



Core and CE Consultative Group & IN STK Forum

17/03/2026
Conference Call

Draft Minutes of Meeting

1. Welcome and Introduction

Z. GAUTIER, together with S. VAN CAMPENHOUT and H. NOLLER welcome everybody to the Core and Central Europe Consultative Group and Italy North Stakeholder Forum meeting and introduce the new meeting setting where the IN STK Forum has been added to the CCG for efficiency reasons.

Z. GAUTIER reminds participants to raise questions in the chat with the slide number.

S. VAN CAMPENHOUT clarifies that the co-chairs mandate remains Core and Central Europe. The IN STK Forum section of the meeting is chaired by the IN Steering Committee chair J. SCHWACHHEIM.

Z. GAUTIER presents today's agenda.

S. VAN CAMPENHOUT informs participants that MP questions and TSO answers have been incorporated into the respective sections of the material.

2. Core, Central Europe and Italy North CCR Program Update

Overall Program Update for Core and Central Europe CCR

S. VAN CAMPENHOUT presents the status of the Core and Central Europe program, however highlights that the updates have been marked as pre-read because the topics will be covered in depth in the respective dedicated sections of the meeting.

Italy North CCR Transition to CE CCR

J. SCHWACHHEIM presents the steps that IN TSOs are taking to prepare for the CE CCR transition.

Clarifications based on MP questions (Q&A):

- Q: When is the target date for IN CCR inclusion into CE CCR
- A: Staged integration is foreseen with DA CC go-live on 15 January 2028 being merged first before remaining methodologies (ID, LT, ROSC, BTCC) are transferred. Detailed roadmaps are yet to be made available for the remaining timeframes.

3. CE CCR: DA CC

CE DA CC Implementation

F. CHIANESE presents the status of CE DA CC implementation including the go-live planned for January 2028, and the focus for the next 6 months.

CE DA CCM First Amendment: Scope and Timeline

F. CHIANESE presents the topics within the scope of the first amendment of the CE DA CCM (with a distinction between those topics to align with the Core DA CCM 4th amendment and those that are specific for CE purposes) and the foreseen timeline regarding public consultation and submission.

Granularity of Capacity Calculation

L. WACHTER and F. CHIANESE present the reasoning for why capacity calculation will remain in hourly granularity.

Clarifications based on MP questions (Q&A):

- Q: More context on what Switzerland as an iTCP would mean for CE CCR and further details on the PoC.
- A: In CE, CH is fully integrated in the CC process and CH CNECs are considered in the process. However, NTC extraction is performed since CH does not participate in market coupling.
- Q: For iTCP integration, will the PTDF matrix be amended to include CH at the same time as ITN?
- A: CH NTC extraction will be the final stage of CC therefore PTDFs will be calculated as for any other CE TSO. PTDFs will be fully available as the other data once external parallel run commences.
- Q: Will the IT-N ->IT-CN remain via NTC?



- A: This will remain in NTC.
- Q: Will the allocation constraints in ITN remain in hourly granularity in CE DA?
- A: Allocation constraints are currently in hourly resolution, and it remains to be further discussed whether the allocation constraints for CE DA will remain in hourly granularity.
- Q: How does iTCP inclusion of CH differ from the current CH consideration solution implementation introduced on 11/03?
- A: The Core CH consideration solution includes CH in the Core individual validation process (SWG can insert their CNECs into the Core FB domain). In CE, CH constraints will be included in the domain from the start of the process and NTCs will be extracted from the domain.
- Q: Has AHC extension been considered for CE?
- A: The FR-ES border will be treated as an AHC border in CE. In Core, SHC is applied, however, CE TSOs see the need to extend the AHC approach for this border given the geographical extension of the CCR. Since FR is a large BZ, elements in the South are influenced by FR-ES and FR-IT flows. The IT-N IT-CN border will be treated as an SHC border in CE.
- Q: Has ATC extraction for the iTCP has been defined?
- A: Art 23 of the CE DA [CCM](#) defines this concept in detail.

4. Long Term Capacity Calculation

LTCC External Parallel Run

P. BRHLIKOVA presents the details of the ongoing external parallel run for LT CC and the subsequent allocation and publication processes (for both the monthly and yearly timeframe) including issues encountered and the next steps that will be taken ahead of the go live. With focus on stakeholder engagement.

P. BRHLIKOVA presents the capacity calculation and allocation runs that are published on the JAO Publication Tool and on JAO websites.

P. BRHLIKOVA presents the yearly and monthly (from January until March) allocation results for 2026 as well as the KPIs to monitor the progress of the external parallel run and the summary of the KPIs .

P. BRHLIKOVA presents the overview of benchmark values per border compared to allocated volumes for the 2026 yearly run and explains that the resulted allocations can be above or below the benchmark due to the allocation mechanism effect. She also summarises results of the KPIs 1, 2 and 5 (AMR for each CNEC, number of pre-solved CNECs and the number of planned outages) highlighting that all KPIs showcases expected trends and patterns. The remaining KPI outcomes are included as a pre-read, and MPs are invited to ask any questions.

Clarifications based on MP questions (Q&A):

- Q: Without the correction factor (0.9/1.1) which was previously foreseen, could TSOs please clarify how the RAMs will be adjusted based on a single value? Will RAMs be modified during the capacity calculation to produce a resulting domain that accommodates this single value?
- A: The consulted version of LTCCM from autumn 2025 included the ATC benchmark range referenced above. The final version following the public consultation and NRA shadow opinion proposes a single value referencing historical benchmark in line with the regulatory guidance. Induced flow is calculated for each CNEC based on the benchmark to assess whether RAM on CNEC is above or below the benchmark and RAM is finally adjusted to respect the benchmark values. The calculated domains still have a cap and a floor represented by 100% of the historical capacity instead of initially proposed range of 90 and 110%. The overall process functions the same to produce a result which fully accommodates the historical benchmark. In other words: the RAM on each CNEC is tuned to meet exactly the benchmark value.
- Q: Will the ATC Benchmark be used to correct RAMs at the DA stage, or just at the LT stage? How is consistency between LT and DA ensured?
- A: ATC benchmark is not used in DA, only in LT to ensure sufficient capacities for LTTR allocation. TSOs also propose LTA inclusion removal in DA to decouple LT from operational security in DA and hereby make the paradigm shift from physical to financial. Consistency between the two timeframes is ensured via DA congestion income monitoring. The underlying principle is TSOs should not "oversell" LTTRs as the DA congestion income is the basis to remunerate the LTTRs.
- Q: How is seasonal maintenance mapped to single network elements?
- A: CGMs from the NMFT process are used as an input for capacity calculation in LT. Currently the CGMs don't include outages and these mapped in a separate process. Outages in OPC are mapped to CGMs, including seasonal maintenances. TSOs then select timestamps with most constraining cases based on the number of simultaneous outages for capacity calculation. In the Publication Tool, it can be observed how CGMs differ per season and timestamp.
- Q: What are the D2-D8 Bidding Zones referring to in the different graphs?
- A: D2 = Tennet Germany, D4 = Transnet BW, D7 = Amprion, D8 = 50 Hertz

LTCCM Amendment Status



B. TRIVIC from ACER presents the background and status of the Core LTCCM amendment escalation, the expected timeline to facilitate a November 2026 go-live and the main changes to the proposal.

Clarifications based on MP questions (Q&A):

- Q: Why did the 0.9 minATC / 1.1 maxATC benchmark disappear in the consultation from ACER as this was included in the ENTSO-E/TSO consultation? And what is the impact on the benchmark?
- A: Only one ATC value will be used resulting in the same value for min and max ATC benchmark. The initial consultation in the autumn of 2025 included a range of ATC benchmark values. Following the Public Consultation and NRA shadow opinion, TSOs updated the proposal to remove the range and proceed with a single value of 100% of historical benchmark. There is no expected impact on how the benchmark functions.
- Q: In the ongoing consultation, article 14.7 references that the minInducedFlow and the maxInducedFlow have the same formulas. Is this normal?
- A: the induced flow is calculated with the same formula both min and max ATC benchmark. Using single value will also result in same result for the induced flow.
- Q: For the LTFBA, will the algorithm be published?
- A: A description of the algorithm is provided in the SAP [methodology](#). The simulation platform using the LTFBA algorithm can be accessed by registered participants.

P. BRHILKOVA presents the answers to the questions sent by MPs ahead of the meeting.

Clarifications based on MP questions (Q&A):

- Q: How can MPs mitigate physical risks and ensure the forward market can be relied upon. MPs raise concerns regarding the disparity between the physical and financial paradigm and the potential for increased speculation.
- A: Core TSOs have investigated improvements to the CC process which resulted in the introduction of the historical benchmark in the LT CCM. With the transition from the physical to the financial paradigm, TSOs aim to offer values that are linked to historically available capacities and provide stability of offered capacities for the markets. It is important to note that not only is capacity calculation changing, but also allocation process will change with the introduction of LTFBA which is dependent on bidding behaviours. Hence the external parallel run is being conducted to allow MPs to assess what happens when the allocation algorithm is changed. Core TSOs want to provide stability in offered volume for hedging even though regulatory framework requires a different allocation process (LTFBA). For fundamental discussions on forward market design including volume determination Core TSOs refer to the FCA 2.0 process with which the European Commission has been tasked (since EMDR) to perform an impact assessment and prepare a proposal for amendment to the FCA network code.
- Q: With a 40€ FR DE spread, have Core TSOs tested that the FR max is not all used?
- A: Simulating allocation uses historical bids. Usage of potential net positions is dependent on allocation and bidding behaviour, therefore was not explicitly tested.
- Q: Are grid models available for market participants?
- A: NMFT models are not published and Core TSOs are not obliged to publish CGMs from a LTCCM perspective either. The several CGM parameters are however published as per Art 20 of LTCCM – production, reference NP and vertical load.



5. Intra-day Capacity Calculation

IDCC Process Overview

P. THOMAS presents the overview of the IDCC(a-e) processes, and their respective timings in relation to market coupling.

IDCC(d) Go-live Planning

P. THOMAS presents the status of IDCC(d) go-live preparations including the parallel run results, the expected go-live date on 28/04/2026 and the status of TSO individual validation.

External parallel run KPIs and the respective outcomes were marked as pre-read, but MPs are invited to ask any questions they may have.

IDCC(e) Go-live Planning

P. THOMAS presents the expected implementation timeline for IDCC(e) in October 2026.

MinRAM Study Timeline and Status

P. THOMAS presents the background of the minRAM assessment, the status of minRAM study finalisation and a status update on the capacity improvement study implementation.

Clarifications based on MP questions (Q&A):

- Q: How is the MACZT capping value computed?
- A: For the study data from 2025 is used. MACZT values are based on DA MACZT objectives of 2025 but for each TSO region only one fixed value is used (this is considered sufficiently representative although for some CNECs the value could vary in DA). This means e.g. for those TSOs who have reached 70%minRAM, those values are considered while for others action plan values are considered). Only once the minRAM study has been finalised, will TSOs assess whether this leads to a potential change in the methodology and subsequent change in the operational process.
- Q: For IDCC(d/e) what are the PTDF and RAM thresholds for the ATC Extraction fallback procedure?
- A: Same parameters as those used for IDCC(b) and IDCC(c) (3% for PTDF and 50 MW for the RAM threshold)
- Q: Which NP for non-Core BZ will be used in IDCC(d)
- A: Same principles apply as for IDCC(b) and IDCC(c). NP values integrated in CGM or the available NPs shortly before computing the initial FB computation of the IDCC process.
- Q: One MP propose to use the ENTSO-E awareness system as an alternative/complement to the JAO platform to minimise shadow prices and avoid structural congestions. This would provide more flexibility and stability in both LT and ID.
- A: it is reminded that TSOs use the JAO platform to fulfil their regulatory obligations in terms of publication requirements of the CCMs. The request is more holistic than just capacity calculation data and therefore outside the scope of this meeting setting. Prior engaging into further discussion (appropriate forum to be seen), TSOs ask market parties for a joint position and elaboration of the proposal.

P. THOMAS highlights that MP questions regarding capacity curtailments will be answered by TSOs in the coming weeks after which they will deliver their response offline (S. VAN CAMPENHOUT clarifies that the element of uncertainty introduced here will be addressed by the DA CCM 4th amendment).

For the MP questions related to allocation, TSOs propose raising the questions in MCSC context such as during the MCCG.

P. THOMAS presents the response to question regarding the new API format.

R. KAISINGER clarifies that for AHC, there will be a similar approach for the API taken as is done for the parallel run for IDCC(e). The AHC parallel run environment will have publication of AHC enabled domains and these will be available at the same [link](#). This will switch to the JAO operational API link after go-live.

ACTIONS

- **Core TSOs to provide answers to MPs regarding capacity curtailments (deadline: 30/04/2026)**

6. Day Ahead Capacity Calculation

R. KAISINGER presents an overview of the Core DA CC topics to be presented today.

Removal of LTA Inclusion

R. KAISINGER reminds MPs of the previous update presented on the removal of LTA inclusion and informs MPs that the first set of default Flow Based Parameters will be published in Q2 2026. Core TSOs are developing a PoC to simulate DFPs based on 2025 FB domains. A similar number of FB constraints as in operations can be expected to be presented in the DFP flow-based domains. This will be published on the JAO website and MPs will be informed when this has been finalised.



AHC

R. KAISINGER presents the status of AHC implementation including the proposed go-live date on 20/05 (20/05 is the day where the DA MC runs, for delivery day on 21/05), the detailed implementation roadmap, shadow price publication for AHC and the details of the additional AHC SPAICC like run requested by MPs (currently being planned, however is restricted by IT environment planning for other SDAC testing and the AHC external parallel run).

Clarifications based on MP questions (Q&A):

- Q: MPs highlight that they were supposed to receive 3-month notice prior to AHC go live.
- A: The notice was provided in the MCCG. Core TSOs communicated the go-live date as soon as it was confirmed from SDAC and this was delayed due to the dependency with Hansa Phase II. If Core TSOs were to strictly abide by the 3-month notice period, then go-live before summer would not be feasible which is not the preference from both a regulatory and MP perspective. Previous communication in the October CG referred to a go-live date in April subject to SDAC readiness therefore MPs could expect a go-live around this period. Core TSOs have prepared extensive impact assessments with multiple SPAICC like runs and are preparing the additional SPAICC like run upon MP request. Core TSOs apologise for the inconvenience.
- Q: When will the parallel run start (it is supposed to be a 1-month parallel run)?
- A: The exact start date is still under discussion. The latest is 20/04 due to the regulatory obligation which states a minimum of 1-month external parallel run. Core TSOs may try to start earlier to allow for contingency. IT environment availability is challenging due to the parallel run for IDCC. TSOs to inform MPs once the parallel run start date has been finalised.
- Q: For SPAICC results, the topology is not clear. For example, what does "bithub" refer to.
- A: Big hub refers to cases where the DC interconnector has more than 1 pole (2 systems in parallel modelled as one). This is a modelling consideration.
- Q: When is the additional SPAICC like run expected and MPs request a brief summary of outcome from the previous SPAICC like run regarding the RO-BG border.
- A: With AHC, loadings on the RO-BG border become transparent per CNEC level. There is no impact on the rest of the Balkan region, as the WB6 are not part of SDAC. Exchanges between Core and WB6 will be based on the Net Position Forecast and are considered static for the purpose of Core day-ahead capacity calculation. The same applies for the MONITA cable. Forecast differences are partially addressed by the Common Grid Model roadmap prepared by Core TSOs (however there will not be a replacement for doing coordinated CC with WB6 and them joining SDAC). Roadmap for WB6 SDAC integration is not under jurisdiction of Core TSOs therefore refer to Energy Community Secretariat.

Clarification that May 21st is the delivery date for AHC not 20th May as stated on the slide

CH Consideration

R. KAISINGER presents the background of the CH consideration solution that went live for BD 11/03 and the outcomes of the impact assessment performed by TSOs to highlight the limited impact of the CH consideration solution on Core DA capacities. Since 11/03, there has yet to be an IVA submitted by SWG. The JAO PuTo now includes CH PTFDs published for all Core CNECs.

Clarifications based on MP questions (Q&A):

- Q: Since CH inclusion in Core DACC, MPs note that on the JAO PuTo a column has been added for CH, but when "SwissGrid" is selected, there are no lines highlighted.
- A: This is because SWG has not yet declared a CNEC with an IVA as a result of their individual validation. This will only be the case once SWG submits an IVA.
- Q: Swissgrid can add CNECs as stated, but are the Swiss PTFDs used to construct the FB domain? ($\text{sum}(\text{PTDF} * \text{netpos}) \leq \text{RAM}$) What is used for CH net position if this is the case?
- A: CH PTFDs are not part of the Core FB domain (only published for transparency). They are used to determine the zone-to-zone PTDF between CH and the rest of Core. With explicit allocation on the CH bidding zone borders, SDAC does handle the CH bidding zone. The CH NP is calculated by the NPF therefore is static for the purpose of Core day-ahead capacity calculation.
- Q: Regarding Swiss publications, MPs would re-insist on the need to publish Swiss NECs even when not limiting. Otherwise, MPs only discover the issue at 10:30 in the morning.
- A: There is no restraint on Core exchanges from CH when SWG does not apply an IVA. Core TSOs will further assess this MP request.

CGM Roadmap

R. KAISINGER presents the CGM improvement roadmap developed by Core TSOs as a response to the ACER recommendations to TSOs to increase capacities.

GLSK Study Outcomes

R. KAISINGER presents the background of the GLSK study incorporated into the Core DA CCM 4th amendment as well as the outcomes from the two specific GLSK studies (1st to set KPIs for GLSK evaluation – Net forecast error and the 2nd to identify the best performing GLSK strategies). The conclusions from the study are also summarised. Colours and digits in the figure presented indicate a rank in relation to the ideal GLSK for each Core TSO. The figure does not show a ranking per TSO.

R. KAISINGER also presents the impact of the GLSK study outcomes in relation to article 9 of the Core DA CCM 4th



amendment.

Clarifications based on MP questions (Q&A):

- Q: Can TSOs clarify the GLSK limitation for FR-ES DA CC observed in recent weeks?
- A: Questions regarding the GLSK for FR & ES should be tackled in SWE CCR and cannot be commented on by Core TSO representatives.

Publication of Information

S. VAN CAMPENHOUT presents the current publication practice among Core TSOs and the ambition to consolidate relevant documentation on the ENTSO-E website following a request by MPs to centralise publications.

MPs enquire whether ENTSO-E transparency platform can be extended and combined with the JAO platform to have one single platform.

Core TSOs respond that the Transparency Platform is fulfilling requirements from Transparency Regulations and therefore doesn't cover publication from the regional perspective as is the case on the JAO message board and JAO publication of parallel run results therefore the preference is to maintain the current set of platforms in alignment with the associated regulatory framework.

R. KAISINGER presents the answers to the questions sent by MPs ahead of the meeting regarding AHC, the CH consideration solution and CE/CEE volatility.

Clarifications based on MP questions (Q&A):

- Q: What are the technical capabilities to preserve inertia.
- A: This is a balancing related topic which is not tackled in CC.
- Q: Regarding the 70% minRAM targets, do Core TSOs confirm that the constraint is applied on the CNE and not the CNEC level? Is it applied on an hourly or year basis?
- A: 70% minMACZT is applied on CNEC level per MTU and a CNEC may only not be compatible with 70% if an IVA is applied (aside for those TSOs with derogations).
- Q: Should RCCs be responsible for adequacy measures to identify structural congestion and prevent forecasted congestion?
- A: A certain level of CZC is ensured (including the use of available remedial actions). Resource adequacy in CC is not permitted by the current regulation and is tackled in the allocation stage via the adequacy patch in SDAC.
- Q: Regarding the net position forecast machine learning methodology, will Core TSOs publish a high-level description on whether borders are simultaneously computed. It is unclear why a feasibility range needs to be added at a later stage and how forecasted net positions get subsequently adapted.
- A: The Net Position Forecast considers machine learning in its forecast. Feasibility ranges are used during merging (if there is a deviation from a BZ from the NPF then the feasibility range describes how far a certain NP can be shifted from its forecasted NP).

ACTIONS

- Core TSOs to assess request from MPs to publish CH NECs even when not limiting (deadline: 30/06/2026)

7. IN STK Forum

J. SCHWACHHEIM (IN STK Forum Chairman) on behalf of IN TSOs welcomes all participants to the Italy North Stakeholder Forum meeting.

J. SCHWACHHEIM introduces the agenda: Italy North TSOs would like to inform market participants of the status of implementation projects.

IN LT CCM amendment

H. HATZ, LTCC expert from APG, informs meeting participants on the approval of the IN LT CCM amendment by IN NRAs and on the updated timeline for the implementation of Export Corner by Q4 2027.

No questions were raised by MPs.

IN DA Fallback Procedures Methodology

R. GERMANA, Market expert from TERNA, informs meeting participants on the submission of the IN DA Fallback Procedures Methodology amendment package to IN NRAs for approval.

No questions were raised by MPs.



8. AOB & Closure

Z. GAUTIER, H. NOLLER and S.VAN CAMPENHOUT thank the CG and IN STK Forum for their participation.

Z. GAUTIER reminds MPs of the ongoing [LTCC consultation](#).

Material to be amended and published on the ENTSO-E website together with the minutes and meeting recording

Next Core/CE CG

- The next Core/CE CG and IN STK forum will take place between 16 and 27 November with the precise date and location to be determined.