Market Coupling Consultative Group Webinar

Q&A
08.07.2026

MCSC

Agenda & Meeting Material

	TOPIC	PRESENTER	TIME
1	**Welcome & Introduction** - Welcome, Agenda and Action Points Review	Max Schneider, Karol Nicia, Andreas Papanaklis (MCCG)	09:00 – 09:10 (10 min)
2	**SIDC Corrective Measures**	Vladimír Satek (SIDC QARM)	09:10 – 09:40 (30 min)
3	**SDAC Fallback Improvements** - Main Takeaways From the 26/05 PCG WS - Update on Survey: Research Around the Fallback Concept for the SDAC - Volume Allocation: Overview of Implementation Timeline - Information on the 03/06 Training Session and Upcoming Training Sessions	Iwona Grude (ANDOA OPSCOM) Lara Visone, Gergő Holló (FEG) Hanna Blomfelt (Core NEMO) Milos Tomic (SDAC OPSCOM)	09:40 – 10:40 (60 min)
4	**30 Min IDCZGCT Updates**	Gergő Holló (30 min IDCZGCT SPoC)	10:40 – 10:50 (10 min)
	Break		10:50 – 11:00
5	**SDAC Storage Orders Public Consultation**	Timo Suhonen, Marja Eronen (SDAC MSD)	11:00 – 11:15 (15 min)
6	**Co-Optimisation R2 Update & View on 1st R&D Simulation Results**	Gerard Doorman (Co-opt SG)	11:15 – 11:40 (25 min)
7	**IT Infrastructure Study**	Jan Rönnback (ITA TF)	11:40 – 11:55 (15 min)
8	**SDAC-SIDC Roadmap and Key Projects** - MNAs Going Live in Q3/Q4 2026 - Flow-Based in Intraday	André Estermann (MCSC Co-Chair) Lara Visone, David Myška (SIDC MSD)	11:55 – 12:10 (15 min)
9	**Update on Consultations** - SDAC PM - AM update for the IDAs-FB incorporation	Chiara Vitelli, Christoforos Zoumas (NEMO Tech TF)	12:10 – 12:20 (10 min)
10	**AOB & Closure**	Max Schneider, Karol Nicia, Andreas Papanaklis (MCCG)	12:20 – 12:30 (10 min)

Meeting presentation: NEMO Committee website [LINK] and ENTSO-E website [LINK]

List of Actions

#	Date	Responsible	Description	Deadline/Status
11	04/03/2026	MCSC NEMOs	Provide clarity on the timeline and updated list of corrective measures under consideration for coordinated application.	MCCG 08/07/2026 - **Closed**

1. Welcome & Introduction

2. SIDC Corrective Measures

Q&A

- Q: Why did MPs never get results/information of the impact of the OB reduction from 100 to 50 orders (as started in Dec 2025)?
- A: The results were shared in the previous MCCG. It was shared that the result of the test in operation did not indicate any improvements. Therefore, it was decided to perform different testing with different test scenarios. Full OBK depth (100) was reinstalled.

- Q: What is the likelihood of activating a CM after the last XBID release on 11 June? Do you have any initial quantitative assessment?
- A: This is still being investigated. Measurements are still to be deployed to conduct a proper evaluation. However, no latency has been observed.

- Q: What is the OCC switch -off? What does it mean and what are the impacts?
- A: The OCC switch- off puts a certain generation of a family of files on hold. These files provide information about offered capacity evolution for publication on the transparency platform.

- Q: For OCC, does it mean we won't have capacity publication updated anymore?
- A: This is indeed the case if it is switched off for a certain period. In this case the information is not provided to the transparency platform. As such, the CMs may result in limitations in some instances.

- Q: I understood from the Status of Corrective Measures document that the OBK depth will be restored to 100 upon the XBID R5.0 go-live in June. However, the presentation mentions a second test on the Order Book Depth reduction planned for the end of the summer. How are these two developments related?
- A: Full OBK depth (100) has already been reinstalled and is in operation.

- Q: What is the impact of the different measures? It is the hope of MPs that the overarching document will provide transparency in general but especially on the monitoring thresholds. Additionally, transparency on the test results on OBK reduction and order management measures.

- A: All processes and details are expected to be provided to MPs in the document. The only thing missing is the result of the testing. If the testing indicates that certain CMs do not work or if the benefit is insignificant, then limited information will be provided and it will simply be stated that the added value is near zero for the specific CM.

- Q: Would the proposed downstream corrective measure impact the timely update of offered capacities for continuous allocation on the transparency platform?
- A: Offered capacity evolution updates are currently published on the Transparency Platform every 15 minutes. The publication includes all capacity updates. The proposed measure – when activated - is to publish, with the same frequency, only a snapshot of the currently available offered capacity instead of all individual updates. This snapshot would represent the offered capacity available at the exact time of the file generation and would not provide information on capacity changes or updates that occurred between consecutive publications. It should also be noted that the publication of the actual up-to-date capacity in the NEMOs' LTSs will not be affected by this measure.

3. SDAC Fallback Improvements

Q&A

- Q: How can we submit comments and proposals from the Market Parties on test scenarios and the overall process for SDAC Fallback Improvements?
- A: Market participants can submit comments and proposals via one of the three options: 1) via your association represented in MCCG (Eurelectric, mschneider@eurelectric.org, Energy Traders Europe, l.biglia@energytraderseurope.org), 2) directly via e-mail to: info@mcsc-communications.eu, or 3) via Slido during the MCCG Webinars.

- Q: Why would a shift in TSO nomination deadline be only possible in case of full decoupling? Should a shift in the deadline not also be used to prevent a decoupling?
- A: Shift of nomination deadlines happens gradually already today depending on the fallback situation which is linked to when the SDAC process is expected to end. WS2 investigates how the nomination deadline can be postponed providing more time for SDAC by postponing the full decoupling deadline. A shift in the full decoupling deadline provides/could provide more time to all the SDAC processes, leading to a (possible) postponement of the partial decoupling deadline as well.

- Q: During full decoupling testing on 03/06, JAO shadow auction results were only available at 16:17 when they should have been communicated by 16:00. What was the root cause of the results delay? Do we have assurances that JAO is ready for full decoupling?
- A: JAO testing system experienced issues during the test coupling session. The root cause is being investigated and proposals for solution/mitigation measures are being prepared by JAO for next member training (expected in Q3-Q4, 2026).

- Q: WS2: We still don’t understand why removing Shadow Auctions (SA) is mandatory to extend nominations deadline by 30min. What is the real reason behind this?
- A: The reason behind is that TSOs experienced in the past that in case of SAs they often receive low-quality cross-zonal nominations. In case of explicit allocation (including SAs) MPs need to provide matching pair of nominations on each side of the border. In case of SAs, TSOs observe mismatches which require a significant amount of time to resolve and fix. When the schedules come from a central system, these mismatches are not present, and this can reduce the time needed for completing the scheduling process on TSOs' side that needs to end before the strict deadline to start the network security processes.

- Q: Will any alternative market design option for a full decoupling fallback solution be publicly consulted on by NEMOs and TSOs with MPs, like the continuous trading option that closed on 17 April?
- A: The alignment is ongoing with NRAs and ACER on these options. NEMOs and TSOs will continue to inform MPs about this discussion. Further consultation is expected before any final decision on the modified fallback solution is taken.

- Q: What is meant by individual implementation by NEMOs?
- A: Volume allocations are implemented by NEMOs individually in the individual NEMO systems. This means that it can be implemented on different timelines.

- Q: Why did NEMOs not consult MPs for the operational implementation of volume allocation for partial decoupling? If implemented for full decoupling as well, NEMOs need to consult MPs to discuss timelines, responsibilities etc.
- A: The principle has already been presented in various forums. MPs are always welcome to submit comments and suggestions via official channels (Associations, MCSC email, and during MCCG events via Slido).

- Q: Why not taking the OTC price (traded in the morning) instead of the historic average (or at least to take a part of OTC price) in the SDAC reference price?
- A: This will depend on an assessment of which options would be the most reliable representation of the SDAC price in case of SDAC auction failure.

- Q: How do the different options for a full decoupling fallback compare when it comes to the allocation of cross-zonal capacity, to volume clearing, and to ensuring a single and reliable price in the SDAC? MPs request that more information is provided to clarify this once NEMOs and TSOs have established a common position. This should be included in a consultation with MPs.
- A: The three different aspects are already described included in the MCCG session file In case a consultation is launched, all the options will be described in a way that is understandable to market participants.

- Q: WS2: Do the proposals for Fallback address the quality of nominations? It is still not understood how removing SA will improve nominations.
- A: The fallback proposal does not simply propose to remove SAs but to replace the capacity allocation process from an explicit process where MPs must provide the

nominations to an implicit process (IDCT) where this happens in a centralized way. The centralized scheduling process leads to fewer mistakes and faster processing which enables the reduction of the needed time window.

- Q: TSOs generally regard the transition from explicit to implicit nominations as an improvement in terms of automation and processing efficiency. However, implicit nominations do not inherently improve the quality of the underlying nomination data. In cases where clearing results are non-representative, forecast accuracy may not improve, despite faster processing. Market Participants are concerned that the volumes cleared may not accurately reflect the volumes that would have been cleared within the same timeframe under comparable conditions. On what basis do TSOs assess that the quality and representativeness of nominations improve through the implementation of implicit nominations?
- A: For the cross-zonal scheduling process the most important quality measure for TSOs is the mismatches because these should be resolved on short notice to provide reliable and correct data for the subsequent processes. This process could be time-consuming in case TSOs must consult multiple parties to fix the errors. Nevertheless, it is of course very important to choose a fallback solution where the results are representative for the next day. This is why TSOs and NEMOs initiated a consultation with MPs and keep aligning on the future solution.

4. 30 Min IDCZGCT Updates

Q&A

- Q: For IDCZGCT and the graph on the top left, which borders does this graph cover?
- A: It covers all the borders and delivery areas. Only the bottom graph differentiates between delivery areas.

- Q: Will there still be a regional phase in Germany, given the extension of cross-border trades? For example, when NL and DE decouple will the 4 DE zones decouple as well?
- A: If the question refers to the gate closure time between the German scheduling areas, then it has not changed and remained T-30 minute. This means that after T-30, trading is only possible within the relevant scheduling area in Germany therefore there is no regional phase anymore. On the other hand, local trading is still open in the scheduling areas up until 5 minutes before real time. For further details please check the local trading and nomination rules.

- Q: Do we have an indication why is Belgium requesting a derogation despite the lack of local liquidity?
- A: Detailed reasoning can be provided by the individual TSOs, but in many cases the derogation request is published on the TSO's website. Furthermore, there is a detailed border-based overview where the links to the derogation approvals are collected. This could also help to understand the reasons behind the derogation. You can find the latest version of this document here [LINK].

5. SDAC Storage Orders Public Consultation

Q&A

- Q: Could you remind us where the need for the new storage product comes from? Is it single MPs, associations, TSOs, or others?
- A: The original request originated from a single MP. NEMOs and TSOs ultimately decided to include this in the R&D process. Subsequently, other MPs started to share similar requests to have storage orders in the DA market. As such, it started as a DA product, which is also the reason why the efforts are focused on delivering storage orders as a DA product.

- Q: Have MCSC performed analysis on the algorithmic performance impact that the storage order would have? MPs would appreciate transparency on the expected impacts (positive and negative).
- A: From an SDAC MSD point of view, the group is not defining the products that individual NEMOs are offering to the MPs. Considering the overall technical implementation, MSD has no plans, or proposal, to remove anything from the product methodology. Storage orders are meant as a new addition. It is expected that the update of the product methodology in collaboration with NEMOs will begin after the summer break.
- A: Regarding the impact on the algorithmic performance, some impact on the performance aggregation has been observed during simulations. However, it is the position of MSD that this impact is tolerable and should not affect the market coupling timeframes. However, the level of aggregation will have an impact on the market coupling system performance. Therefore, the correct balance between the level of aggregation compared to the performance impact is currently being investigated. This requires input from MPs and is partly the reason for the ongoing consultation.

- Q: Should the storage order trigger corrective measures, is it the first measure to remove storage orders?
- A: Corrective measures are selected based on the analysis of the performance issue. If it is determined that a storage order needs to be removed to restore performance, then they will be removed.

6. Co-optimisation R2 Update & View on 1st R&D Simulation Results

Q&A

- Q: Have you tested, on the small system, market products as diversified as the ones that we have today in Euphemia? Particularly block bids. Also, in December 2025 (in the R1 report) you planned to consult MP on the R2 report, will we have such a consultation even with a delay?

- A: So far, block bids for the integrated balance capacity and energy bids have not been utilized. Instead, a new product linking MTUs has been used.
- A: Historical data has been taken from production, meaning all order types used in that region for DA market are included. Feedback from market participants is expected via webinars (end of 2026- early 2027), no dedicated consultation process for R2 is planned at this stage.

- Q: Considering the "outstanding challenges" to which point are you confident to obtain an efficient tool that doesn't diminish the bid diversity, the total welfare and that allows the MP to express their costs and constraints as well as the current market design? Do you have a fallback design option?
- A: Firstly, for market participants that do not have bid balancing capacity, the bid diversity will remain the same as today, or possibly enhanced, e.g. by the introduction of scheduling order groups and increased opportunities for bid linking. When it comes to co-optimisation, a key question of the R&D track is to find bid designs that allow for efficient representation of costs and correct pricing principles to ensure optimal outcomes. At the same time, algorithmic performance and system functioning cannot be compromised. No final conclusions on the design, system or set-up can presently be made.

7. IT Infrastructure Study

Q&A

- No questions posted during event

8. SDAC-SIDC Roadmap and Key Projects

Q&A

- Q: For the FB IDA testing, could you please provide more time between the member testing and the go-live? It says 1 month but MPs need more time between testing and go -live.
- A: The roadmap and planning are ambitious. There is pressure from regulators to deliver. As such, delays in go-live are not acceptable. Therefore, the testing cannot be delayed.

9. Update on Consultations

Q&A

- No questions posted during event

10. AOB and Closure

11. Annex

Abbreviation	Abbreviation for
ACER	Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators
AM	Algorithm Methodology
BE	Balancing Energy
BZ	Bidding Zone
CC	Capacity Calculation
CCR	Capacity Calculation Region
CM	Corrective Measure
CT	Continuous Trading (context: SIDC-CT)
DACC	Day-Ahead Capacity Calculation
Go-live	The date when a new process/system becomes operational
HMMCP	Harmonised Maximum and Minimum Clearing Prices
IDA	Intraday Auction
IDCC	Intraday Capacity Calculation
IDCZGCT	Intraday Cross-Zonal Gate Closure Time
IGCT	Intraday Gate Closure Time
LTS	Local Trading System
MCCG	Market Coupling Consultative Group
MCSC	Market Coupling Steering Committee
MNA	Multi-NEMO Arrangement
MP	Market Participant
MTU	Market Time Unit
NEMO	Nominated Electricity Market Operator
NRA	National Regulatory Authority
OBK	Orderbook (context: Orderbook Depth)
OPSCOM	Operations Committee (context: SDAC OPSCOM, SIDC OPSCOM)
POM	Performance Optimisation Measure
QARM	Quality Assurance and Release Management (context: SIDC QARM)
R&D	Research and Development
RfC	Request for Change
SDAC	Single Day-Ahead Coupling
SIDC	Single Intraday Coupling
SLA	Service Level Agreement
TF	Task Force (context: NEMO Tech TF)
TSO	Transmission System Operator
TTFS	Time To First Solution
WS	Workstream
XBID	Cross-Border Intraday (European intraday electricity trading platform)