

## NDSG hearing, 31 March 2020

### Request for review of the decision to not accept project 'Rio' in the TYNDP2020

#### Participants:

NDSG members: Pierre Bernard (FOSG), Antina Sander (RGI), Alberto Lampasona (Europacable)

ENTSO-E: Lea Dehaudt, Jean-Baptiste Paquel

Rio PSKW: Dorte Fouquet, Johanna Kamm, Raphael Stott

The hearing took place in two phases. In the first phase, the project promoter PSKW Rio presented the project and the reason why it should be included in the TYNDP2020 (related documents: [sliddeck \(link\)](#), [request for decision review \(link\)](#)). The presentation was followed by a Q&A.

In the second phase, the NDSG members together with ENTSO-E had an open discussion on the arguments for accepting or rejecting the project.

Overview of the discussion:

Practice applied in previous TYNDPs: make an exception only if there is a good reason for the non-compliance.

Main arguments in favour of accepting the project in the TYNDP:

- The project seems important for the EU transition.
- There are very few hydro pump projects onshore.
- It is hard for small organisations to be aware of EU processes, which could explain why they missed the deadline.

Main arguments against accepting the project in the TYNDP:

- 3 months delay is quite long - there is a risk of creating a precedent for future TYNDPs, the deadline for application would become meaningless.
- Lack of political support does not explain why they did not apply to TYNDP in November. Political support is important only for PCI application.
- Project is 10 years old, they had time to inform themselves on the TYNDP and PCI process.
- Project is due to be commissioned in +/- 9 years: still gives the possibility for several PCI & CEF applications

Following the open discussion, NDSG members expressed their recommendation to ENTSO-E:

RGI:

- We have given ourselves the possibility to allow for exception when there is a good reason. As the project seems to contribute in a significant way to achieve the energy transition, I think it is important that it is in the TYNDP. But: ENTSO-E is the institution that can make a plausible judgement on such a significance, not RGI.

- If ENTSO-E judges that it does not make a difference whether the project is included in this TYNDP or in the next one, fair enough to not make an exemption. Considerations should include both procedural aspects for ENTSO-E (does a substantial amount of work already done have to be repeated and does this cause a problem) and time considerations from the project perspective (is a two hour delay for potentially obtaining the PCI status significant in the context of the overall timeline of realizing this project or not). If it does make a difference, we should be flexible and include the project.
- It is important to publish the reason for doing an exception.

## Europacable:

- As we understand that the project could have an added value at European level, we believe it could be given a chance and included in the next TYNDP. Having said that, ENTSO-E is better placed to make such a judgment .
- For the sake of transparency, it is important to make the reason for accepting/rejecting the project available on ENTSO-E website.

## FOSG:

- Inclined to say no because the delay is very long and there is no understandable/acceptable justification for this delay. ENTSO-E has already started the TYNDP process, part of the work has to be redone.
- If they would not be in the TYNDP at this stage, it is not negatively impacting the future of the project as it was launched 10 years ago and commissioning is not due before 9 years, at best.
- If the decision of ENTSO-E would be to integrate this project in this TYNDP, there must be a clear public communication on the fact that for next TYNDPs the rules for admissibility are not considered as being final and that there is flexibility up to the process of appeal (both for administrative criteria and timing).
- The project looks indeed important, but for every developer his project is perceived as an important one for Europe and the transition. We should not base our decision on the promoter's perception of the importance of the project. We should base it on whether it is important to integrate it, yes or no.