

ACER consultation on ENTSO-E common harmonisation proposal for balancing implementation frameworks

A Eurelectric consultation response paper

Eurelectric represents the interests of the electricity industry in Europe. Our work covers all major issues affecting our sector. Our members represent the electricity industry in over 30 European countries.

We cover the entire industry from electricity generation and markets to distribution networks and customer issues. We also have affiliates active on several other continents and business associates from a wide variety of sectors with a direct interest in the electricity industry.

We stand for

The vision of the European power sector is to enable and sustain:

- A vibrant competitive European economy, reliably powered by clean, carbon-neutral energy
- A smart, energy efficient and truly sustainable society for all citizens of Europe

We are committed to lead a cost-effective energy transition by:

investing in clean power generation and transition-enabling solutions, to reduce emissions and actively pursue efforts to become carbon-neutral well before mid-century, taking into account different starting points and commercial availability of key transition technologies;

transforming the energy system to make it more responsive, resilient and efficient. This includes increased use of renewable energy, digitalisation, demand side response and reinforcement of grids so they can function as platforms and enablers for customers, cities and communities;

accelerating the energy transition in other economic sectors by offering competitive electricity as a transformation tool for transport, heating and industry;

embedding sustainability in all parts of our value chain and take measures to support the transformation of existing assets towards a zero carbon society;

innovating to discover the cutting-edge business models and develop the breakthrough technologies that are indispensable to allow our industry to lead this transition.

Dépôt légal: D/2026/12.105/14

Harmonisation of balancing implementation frameworks

A Eurelectric consultation response

February 2026

KEY MESSAGES

- **The introduction of the PICASSO and MARI platforms** for the exchange of standard balancing energy products is progressively widening the pool of Balancing Service Providers (BSP) on which TSOs can rely to keep the electricity grid in balance.
- **To further increase the liquidity on these balancing platforms, while preserving a level playing field at EU level, Eurelectric supports a more agile and harmonised set of rules** for the prequalification of BSPs and Reserve Providing Units and Groups (RPU/RPGs) under their control. Such framework should apply equally to all market participants, regardless of their size.
- **Eurelectric welcomes ENTSO-E's initiative to align national prequalification rules further** and supports measures designed to shorten the prequalification process and reduce access barriers to national balancing markets.
- **However, repeated references to national Terms & Conditions in the current Common Harmonisation Proposal continue to create the potential for diverging TSO practices.** This carries the risk that BSPs competing across borders are subject to different requirements, **undermining the level playing field.**
- Eurelectric therefore calls on TSOs to conduct a **comparative assessment of prequalification and ex-post verification practices across Europe.** Based on this assessment, the development of principles at EU level should be expedited **to ensure that RPUs and RPGs across the Union meet the same standards of reliability and quality**, thereby guaranteeing the equivalent quality of standard balancing products.
- Our proposals reflect Eurelectric's commitment to an efficient and fair framework for balancing energy products:
 1. **Harmonisation cycles:** a comparative assessment of TSO practices leading to the **harmonisation of substantial prequalification requirements** is a precondition for Eurelectric to accept moving to a biannual survey cycle.
 2. **Simplification of pre-qualification requirements:** beyond our proposal for shorter prequalification timelines, a simplified prequalification procedure should be envisaged when BSPs prequalify RPUs/RPGs of the same technology as RPUs they have already prequalified, subject to equal treatment for all BSPs.

3. **Ex-post verification:** access conditions and substantial requirements of the ex-post verification process need to follow harmonised principles at EU level to ensure that the activations of RPUs/RPGs are representative of their genuine market activity. ACER and TSOs should consult stakeholders on principles for e.g., the minimum number of activations and the quality of activations based on the abovementioned comparative assessment.
4. **BSP switching:** we broadly agree to the conditions for BSP switching in the same LFC. However, Art. 8(1)(c) should be strengthened to clarify that the BSP taking over an RPU or RPG already operates an RPU or RPG with an identical technology. The transfer of the prequalification status should further be understood as a full transfer without any change to the assets' technical or functional scope.
5. **Re-prequalification:** requirements for re-prequalification should be precise, proportionate and limited to detected issues or identified changes. In addition, like other qualification processes, TSOs discretion in defining additional triggers should be restricted.

Consultation Topics and Questions

Topic 1: Frequency of stakeholder survey

According to Article 20(2)(a) of the mFRR IF and aFRR IF, the stakeholder survey to identify a shortlist of prioritised harmonisation needs should be organised every year. In Article 20(2)(a) of the Proposals, the TSOs propose that a stakeholder survey should be organised every three years.

ACER considers that conducting the stakeholder survey every three years could result in delays in the further harmonisation process. Therefore, ACER intends to revise Article 20 of the Proposals in order to reduce the interval of the stakeholder survey from every three years to every two years. This approach would reduce the time gap between the identification of the stakeholder needs and thereby improving responsiveness and efficiency in the harmonisation process.

1.1 Do you agree with ACER's proposed modification to reduce the frequency of the stakeholder survey to every two years?

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Partially agree
- ☒ Partially disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ No opinion

1.2 Please provide an explanation for your answer above.
1000 character(s) maximum

Harmonised legal requirements towards Balancing Service Providers and regarding the nature and standards of balancing energy products are a precondition to achieve a level playing field on European balancing platforms. Considering the wide-ranging opportunities to harmonise prequalification and ex-post verification requirements, a comparative assessment of prequalification and ex-post requirements across Member States is a necessary first step. Without it, the equivalent quality of balancing services cannot be assured.

Provided that a comparative assessment is conducted and technical requirements for prequalification and ex-post verification are harmonised accordingly, Eurelectric can accept moving to a biannual survey cycle. This approach needs to ensure that identified harmonisation opportunities are not pushed back indefinitely but bundled and prioritised in discussion with market participants.

Topic 2: Proportionality of the prequalification process

The prequalification was originally designed for large generation units, where the process, although time-consuming and complex, had a relatively limited impact due to their size and available resources. However, today the system is more decentralised, with many smaller units participating in the market. For these smaller units, applying the same prequalification process becomes disproportionately burdensome and costly. Therefore, applying the exact same prequalification framework may no longer fit today's reality. At the same time, cross-border exchange of balancing products is increasing due to the development of more integrated European balancing markets. This further reinforces the need for a level playing field for BSPs across Member States to avoid BSPs in one country undergo a more complex prequalification process than BSPs in

another country, while they are providing the exact same product.

Therefore, ACER believes it is important to ensure a simplified and streamlined process for all units but in particular for small, identical or standardised units with requirements and conditions that are proportionate with the real impact these units may cause on the system security and network operation in case of non-delivery.

2.1 Do you agree that the prequalification process proposed by TSOs is sufficiently proportionate and inclusive for all types of market participants?

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Partially agree
- ☒ Partially disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ No opinion

2.2 Please provide an explanation for your answer above.

1000 character(s) maximum

While we agree on the need to explore the feasibility of streamlined PQ procedures, any such measure needs to ensure technology neutrality and preserve a level playing field between BSPs.

The multiplication of small units in the electricity system represents a significant volume on balancing markets. Their failure to deliver balancing services has the potential to significantly affect system security and network operations. Therefore, a robust qualification process remains essential to ensuring safety and fairness. In this context, we recall that ex-post verification, contrary to PQ, does not include FRR activation under stressed system conditions or validate the asset's endurance performance. It also allows subsequent qualification of RPU/RPGs with higher capacity without full proof that the asset meets applicable standards.

For this reason, streamlined prequalification should strictly be:

- Conditional on previous successful prequalification by the BSP of RPU/RPGs of the same technology,
- Available to all units and MPs, regardless of their size.

Topic 3: Level of harmonisation

ACER observes that the Proposals still contain several Articles that refer to national terms and conditions for the specification of certain requirements. These include the conditions for performing ex-post verification under Article 6 of the Annexes of the Proposals, certain application submission requirements under Article 7 of the Annexes of the Proposals, conditions for switching RPU from one BSP to another while retaining their prequalification status under Article 8 of the Annexes of the Proposals, as well as conditions related to re- prequalification and termination processes under Articles 9, 10, and 11 of the Annexes of the Proposals.

ACER considers that the overall objective of the Proposals to amend the FRR IFs should be to harmonise prequalification and ex-post verification processes across Member States, thereby, among other objectives, creating a level playing field for all BSPs and contributing to the achievement of the objectives of the Electricity Regulation.

3.1. Do you agree that the current level of harmonisation in the Proposals fulfils the requirements for harmonising FRR prequalification and ex-post verification processes in order to provide a level playing field for all BSPs across Member States in an integrated European balancing market?

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Partially agree
- ☐ Partially disagree
- ☒ Fully disagree
- ☐ No opinion

3.2 Please provide an explanation for your answer above.

1000 character(s) maximum

The current harmonisation proposal for FRR prequalification falls short of achieving a level playing field on European balancing platforms. While the proposal introduces a unified process structure and timeline for BSP prequalification, it leaves technical asset requirements to national T&Cs, which are unharmonised by definition.

If progress is made on the harmonisation of technical asset requirements, the EU can move closer to a common measure of the quality of standard balancing energy products, thereby achieving a level playing field between BSPs.

We therefore suggest, as a first step, to conduct a comparative assessment of prequalification and ex-post verification practices across Europe and to evaluate the potential for further harmonisation. Such assessment should result in a roadmap towards the alignment of technical prequalification and ex-post verification requirements, including during the ramping up/down periods, to ensure that they follow harmonised principles ensuring an equivalent quality of standard balancing energy products.

Topic 4: FRR prequalification process

In Article 5(2) of the Annexes of the Proposals, the timeline for the FRR prequalification process proposed by the TSOs is based on the maximum permissible durations established under Article 159 of the SO Regulation; according to Article 159(3) of the SO Regulation: "...Within 8 weeks from receipt of the application, the reserve connecting TSO or the designated TSO shall confirm whether the application is complete. Where the reserve connecting TSO or the designated TSO considers that the application is incomplete they shall request additional information and the potential FRR provider shall submit the additional required information within 4 weeks from the receipt of the request..", and according to Article 159(4) of the SO Regulation "Within 3 months after the reserve connecting TSO or the designated TSO confirms that the application is complete, the reserve connecting TSO or the designated TSO shall evaluate the information provided and decide whether the potential FRR providing units or FRR providing groups meet the criteria for a FRR prequalification. The reserve connecting TSO or the designated TSO shall notify their decision to the potential FRR provider."

According to Article 5(2)(b) of the Annexes of the Proposals, the timeline for the "Confirmation of application" should be complete within four weeks of its submission, however, in exceptional cases, the reserve connecting TSO may extend the confirmation process up to a maximum of eight weeks in accordance with Article 159 of the SO Regulation.

According to Article 5(2)(b) of the Annexes of the Proposals, the timeline for the technical evaluation is within three months after the reserve connecting TSO confirms the completion of the application. According to Article 5(4) of the Annexes of the Proposals, in the event of a negative result of the technical evaluation, the reserve connecting TSO may grant an extension to the BSP to repeat the activation test. The BSP shall submit the requested supplementary information or perform the repeated activation test

requested within four weeks. The reserve connecting TSO shall assess the supplementary information or/and the requested activation test within four weeks following its receipt.

According to Article 5(3) of the Annexes of the Proposals, if there are missing information provided under any of the prequalification steps, or the provided information is rejected by the reserve connecting TSO, the BSP is required to submit additional or corrected information within four weeks in accordance with Article 159(3) of the SO Regulation and the reserve connecting TSO shall assess within four weeks the updated application.

Finally, according to Article 5(4) of the Annexes of the Proposals, the total duration of the prequalification process shall not exceed nine months from the date of submission of the FRR prequalification application.

While these deadlines reflect the upper limits allowed by the Regulation, ACER considers the proposed timeline to be too long, with the potential to adversely affect the business case for prospective BSPs, in particular when aggregating small, identical or standardised units that may face greater and unnecessary administrative and financial burdens during prequalification. With the increasing participation of smaller and decentralised units in the market, applying the same prequalification process as used for large generation units can be more burdensome, particularly given their limited size and capacity.

ACER observes that some TSOs have already implemented shorter intermediate deadlines¹. In cases where a BSP can demonstrate that all units exhibit identical technical capabilities and operational behaviour, it may be sufficient to conduct prequalification measurements on only a portion of the total capacity or on a representative subset of units since this good practice is already implemented in certain Member States, such as Denmark², Finland or the Netherlands³.

Nevertheless, ACER acknowledges that any reduction in procedural timeframes must strike a careful balance between maintaining the security and reliability of balancing services for system operators and ensuring fair, timely access for service providers. It is essential that the timeline does not jeopardise the system operator's ability to assess operational risks, while at the same time avoiding undue delays that could deter or disadvantage potential balancing providers.

In light of these considerations, ACER intends to explore the feasibility of introducing proportionate exemptions or streamlined procedures for RPU or RPGs with small, identical and standardised units, in order to protect such participants from disproportionately long waiting periods and ensure fair and non-discriminatory access to the FRR prequalification process.

4.1 Do you agree that the FRR prequalification process proposed by the TSOs is

¹ 2023 ACER Market Monitoring report on Demand response and other distributed energy resources: what barriers are holding them back?, available at: https://www.acer.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Publications/ACER_MMR_2023_Barriers_to_dem_and_response.pdf

² 2024 Energinet report on Prequalification of Units and aggregated portfolios, available at: <https://energinet.dk/media/ox0gqmvw/gaeldende-prequalification-of-units-and-aggregated-portfolios.pdf>

³ 2021 ACER Wholesale Electricity Market Monitoring report on prequalification processes for the provision of balancing services, available at: https://www.acer.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Publications/ACER_Prequalification_BAL_Services.pdf

compatible with all types of market participants features?

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Partially agree
- ☒ Partially disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ No opinion

4.2 Please provide an explanation for your answer above.

1000 character(s) maximum

The FRR prequalification process proposed by TSOs does not make a distinction according to the size of the asset or the market participant, which helps preserve a level playing field. We, however, agree with the need to explore the feasibility of streamlining PQ procedures for RPU/RPGs from the same technology as assets that have already been prequalified by the relevant BSP. To ensure a level playing field, such measures should be available to all units and MPs, regardless of their size.

Besides, Eurelectric questions the option provided in Article 5(5) to foresee the possibility in national T&Cs of approving the prequalification of an RPU or RPG without any activation test or ex-post verification. First, this would allow for a rather stark difference in the qualification process applied to BSPs from one Member State to another. In addition, the '*sufficient controls and penalties*' designed to incentivise BSPs to guarantee the reliability of the submitted bids are not defined.

4.3 Do you agree that the timeline for the FRR prequalification process proposed by the TSOs in Article 5 of the Annexes to the Proposals is excessively long?

- ☒ Fully agree
- ☐ Partially agree
- ☐ Partially disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ No opinion

4.4 In case your answer to Question 4.3 is "Fully agree" or "Partially agree" or "Partially disagree", could you propose a specific timeline or deadline for different phases of the prequalification process as outlined in Article 5(2)(b) (timeline for 'Confirmation of application'), Article 5(2)(c) (timeline for 'Technical evaluation'), Article 5 (3) (timeline in case of incorrect and missing information) and Article 5(4) (timeline in case of negative results)?

1000 character(s) maximum

TSOs should align PQ timelines on best practices while ensuring that standard balancing energy products are reliable and meet the same quality standards:

- **Confirmation of application:** we welcome the shortening of the timeline for TSOs to confirm completeness of the application to 4 weeks.
- **Technical evaluation:** the timeline for TSO communication and activation tests should be shortened to 1 month.
- **Incorrect/missing information:** the proposed timeline results in a 2-month delay, which is too long especially for minor omissions.
- **Negative results:** the timeline should be shortened to two times 2 weeks for both resubmission by the BSP and ensuing TSO review.

While ACER states that “the PQ deadline reflects upper limits allowed by the regulation”, **Art. 5 should explicitly mention that “national stakeholders can opt for a faster prequalification process”**. Indeed, common rules must not regress from more ambitious practices adopted by some TSOs. Furthermore, regional harmonisation should be encouraged, as it can serve as “pilot project” for future EU-level rules. Finally, the possibility in Art. 5(6) for NRAs to grant derogations from PQ timelines should be deleted.

4.5 Do you agree with ACER that the timeline and steps required to complete the prequalification process, as outlined in Article 5 of the Annexes to the Proposals, are excessively long and not fully compatible with small, identical, and standardised units?

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☒ Partially agree
- ☐ Partially disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ No opinion

4.6 If your answer to Question 4.5 is “Fully agree” or “Partially agree” or “Partially disagree”, could you propose a specific timeline or deadline, and indicate which phases of the prequalification process should be included or excluded, as set out in Article 5 of the Annexes of the Proposals?

1000 character(s) maximum

We agree with ACER on the need to explore the feasibility of streamlining prequalification procedures for RPU or RPGs that are of the same technology as assets already prequalified by the BSP. However, we would like to emphasise that, to ensure a level playing field, such measures should be available to all units and market participants, regardless of their size.

4.7 Do you agree with ACER that the timeline in the event of a negative result of the technical evaluation proposed by the TSOs in Article 5(4) of the Annexes to the Proposals should be shorter than the general FRR prequalification process?

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☒ Partially agree
- ☐ Partially disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ No opinion

4.8 Please provide an explanation for your answer above.

1000 character(s) maximum

The revaluation does not imply a full review of all the technical data; hence, it should be shorter than the general process.

Topic 5: Prequalification with activation test and ex-post verification process

According to Article 6 of the Annexes to the Proposals, prequalification with an activation test is considered the standard process for the prequalification of an RPU or RPG. However, the reserve connecting TSO may apply ex-post verification as an alternative to the activation test. The conditions under which the TSO may allow ex-post verification for RPUs, or RPGs are listed in Article 6(3) of the Annexes to the Proposals.

The ex-post verification process is primarily intended to demonstrate the actual

performance of an RPU or RPG through market participation. Therefore, if the system security conditions described in Article 6 of the Annexes to the Proposals are fulfilled, ex-post verification can help RPUs and RPGs, particularly small units, avoid a lengthy prequalification process involving activation tests, thereby enabling quicker access to the markets. Therefore, ACER considers ex-post verification to be on an equal footing with prequalification and views it as an alternative prequalification process.

5.1 Do you agree with ACER that ex-post verification should be considered an alternative to prequalification with an activation test, provided that the conditions required to ensure system security are fulfilled?

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☒ Partially agree
- ☐ Partially disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ No opinion

5.2 Please provide an explanation for your answer above.

1000 character(s) maximum

Ex-post verification can increase the overall supply of balancing services if system security can be ensured. To the extent that Art.6(2) and (3) of the proposal refer to national T&Cs in deciding whether RPU/RPGs can be subject to ex-post verification for their first access to the market, it however risks creating an uneven playing field between BSPs located in different countries. Based on a comparative assessment and following stakeholder consultation, ACER should establish harmonised principles allowing fair and equal access to ex-post verification and ensuring that activations are representative of RPU/RPGs' capacity.

Finally, we recall that pre-qualification requires demonstrating the asset's ability to deliver the requested FRR activation under extreme operating conditions, as well as validating its endurance performance, whereas ex-post verification considers only normal market operation. It does not provide a full guarantee that the actual asset performance meets the required standards.

5.3 Do you agree that Article 6 of the Annexes of the Proposals correctly defines the conditions for RPUs and RPGs to carry out ex-post verification?

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Partially agree
- ☐ Partially disagree
- ☒ Fully disagree
- ☐ No opinion

5.4 Please provide an explanation for your answer above.

1000 character(s) maximum

Art.6 leaves far-ranging discretion to TSOs and national frameworks in applying ex-post verification, undermining the level playing field across Member States and their ability to ensure a uniform and consistent quality of standard balancing energy products. In particular:

- TSOs may allow ex-post verification, but are not required to do so, for the cases listed in Art. 6;
- TSOs may define additional cases, beyond those listed in Article 6, in which ex-post verification may be granted;
- Substantial criteria applicable to ex-post verification (including minimum timelines, number of activations, activation quality, and additional criteria defined by TSOs) are entirely left to national T&Cs.

Eurelectric therefore reiterates the need for a comparative assessment of PQ and ex-post verification practices across Europe, based on which ACER should consult on robust harmonisation principles ensuring the representativeness of BSPs' behaviour during ex-post verification.

5.5 Do you agree with the steps and timeline of the ex-post verification process proposed by the TSOs in Article 6 of the Annexes of the Proposals?

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Partially agree
- ☒ Partially disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ No opinion

5.6 Please provide an explanation for your answer above.

1000 character(s) maximum

The precise duration of the ex-post verification process is secondary to the substantial requirements of ex-post verification. As mentioned above, the conditions for successful ex-post verification should follow harmonised principles ensuring that the behaviour of BSPs during ex-post verification is representative of their foreseen activity in the balancing market (activations representative of the RPU/RPG's capacity). Such harmonised principles, based on a comparative assessment and full stakeholder consultation, are needed to preserve a level playing field and safe system operation.

Sanctions for unavailable RPU/RPGs under ex-post verification should be appropriate to avoid that their failure to deliver undermines system security.

Topic 6: Granularity of information requirements

ACER observes that certain data elements listed for the application submission requirements in Article 7 of the Annexes of the Proposals appear to be relevant at the RPU or RPG level rather than at the controllable unit level and considers that the level of detail currently required at the controllable unit level may be excessive.

6.1 Do you agree with the current level of detail in the application submission requirements proposed by TSOs in Article 7 of the Annexes of the Proposals?

- ☒ Fully agree
- ☐ Partially agree
- ☐ Partially disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ No opinion

6.2 Please provide an explanation for your answer above.

1000 character(s) maximum

Information required from BSPs should be proportionate and strictly necessary to the service they are applying to provide. Therefore, information about controllable units does not seem proportionate and would create unnecessary administrative burden for BSPs.

Topic 7: Switching of Reserve Providing Units (RPU) between BSPs

Article 8 of the Annexes of the Proposals outlines the prequalification for the switching of the RPUs between the BSPs. Article 8(a) of the Annexes of the Proposals includes the conditions under which RPUs may retain their prequalification status when switching between BSPs. This article also allows TSOs to perform an ex- post verification of the BSP's newly added RPU. Article 6(3)(a) of the Annexes of the Proposals also states that the reserve connecting TSO may allow for ex-post verification for the switching of RPUs between BSPs according to Article 8(1) of the Annexes of the Proposals. The timeline for switching of RPUs between BSPs is also included in Article 8(6) of the Annexes of the Proposals.

In case of non-fulfilment of the conditions for retain the prequalification status, the new BSP and the reserve connecting TSO, should decide whether a prequalification process with activation test or ex-post verification is necessary. Further requirements for the communication test and validity periods under switching of the RPUs between BSPs are outlined in Article 8 of the Annexes of the Proposals.

7.1 Do you agree with the requirements and conditions and timeline of switching RPUs between BSPs proposed by the TSOs in Article 8 of the Annexes of the Proposals?

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Partially agree
- ☒ Partially disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ No opinion

7.2 Please provide an explanation for your answer above.

1000 character(s) maximum

Eurelectric welcomes the possibility for RPUs and RPGs to retain their prequalification status when switching between BSPs in the same Load Frequency Control area. This mechanism can help streamline exchanges while maintaining a satisfactory level of operational security, by allowing BSPs to demonstrate that they can safely operate RPU/RPGs transferred to them.

The following points should however be considered:

- Strengthen Art. 8(1)(c) to specify that BSP switching is conditional on the prior existence within the BSP of RPU/RPGs already prequalified with a strictly identical technology (e.g., in the case of a battery: same manufacturer, identical connection voltage, same battery chemistry). In case this condition is not added, TSOs should remain free to perform real-condition tests of the asset with the new BSP;
- Add Art. 8(1)(e) defining BSP switching as a complete transfer of the asset without any modification to its technical or functional scope.

7.3 Do you agree that the scope of Article 8 of the Annexes of the Proposals should be limited to switching RPUs and not RPGs between BSPs?

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Partially agree
- ☐ Partially disagree
- ☒ Fully disagree
- ☐ No opinion

7.4 Please provide an explanation for your answer above.

1000 character(s) maximum

RPGs should be included in Art. 8 provided they follow the same technical conditions and requirements and that Art. 8.1 is completed with the conditions referred to in our previous response (i.e. the complete transfer of the asset without any modification to its technical or functional scope, and the prior existence within the BSP of RPGs already qualified with a strictly identical technology).

7.5 Do you agree with the level of harmonisation for the ex-post verification for the switching of RPU between BSPs as outlined in Article 6(3)(a) and Article 8(1) of the Annexes of the Proposals?

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☒ Partially agree
- ☐ Partially disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ No opinion

7.6 Please provide an explanation for your answer above.

1000 character(s) maximum

Overall, the proposal for BSP switching helps reduce periods of asset inactivity due to lengthy prequalification timelines when RPU/RPGs already have prequalification status. However, a condition should be added to ensure that the RPU/RPG is fully transferred without any change to its technical or functional scope and Art. 8(1)(c) should be strengthened to specify that BSP switching is conditional upon the prior existence within the receiving BSP of at least one RPU/RPG already qualified with a strictly identical technology (for example, in the case of a battery: same manufacturer, identical connection voltage, same battery chemistry...). Substantial modifications would require evidence that the asset still meets sufficient reliability and quality conditions.

Topic 8: Re-prequalification process and conditions

Articles 9 and 10 of the Annexes of the Proposals outline the re-prequalification process and the conditions, respectively. In Articles 9(1) and 9(2) of the Annexes of the Proposals, subject to the applicable national T&Cs for BSPs, the BSP shall inform the reserve connecting TSO no later than six weeks before the planned implementation date of any changes pursuant to Article 10(1) of the Annexes of the Proposals to their RPU or RPG via the reserve connecting TSO communication interface. Subject to the applicable national T&Cs for BSPs, the reserve connecting TSO shall within four weeks of receiving the notification pursuant to Article 9(1) of the Annexes of the Proposals, assess whether a re-prequalification on RPU or RPG level pursuant to Article 10(1) of the Annexes of the Proposals is required.

ACER acknowledges that the TSOs have provided an explanation regarding the ex-post verification for re- prequalification in Article 6(3)(c) of the Annexes of the Proposals, according to which the reserve connecting TSO may allow for ex-post verification for RPU or RPGs in case of re-prequalifying at the end of the validity period in accordance with Article 10(1)(d) of the Annexes of the Proposals. However, ACER observes that it is not fully clear from Article 10 of the Annexes of the Proposals whether for an RPU or RPG undergoing re- prequalification it is required to repeat all steps from the initial prequalification procedure. This creates uncertainty for market participants and may lead to inconsistent implementation across TSOs. Therefore, ACER sees the need for more clarity: whether and which steps should be repeated in the case of re-prequalification and clearly distinguish the timeline and steps for first-time

prequalification and re- prequalification.

8.1 Do you agree with the proposed timeline for re-prequalification by TSOs in Article 9(1) and 9(2) of the Annexes of the Proposals?

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Partially agree
- ☐ Partially disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☒ No opinion

8.2 Please provide an explanation for your answer above.

1000 character(s) maximum

/

8.3 Do you agree with the proposed conditions by the TSOs to request re-prequalification in Article 10(1) of the Annexes of the Proposals?

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Partially agree
- ☒ Partially disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ No opinion

8.4 Please provide an explanation for your answer above.

1000 character(s) maximum

We disagree with Art. 10(1)(f), which opens the door to further conditions triggering re-prequalification at national level, thereby creating the risk of diverging practices and an unlevel playing field.

8.5 Do you agree with the level of harmonisation for the ex-post verification for the re-prequalification in Article 6(3)(c) and Article 10(1)(d) of the Annexes of the Proposals?

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Partially agree
- ☒ Partially disagree
- ☐ Fully disagree
- ☐ No opinion

8.6 Please provide an explanation for your answer above.

1000 character(s) maximum

The same concerns as stated before apply:

- The TSO may allow for ex-post verification in Art. 6(3)(c) but is not obliged to do so, leading to the risk of diverging practices and an unlevel playing field.
- TSOs have discretion over allowing RPU/RPGs to skip re-prequalification if the last prequalification occurred +5 yrs ago under the condition that they have delivered on their service in the last 12 months. Also in this case, TSOs in different countries risk adopting different practices, causing a risk for the level playing field.

8.7 Do you agree with ACER that, it is unclear whether re-prequalification for RPUs or RPGs should include all the steps of the prequalification process as outlined in Article 5 of the Annexes to the Proposals?

- ☒ Fully agree
☐ Partially agree
☐ Partially disagree
☐ Fully disagree
☐ No opinion

8.8 If your answer to Question 8.7 is “Fully agree” or “Partially agree” or “Partially disagree”, please specify under which conditions re-prequalification for RPU or RPGs should require a full prequalification process or a partial prequalification process. Please also indicate which steps of the prequalification process, as outlined in Article 5 of the Annexes to the Proposals, should be included or excluded.

1000 character(s) maximum

We agree on the need for more clarity regarding the scope of re-prequalification for situations outlined in Art. 10(1). Only necessary tests should be performed.

The following conditions under Art. 10(2) and Art. 11(1) also partly overlap and lack clarity:

- The condition for re-prequalification in Art. 10(2) if an RPU/RPG “causes a detrimental impact on system operation” leaves a wide margin of appreciation to TSOs and should be clarified;
- Art. 11(1)(b) refers to the conditions in Art. 10(2) as a trigger to withdraw PQ status. This mention seems to contradict the statement in Art. 10(2) according to which re-PQ is limited to the TSO’s detected issue. In case of limited issues, TSOs should not terminate the RPU’s entire PQ status.
- An isolated failure to deliver on contracted balancing services should not trigger re-PQ for fully prequalified assets. Verification rules and penalties provide sufficient incentives for BSPs to prevent and address limited incidents.

Topic 9: Other comments

If you would like to comment on other topics, please indicate clearly the related Article and paragraph of the Proposals and add a sufficient explanation.

1000 character(s) maximum

Eurelectric welcomes the proposal to publish a non-binding version of national T&Cs in English. Beyond the convenience translation, TSOs should publish general information about national balancing markets in English on the ENTSO-E Transparency Platform, such as standardized and synthetic presentation would significantly improve understanding and participation across all balancing markets. The main barrier for market participants is not the use of national languages, but rather the complexity and variability of operational processes and requirements across countries.

Eurelectric pursues in all its activities the application of the following sustainable development values:

Economic Development

- Growth, added-value, efficiency

Environmental Leadership

- Commitment, innovation, pro-activeness

Social Responsibility

- Transparency, ethics, accountability



Union of the Electricity Industry - Eurelectric aisbl
Boulevard de l'Impératrice, 66 – bte 2 - 1000 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: + 32 2 515 10 00 - VAT: BE 0462 679 112 • www.eurelectric.org
EU Transparency Register number: [4271427696-87](https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/?s=details&id=4271427696-87)