
**Roundtable meeting with Organised Market Places, trade reporting systems,
trade matching systems or other persons professionally arranging transactions**

**11th March 2015, 09:30-17:00 and 12th March 2015, 09:30-12:00
(6th floor, ACER's premises)**

Minutes

(Chatham House Rules, no names in quotes during the meeting)

NAME	ORGANISATION
Tomaž Vižintin	ACER
Elio Zammuto	ACER
Tomaž Zaplotnik	ACER
Iztok Zlatac	ACER
Arthur De-Graft	APX
Tomaž Paljk	BSP SOUTHPool
Mathias Ponnwitz	EEX
Filip Sleeuwagen	EFETnet
Tzvetelina Tzankova (observer)	Elcom
Isabelle Parent	EPEX SPOT
Alexander Thuma	EXAA
Nik Kakoullis	GFI
Eleonora Nagali	GME
Steve Banks	Griffin Markets Group Limited
Jorge Fernández Gómez	Iberian Gas Hub
Evi Samonaki	LAGIE S.A.
Glenn Channon	Marex Spectron
Adrian Yorke	Nord Pool Spot
Peter Frampton	Ofgem
Mario del Barrio Rodríguez	OMIE
João Morais	OMIP

Jozef Drgoňa	on behalf of OKTE
Derek Willis	on behalf of the London Energy Brokers Association
Andrea Stejskalova	OTE
Piotr Skoczylas	POLPX
Grzegorz Szpecht	POLPX
Steven Clark	Tradition
James Hutton	Trayport
Stefan Giemza	Tullett Prebon

Day 1

1 Opening

Welcome address and introduction of the present participants. The agenda was approved. The minutes from the previous meeting were also approved.

2 Trading Examples

Examples of orders and trades executed on the organised market places were discussed based on the input given by the meeting participants prior to the meeting. The topic raised fruitful discussion. It was proposed to consolidate all the questions and publish answers in a second part of the TRUM, in an Annex or in a Q&A paper.

Most of the trading examples submitted to ACER were discussed at the meeting. Some of them were not discussed as they become clear while discussing the other examples.

It was agreed that there were no outstanding questions on the submitted examples and that some participants will send ACER a clean spreadsheet with their anonymised examples to be included in the TRUM.

A participant at the meeting asked if the UTI and the order ID can be the same. It was said that by default one could add a letter/number in front or at the end of the UTI to make it different than the order ID: e.g. order ID=123 and UTI=A_123. Most of the participants to the meeting agreed that this is not an issue to implement it. Still, ACER will discuss it internally and let participant of the roundtable know the outcome.

3 Other Aspects for Standardised Transactions

ACER is currently considering some fine-tuning of the schema to be used to report trading examples according to Table 1 of the Implementing Acts. The fine-tuning would not affect the use of the current schema as any changes are minimal. This is why they will not have any impact on anyone that wants to use the current schema for reporting as of 7 October 2015 since the new one will only extend the set of allowed values on request of stakeholders. Therefore the current schema (v1) will be fully supported for October go-live so this fine-tuning will not have any impact on stakeholders' ability to properly prepare for the go-live. The fine-tuning in the schema concerns the following:

- Field no. 26, Organised Market Place ID /OTC: we added new accepted value "CLR" which stands for "Cleared" to capture cleared trades which take place outside the screen of the organised market places (ACER will create an example in the Annex to the TRUM).

- Field no. 53, Days of the week: added “WN” for weekend and “WD” for weekdays to be used instead of “SAtoSU” and “MOtoFR” respectively. SAtoSU and MOtoFR are still accepted values in the schema, even though WD and WD are those to be used.
- Field no. 53, Days of the week: ACER will add “IB” for “Including Bank Holidays”. This should be used, for example, for off-peak weekend products which include Bank holidays.
- To overcome the problem of the UTI for intraday market coupled that share the same order book ACER has amended the name of the field “previousUniqueTransactionIdentifier” to “additionalUtilInfo” which will capture the system ID hosting the shared order book making the UTI unique. The field “previousUniqueTransactionIdentifier” was created to overcome the issue with the UTI modification for bilateral contracts. This functionality is still working for XBIL trades.

4 RRM Registration Process

The ACER explained how to start a registration of a third party as an RRM and guided participants step by step through the registration process. Special attention was given also to the digital certificates and problems that may occur if the criteria set out in the ACER’s ‘RRM Requirements’ document (Annex I, section 6) is not fulfilled.

5 AOB

It was proposed to have another meeting in July and that ACER would communicate the dates soon.

Day 2

(Chatham House Rules, no names in quotes during the meeting)

NAME	ORGANISATION
Tomaž Vižintin	ACER
Elio Zammuto	ACER
Iztok Zlatac	ACER
Arthur De-Graft	APX
Tomaž Paljk	BSP SOUTHPOOL
Mathias Ponnwitz	EEX
Filip Sleeuwagen	EFETnet
Tzvetelina Tzankova (observer)	Elcom
Isabelle Parent	EPEX SPOT
Alexander Thuma	EXAA
Nik Kakoullis	GFI
Eleonora Nagali	GME
Steve Banks	Griffin Markets Group Limited
Jorge Fernández Gómez	Iberian Gas Hub
Evi Samonaki	LAGIE S.A.
Glenn Channon	Marex Spectron
Peter Frampton	Ofgem
Mario del Barrio Rodríguez	OMIE
Jozef Drgoňa	on behalf of OKTE
Derek Willis	on behalf of the London Energy Brokers Association
Andrea Stejskalova	OTE
Piotr Skoczylas	POLPX
Grzegorz Szpecht	POLPX
Steven Clark	Tradition
Stefan Giemza	Tullett Prebon

1 OMP Registration

ACER presented a brief overview of the Organised market place registration and presented how future updates and notifications of the list are going to be presented to the general public. There were no comments on proposed process of updating the list.

One participant of the roundtable suggested expanding the list to include which Market Participants are registered to trade at each individual Organised market place.

2 List of Standard Contracts

First, the process and the milestones were presented. The purpose of the list was explained and discussed. Then, the questions and answers were discussed based on the input given by the meeting participants prior to the meeting.

Special attention was given to:

- The naming convention of the listed standard contracts
- Delivery zone definition for spreads, swaps

Issues to be addressed in the process:

- Further generalisation of the naming convention
- ACER should give feedback on the update of the list (two way communication)
- Frequency of the updates after the start of transaction reporting were discussed (every day, intraday, based on the change)

Additional questions addressed:

- Question on list exchange format: Currently the xls format is accepted, in future the format will be xml. The schema should be published soon. The stakeholders need time to implement the process in the system.
- Question on OMP ID: Which ID type do we use if we are not MPs or RRM? (request LEI od MIC)
- Question on no-defined delivery zones: For the time being leave the field empty - further discussion needed.

ACER agreed to send the presentation to the participants by the end of day.

3 Planning Ahead

ACER informed the participants that will create a page on the REMIT portal where market participants can find the following documents:

- Excel spreadsheet will all the trading examples created so far

- Excel spreadsheet template for presenting new cases to ACER
- New draft schema: updated version of V1 which include the above mentioned amendments
- Final version of the Excel spreadsheet with the mapping between Table 1 of the Implementing Acts and the Schema
- Individual XML files for each example published in the Annex to the TRUM
- We will study a solution to publish the Q&A on transaction reporting so that all interested parties have final answers at the same time
- The timeline depends on ACER workload

Given the workload, ACER does not envisage to address any other questions until we address those already received so far.

4 AOB

It was proposed to have another meeting in July and that ACER would communicate the dates soon.