3 generic options, Draft recommendation)

See attached presentation (03)

Issues from the discussion

- The criteria “flexibility” should be defined in more detail.
- You do not need a residual mix if you force all suppliers to provide the corresponding amount of certificates.

- Flexibility of the system is not that relevant, if the tracking system covers all requirements.
- Timing is important: Calculation IRM takes time (several months) and might cause delays for disclosure.
- Is it necessary to harmonise the disclosure period within the E-Track-bubble? Calendar year seems to be reasonable due to comparability of disclosure information and in order to have a same/harmonised calculation basis.
- How have the thresholds been decided upon? 2 points for both axes are reasonable, but explanation is necessary.
- Option A seems to be a dead end. – No potential to develop towards option C.
- Option B has good potential to develop towards option C.
- “Feasibility” and “flexibility” may be different for different market players
- A control mechanism is needed if the electronic central registry is voluntary and other certificates are allowed in order to avoid double issuing.
- How to handle HE-CHP and normal CHPs with regard to tracking? Coexistence of GO for HE-CHP and REGOs has to be regulated.
- What will be delivered as output of the project? Option C seems to be the “perfect” option in the long run (E-Track vision) and must be highlighted in the final report.

5 Cost drivers of tracking systems

See attached presentation (04)

6 Outlook on the upcoming work in E-Track, Next consultation workshop

See attached presentation (05)