

Corrigendum

of 22 December 2020

to Decision No 25/2020 of the European Union Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators of 23 October 2020 on sharing costs incurred to ensure firmness and remuneration of long-term transmission rights

On page 2, in Recital (3):

for: ‘Accordingly, on 23 April 2020, all TSOs submitted to ACER ‘All TSOs’ Proposal for sharing costs incurred to ensure firmness and remuneration of long-term transmission rights (FRC) methodology in accordance with Article 61 of the Commission Regulation (EU) 2016/1719 of 26 September 2016’ (hereinafter referred to as the ‘Proposal’).

read: ‘Accordingly, on 23 April 2020, ENTSO-E submitted ‘on behalf of all TSOs’ (i.e. the TSOs listed in Article 2 of this Decision) to ACER an ‘All TSOs’ Proposal for sharing costs incurred to ensure firmness and remuneration of long-term transmission rights (FRC) methodology in accordance with Article 61 of the Commission Regulation (EU) 2016/1719 of 26 September 2016’ (hereinafter referred to as the ‘Proposal’).¹

On page 4, in Recital (12):

for: ‘Accordingly, on 23 April 2020, all TSOs submitted the Proposal to ACER for revision and approval, thereby making ACER competent to adopt a decision in that respect.’

read: ‘Accordingly, on 23 April 2020, all TSOs represented by ENTSO-E submitted the Proposal to ACER for revision and approval, thereby making ACER competent to adopt a decision in that respect.’²

On page 4, in Recital (14):

for: ‘All issues described in this decision were consulted with all regulatory authorities and all TSOs as stated in Recital (8) above.’

¹ Decision No 25/2020 approves the proposal of 23 April 2020 for a methodology for sharing costs incurred to ensure firmness and remuneration of long-term transmission rights in accordance with Article 61 of Commission Regulation (EU) 2016/1719, which TSOs submitted to ACER for approval. Baltic Cable AB was not among the TSOs which submitted this proposal, or on whose behalf this proposal was submitted, to ACER for approval. By email of 13 December 2020, Baltic Cable AB pointed out to ACER that ‘the FRCM proposal as consulted by ACER was not submitted on behalf of Baltic Cable AB’ and that ‘[h]owever, Art. 2 of the ACER Decision approving the FRCM lists Baltic Cable AB as an explicit addressee of the FRCM’. Indeed, ACER does not consider Baltic Cable AB as an addressee of its Decision No 25/2020.

² See footnote 1.

read: ‘All issues described in this decision were consulted with all regulatory authorities and all submitting TSOs as stated in Recital (8) above.’³

On page 5, in Recital (18):

for: ‘ACER initiated a hearing phase on 31 August 2020 by providing all TSOs and all regulatory authorities with a near final draft of Annex I to this Decision, as well as the reasoning for the introduced changes.’

read: ‘ACER initiated a hearing phase on 31 August 2020 by providing all submitting TSOs and all regulatory authorities with a near final draft of Annex I to this Decision, as well as the reasoning for the introduced changes.’⁴

On page 13, in Article 2:

for: ‘This Decision is addressed to all TSOs:’

read: ‘This Decision is addressed to the following TSOs:’⁵

On page 13, in Article 2:

The name ‘Baltic cable AB’ is deleted⁶.

³ See footnote 1.

⁴ See footnote 1.

⁵ See footnote 1.

⁶ See footnote 1.