Market Coupling Consultative Group Webinar

Q&A
22.10.2026

MCSC

PRIVATE

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** - XBID 5.0 Update	Vladimír Satek (SIDC QARM)	09:10 – 09:30 (20 min)
3	**15-Minute MTU: One Year After Go-Live** - Statistics on Algorithm - Scalability Report	Joël Hoeksema (PCR ALG)	09:30 – 09:50 (20 min)
4	**SDAC Fallback Improvements** - Main Takeaways from the 14/10 PCG WS - Update on Assessment of Fallback Options - Update on Volume Allocations - Information on Upcoming Training Sessions	Karol Nicia (MCCG) Lara Visone, Gergő Holló (FEG) Darija Sinovčić (Core OPSCOM) Miloš Tomić (SDAC OPSCOM)	09:50 – 10:50 (60 min)
5	**30 Min IDCZGCT Updates**	Gergő Holló (30 min IDCZGCT SPoC)	10:50 – 11:00 (10 min)
	Break		**11:00 – 11:10**
6	**SDAC Storage Orders**	Marja Eronen (SDAC MSD)	11:10 – 11:40 (30 min)
7	**IT Infrastructure Assessment**	Jan Rönnback (ITA TF)	11:40 – 12:00 (20 min)
8	**SDAC-SIDC Roadmap and Key Projects** - Overview of Activities	André Estermann (MCSC Co-Chairs)	12:00 – 12:10 (10 min)
9	**Update on Consultations** - SDAC Project Methodology - Algorithm Methodology Update for the IDAs-FB Incorporation	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
12	22/10/2026	G.HOLLO	For 30 Min IDCZGCT: Clarify if technical limitations on certain interconnectors will limit implementation beyond 2029.	Q2 2027

1. Welcome & Introduction

2. SIDC Corrective Measures

Q&A

- Q: Hi, so at the end will the PTS modification be implemented or not? I thought it was planned in October. What is preventing it to be implemented? Thanks
- A: PTS has been agreed and approved as a corrective measure and has been available for application since 1 October. However, it will only be applied if the system experiences performance degradation. At the present, the system is far from such a critical situation, and the algorithm continues to perform very well.

- Q: Could you confirm which corrective measures have ultimately been validated?
- A: PTS modification is the first and only CM that has been marked as eligible and that will be available once procedures have been finalized. It is expected that the procedures will be finalized within the next month. In parallel, OBK depth as CM will continue to be investigated.

- Q: What about the latency of the order execution report? According to detailed measurements this latency doubled on all exchanges since xbid v5.
- A: Based on our preliminary discussion, it is not clear where the issue of doubled latency is coming from. In any case we are happy to analyze it but we need more detailed information such as in which period you observed the issue, what periods were used for comparison of XBID version 5.0 and previous releases, in which NEMO Local Trading Solution(s) the observation was made. We would also need to understand what is meant by "all exchanges" e.g. is it the same Market participant that is trading in all LTSs at the same time and encounters the issue?

- Q: The CM framework addresses degradation over several days and provides one week's advance notice. Which separate emergency procedures apply to an incident developing within minutes, particularly near gate closure? Who can activate them, and what are the maximum detection, decision and recovery times?
- A: First, incidents caused by performance need to be considered separately. In case an issue causes the system to collapse, this is considered an incident. In this case, established procedures exist to resolve the issue as soon as possible. In case of the

performance degradation, this situation applies for long-term observation. As such, different decisions/action plans applies.

- A: CMs are intended to proactively mitigate/avoid incidents.
- A: The framework that was presented is meant to support the systems' continued operation when in a relatively small period of time technical limits are reached before further software and hardware updates are provided.

- Q: Does the proposed depth reduction affect only published market data, or also orders available for matching? What evidence shows that it preserves execution quality, price discovery and participants' ability to assess the cost of covering large positions in smaller bidding zones?
- A: It does not affect orders available for matching, only visibility. We have not conducted any formal analysis on OBK depth effect on price discovery, etc.

3. 15-Minute MTU: One Year After Go-Live

Q&A

- Q: For the time to first solution, what is the regular time to comply with the existing publication results deadline?
- A: Currently 30 minutes of calculation time is reserved for EUPHEMIA in SDAC. So, if a first solution is found before, the publication deadline is not impacted.

- Q: Does better performance of the fastest first solution from parallel Euphemia calculations mean that risk of decoupling is mitigated compared to a higher TTFS?
- A: Having multiple parallel calculations increases the probability that at least one returns a solution within the available calculation at least before the decoupling deadline. So, this should contribute to reducing the decoupling risk for EUPHEMIA related issues. As long as the TTFS stay below the allocated calculation time (currently 30 minutes for SDAC), there is no mitigation to be done, and we benefit from the parallel calculations by selecting the solution that obtained the highest social economic welfare.

- Q: On the TTFS graph, what would be an alert threshold? A critical threshold? Same question for the block orders: what are the limits / thresholds?
- A: Also see the SDAC Corrective Measures: [LINK]. Thresholds from this procedure are: Case 1) TTFS > 85% of the allocated calculation time for 3 days in the last 7 days. Case 2) TTFS > 150% of the allocated calculation time for 2 days in the last 7 days. Where the "allocated calculation time" currently is 30 minutes. For the block orders, the limits are the numbers from the most complex successful scalability scenario: [LINK, page 17]. Mind that if these thresholds are exceeded, but the TTFS is not breaching its thresholds, the CM procedure will not be activated. The TTFS thresholds are leading in this process.

- Q: What are the metrics for average pre and post go-live TTFS? And then the added time when AHC was introduced?

- A: If we start from 15 May until 10 June (27 days), and compare it with 11 June until 7 July (also 27 days) we have:
  - pre-Core AHC: 4 min 47s
  - post-Core AHC: 5 min 48s

- Q: Do you investigate specific moments of longer TTFS times? Do you have an indication what caused some of the spikes in TTFS times that are visible in the graph?
- A: Throughout its calculations, EUPHEMIA keeps track of any anomalous behaviour. If such behaviour is detected (not necessarily impacting the market coupling session), this is flagged for follow up towards the algorithm provider. Finding solutions after the allocated 30 minutes calculation time is one of the conditions that is considered "anomalous", but there are others too, typically having to do with numerical challenges in some of the different steps of the calculation. Many of them are considered benign and may only impact configurational changes for future EUPHEMIA releases. Others may trigger developmental changes. Where needed, the algorithm provider proposes mitigations. E.g. shortly after the 15'MTU introduction EUPHEMIA suffered from more numerical issues where solutions failed to meet our (strict) tolerances, which wasted EUPHEMIA to spend time improving solutions. This eventually led to an increase in tolerances that mitigated some of those earlier spikes.

- Q: Does better performance of the fastest first solution from parallel Euphemia calculations mean that risk of decoupling is mitigated compared to a higher TTFS?
- A: Having parallel calculations indeed mitigates decoupling risks to some extent. But it does not remove this risk. A distinction between the first and the best solution is made. It may be that the first solution does not represent the best solution. What is monitored is the fastest TTFS. Subsequently, defined thresholds are applied to measures against the solution to predict issues moving forward. This is then used to determine if CM needs to be activated in the day-ahead.

4. SDAC Fallback Improvements

Q&A

- Q: What immediate, tested fallback protects Croatia if a sole shipping agent/NEMO fails during drought, congestion and thin liquidity? Can MCSC demonstrate failure containment, backup activation and access to available cross-border energy, including in the next decoupling exercise?
- A: With the go-live of the Slovenian MNA, Croatia (Cropex as a sole NEMO) now has two shipping arraignments: Cropex_HR - Cropex_SI on the HR-SI border and Cropex_HR - MAVIR on the HR-HU border. In case of the partial decoupling of Cropex, local rules apply (local auction with shadow auction on the borders). This shall be changed with the go-live of the Croatian MNA, with more NEMOs being active in the Croatian BZ, thus having multiple shipping arraignments and the Volume Allocation for securing the single price within the BZ.

- Q: There has been some frustration regarding the timeline. MPs would appreciate more transparency on the progress. Could you provide a clearer overview?
- A: NEMOs and TSOs presented the identified options and their assessment to ACER during the PCG Workshop on 14/10/2026. It was agreed that the future work will focus on the removal of possible price multiplicity in case of full decoupling or partial decoupling of all NEMOs in a dedicated bidding zone. This work is ongoing and NEMOs and TSOs will provide an update on this work during the next MCCG.

- Q: Will there be a new consultation for MPs? Would be good for us to be able to provide our views, particularly on options #1 and #2. I think option #3 has been consulted and rejected by MPs.
- A: Indeed, it is foreseen that there will be additional consultation with MPs on options #1 and #2. It is expected that before any decision is made, the details will be presented and consultation with MPs will be conducted to receive feedback.

- Q: As Max already explained how do you see Market participants react content wise on the 2 options supplied?
- A: NEMOs and TSOs plan to finalize the concept that is focusing only on the removal of possible price multiplicity in case of full decoupling or partial decoupling of all NEMOs in a dedicated bidding zone. Once this concept is finalized, it will be consulted with market participants.

- Q: Before SIDC continuous trading is selected as the fallback, will MCSC demonstrate its independence from the cause of the SDAC failure and test simultaneous SDAC/SIDC disruption? If SIDC is unavailable, or cannot clear sufficient volumes, what is the next operational fallback and who activates it?
- A: It must be highlighted that there are already multiple fallback processes implemented in SDAC, full decoupling is the very last measure which never happened before. Nevertheless, there are processes already today in practice for the full decoupling, these are described in detail in the Fallback Manual (it is available both on the websites of NEMO Committee and ENTSO-E). Considering the status of the discussion, there is no consideration of using SIDC as fallback to clear SDAC volumes, i.e. to solve the price multiplicity issue in Core MNA bidding zones. If both SDAC and SIDC are fully unavailable, then there is no organized market at the moment that could work as fallback.

- Q: The fallback comparison excludes external Core borders, while the June exercise exposed difficulties particularly there. Who owns fallback assessment for Core's eastern and SE interfaces, how will allocation, nomination and reopening procedures remain consistent with the internal Core solution?
- A: The current focus is to find a solution that avoids price multiplicity in Core MNA bidding zones. This means that no broader changes are discussed currently where e.g. nomination deadlines are affected.

- Q: Partial decoupling: MPs have raised concerns about reopening of order books after SDAC price publication, which risks affecting the effectiveness of the partial decoupling fallback. Can the MCSC explain why this feature exists and whether dropping it is still under consideration?

- A. The rationale for allowing Volume Allocation (VA) requests to remain open after SDAC price publication is to give market participants sufficient time to respond to a partial decoupling, assess their position and explicitly confirm their participation in VA. Closing requests before price publication may significantly shorten this window and create operational difficulties for participants.

- Q: Do the daily pre-checks test only order-book generation, or also clearing, shipping, nomination and post-coupling interfaces? If one component fails after a successful check, can the affected participant or service be isolated while the bidding zone and unaffected borders remain coupled?
- A: In terms of pre-checks, the current focus is on the OBK generation. This is because, it was identified to be one of the causes leading to partial decoupling in the past. For clearing, shipping, nomination, and post-coupling, these checks are primarily governed by local rules, meaning local solutions apply.

- Q: In the Volume Allocation slide, it is stated that CROPEX will introduce it with Croatian MNA, so does that mean that they don't have this solution in place in Slovenia where MNA is already active?
- A: CROPEX does not currently have a Volume Allocation solution active in Slovenia. As indicated in the slide, CROPEX plans to introduce Volume Allocation with the implementation of the Croatian MNA.

- Q: If SDAC fails during drought and cross-border congestion, how will the fallback work where intraday liquidity is insufficient to replace missing day-ahead purchases?
- A: The European system is very extensive, and SDAC failures are very rare. However, in case of failure or market limitation on one bidding area, other bidding zones will cover the shortcomings. The fallback options that are being investigated seek to cover the specific scenarios.

5. 30 Min IDCZGCT Updates

Q&A

- Q: Will the technical limitations of certain interconnectors limit implementation beyond 2029?
- A: Information will be provided at a later stage when there is more visibility on how the planned developments are going.

- Q: On GCT CZ and within BZ: Does listing of e.g. 60 Min before mean continually, thus for example delivery 22:45-23:00 closing for trade at 21:45 CET or is in in some cases still meaning 21:00 CET?
- A: Indeed, the gate closure time means that trading is closed either 60 or 30 minutes before the delivery for that dedicated contract. Taking the example of the 15-min contract for 22:45-23:00, if the GCT is 60min., then trading is not possible for this contract after 21:45.

6. SDAC Storage Orders

Q&A

- Q: Is the go-live of storage products still planned for Q4 2027?
- A: Yes. However, this will depend on the algorithm performance and the release cycle (if adjusted). It might be that the go-live will be delayed until early 2028.

- Q: How much additional time would the rollout of individual NEMOs take considering that the Storage Orders are an optional product?
- A: This will depend on the local trading system development of each NEMO. This is to be clarified at a later stage.

- Q: Could NEMOs confirm whether the basket functionality is still part of the Storage Order design below the minimum power threshold and indicate the threshold considered?
- A: Since the final simulations are being performed now, we don't have a final answer yet about the minimum threshold and/or basket functionality that will be used. This will be included in the final design in the coming months.

- Q: "Maximum charged energy over the whole day (one per order, MWh)" - is this not quite different from "Minimum charged and minimum discharged energy per period", as it does not allow to reflect i.e. balancing market / capacity market requirements that are period-specific?
- A: Parameters "Maximum charged and maximum discharged energy over the whole day" are intended to limit the overall cycles of the storage asset over the whole day. Regarding the period-specific parameters that are available, MPs can make use of the following parameters which can differ based on the needs for each period: "Maximum energy stored" (maximum capacity of the asset in MWh in each period), "Maximum input and Maximum output power" (limiting the charged/discharged energy for each period, also 0 can be entered for some periods to reflect the need to use the asset in some periods in other markets), "Minimum energy stored" (minimum amount of energy to be kept in the asset in each period), additionally "Charging and Discharging costs" defined for each period could be also used to represent for the different costs associated in each period. Please also note that storage order does not need to be provided with the full capacity of the MPs storage asset.

- Q: If baskets are retained, how will material differences between aggregated assets, notably in State of Charge, storage duration, maximum number of cycles and cycle usage status, be taken into account?
- A: If baskets are offered, MPs would choose from a predefined list of values of all parameters and only the orders from the same basket (i.e. orders with all the exact same parameters, only the charging and discharging power could be entered freely by MPs) would be aggregated. It would be up to individual NEMOs to offer the baskets *(Note: that it is still TBD also considering the value of the minimum threshold)*.

- Q: Can MP participate in validation using realistic pump-storage HPP operating constraints?
- A: It was supposed to be provided in the public consultation already held (in June-July 2026), now the inputs for the simulations are already finalized.

- Q: Since minimum operating durations, transition times and ramping constraints are excluded from the proposed storage-order design, how can MP represent technically feasible pumped-storage schedules without creating costly intraday corrections?
- A: MPs can make use of the largest available granularity of the storage order, namely the 60' storage order (depending on the individual NEMO product granularity offering). In that case, all parameters defined on per-period basis are to be specified only for each 60' interval. The resulting charging and discharging energy profiles can only change between consecutive 60' periods, considering the constraints given by the input parameters. Additionally, MPs can use all the available parameters to achieve the intended outcomes: Maximum charged and discharged energy over the whole day (limiting the overall charged and discharged energy), Minimum energy stored defined for each period (minimum amount of energy to be kept in the asset in each period), Maximum output and input power defined for each period (limiting the charged/discharged energy for each period, also 0 can be entered for some periods), Maximum energy stored (MPs can adjust the maximum capacity that they want to offer to SDAC for each period, Note: storage order does not need to be provided with the full capacity of MPs' asset – this note is also relevant for other parameters), Starting energy stored (reflecting the initial state of the asset), and the remaining parameters like charging/discharging costs and end-of-day value could also be adjusted to achieve the intended outcomes.

7. IT Infrastructure Assessment

Q&A

- Q: Can a local IT failure be isolated while unaffected borders remain operational, avoiding unnecessary loss of import access for peripheral Core bidding zones?
- A: It is not known now if it is possible to isolate a local IT failure. But it is a good idea to measure the market impact of outages, if possible.
- A: The most important aspect is to develop the infrastructure in a manner that makes it as resilient as possible. However, it is important to highlight that the current infrastructure does not exist within a single system. Instead, there are multiple systems from multiple organizations. As such, it first needs to be defined what is considered a local IT failure in this regard. However, these considerations are being considered during the process of designing the infrastructure.

- Q: Will resilience tests cover simultaneous IT failure, low hydro output and scarce imports, including markets without a capacity mechanism and with limited replacement generation?

- A: During testing it is of course considered if issues are caused by an IT failure, market limitations, etc. Both can happen simultaneously but are assessed separately to deploy mechanisms that are relevant to mitigate the specific issue.

- Q: Who takes responsibility when the IT platform is restored but liquidity is still insufficient to cover demand? What escalation procedure connects market operators, TSOs and affected participants?
- A: Market platforms unavailability should not directly impact liquidity negatively. The aim is to ensure that market participants have a market to trade their assets and for their balance.

- Q: Will MP receive real-time incident alerts stating affected borders, valid trades, available fallback routes and expected recovery times, through a channel independent of the failed system?
- A: Currently nothing has been decided on this point as only the current state of the system has been assessed so far. Future scenarios are being investigated. Getting comprehensive data on the state of market coupling, auctions, decouplings, etc. across all market timeframes is currently a challenge that will also be of interest to MPs.

- Q: IT infrastructure: can you provide some examples of the most important pain points and what could be possible solutions?
- A: One paint point is related to implementation of a regional system. This is due to different data flows and data paths between local, regional, and central systems. This requires a lot of testing to facilitate and is costly to maintain also in the long term. As such, another important aspect is to future proof the performance of the central system, which is a reoccurring theme. One possible solution is to standardize/simplify the process to have less parties in the data flow. However, this needs to be done in a manner that solves actual issues without creating new single points of failure. As such, this is a balance between efficiency and preserving the resilience of the system.

- Q: Will the IT assessment measure recovery time and unfilled energy volumes for individual peripheral zones, rather than relying only on European platform availability averages?
- A: It is a good idea to measure outage in unfilled trading needs and the financial impact.

8. SDAC-SIDC Roadmap and Key Projects

Q&A

- Q: What measurable criteria would postpone a go-live if testing reveals weak fallback arrangements or unresolved risks for peripheral Core markets?
- A: The defined criteria are used to have a go/no-go decision for the go-lives. It is reported if there are minor, major, or sever impact in either MESC or MCCG. If a severe issue cannot be resolved, then there will be a go/no-go decision to go live and MPs will be informed accordingly.

- Q: What improvements will protect MPs during the transition while flow-based continuous trading remains under development and intraday liquidity is insufficient?
- A: It will be clarified during testing if there is a negative effect. It might also be that the opposite is true, e.g. looking at the increase in traded volumes since June of 2026. Once testing has been concluded, the course of action will be clarified.

- Q: Can you clarify the sequencing of flow-based IDA implementation shown on the roadmap and the Q4 2027 window mentioned on slide 55? Which dates should MPs use for planning?
- A: As indicated in the roadmap, the current flow-based IDA implementation is expected on Q4 2027. MPs will be contacted in the near future regarding the testing with MPs. This has not yet been fully communicated as the system is still being updated/prepared for said testing.

- Q: For each major release, what is the rollback plan if problems emerge after go-live, and how will valid trades, allocated capacity and nominations be preserved?
- A: Essentially, it is the same clause that has been applied for years. Historically, go-lives have been successful without issues for MPs. There may be an opportunity in the future to provide MPs with more insight into the specific rollback plans.

9. Update on Consultations

Q&A

- Q: Is the 40-minute SIDC suspension a maximum or an expected operating duration? What happens if an IDA calculation fails or exceeds this window?
- A: The timing is relevant for the entire 40-minute suspension period. In case there is a need to have an update on the exact timeline, then this will be communicated by the TSOs and NEMOs prior to the go- live. But for now, there is no change in the 40-minute suspension time. If IDA calculation fails exceeds this window, there are no defined fallback. Instead, the solution is to return it to continuous trading as an intraday trading mechanism.

- Q: How will IDA suspension periods interact with 30-minute cross-zonal gate closure? Could participants lose their last opportunity to correct positions for some delivery intervals?
- A: Considering the 30 min IDCZGCT and the requirement to have a minimum of time to trade, MPs will not lose their opportunity to correct their position. The same timings as are currently in production will be maintained.

- Q: If a flow-based IDA fails, when and how will capacity return to continuous trading, and how will participants know which orders and trades remain valid?
- A: In this case, if an IDA is canceled everything with it is cancelled. Therefore, all orders and trades are considered invalid in this case. In the case that is outlined, which has never happened before, capacity would return to continuous trading. When flow-based will be implemented in IDAs there will be interaction at TSOs system level, and

recalculation of capacity that needs to be transferred to IDA will be completed within the 40-minute window. To summarise, in the specific case, the market will reopen with the continuous trading capacity calculated by TSOs systems.

- Q: Does moving the SDAC publication deadline to 13:05 shorten subsequent fallback preparation time? Which downstream deadlines will be adjusted to preserve participants' response time?
- A: Based on the feedback received by MPs following the public consultation, the deadline is not moved and will remain at the same time.

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)