

Febeliec answer to the Terms of Reference of the Elia Task Force Scenarios

While Febeliec in essence has no objections to the objectives of the Elia Task Force Scenarios, to co-create storyline and scenarios for electrical demand and supply to be used in studies performed by Elia, it does have a range of comments to the terms of reference of this task force as well as the decision on and application of the results and outcomes of this task force. In general, Febeliec wants to stress that at this point it is still unclear how the task force and its members and membership will be managed, how decisions will be taken and how the final report will be validated and used.

- Febeliec notices that Elia is asking stakeholders to provide evidence based data, and wonders that this means that Elia itself will also be providing (quantitative) evidence based data for all its studies. In any case, it is not possible neither for Elia, nor for stakeholders to provide evidence based data for anything taking place in the future.
- Febeliec takes note that Elia is referring to long term storylines and wonders how these will be developed and how many and which variations will be included, although this of course could be exactly the role of the task force itself.
- Febeliec can only support the wish of Elia to increase stakeholder participation, transparency and improve coherence, improve data quality and increase efficiency, and of course comply with (European) legislation, but wonders whether this implies that these goals were not yet at the centre of Elia's analyses, as Elia several times mentioned it would take into account the recent European legislation "as much as possible"?
- On the composition of the task force itself, Febeliec takes note that Elia refers to a "balanced composition", yet it is unclear who will determine whether the composition is balanced (and balanced compared to which benchmark) and who will guarantee that such balance is maintained. It is also unclear to what extent this includes external consultants, interested individual persons, foreign participation, other governmental levels (regional or European), ... Febeliec insists that this point is further elaborated, towards accreditation of participants.
- Concerning the (annual) process, Febeliec takes note that Elia states that "*the recurrence of long term scenario creation will be linked to the recurrence of studies depending on these scenarios, whereas an updated quantification of the short term scenarios will be in scope every year*", but does not understand how this for example links to the yearly CRM process, which has to look at least towards the medium long term as it envisages auctions more than four years in the future with contracts potentially granted for a period of 15 years, thus looking forward at least 20 years in order to have a full picture.
- On the decisions making process for the delivery of the Belgian scenario report, Febeliec would like to better understand how Elia intends to organise the decision making process towards such (draft) report to be put forward for public consultation. Febeliec takes note that Elia indicates that after consultation, a final report will be drafted by Elia (and decided by Elia, without any further involvement of other actors?), where Elia will clarify "*for the sake of transparency and future reference*" "*whether the **data** was achieved though consensus or dissension*" but not on the selected scenario(s) themselves. In general, Febeliec insists that the decision making process is much more extensively described, including on how Elia wishes to treat the comments from the different stakeholders, also linked to the comment on the composition of the task force and the weight that is attributed to the different participants.
- On the meetings, meeting dates and agendas should be announced sufficiently long in advance, and in any case much sooner than one week before, in order to allow participants to organise participation as well as provide any potential relevant input or topic experts. In

any case is the last bullet of point 6 of the terms of reference unacceptable for Febeliec, in particular the second part. Indeed, Febeliec insists on the importance of working towards consensus in the future Task Force, which requires open discussions and exchange of arguments, of course always with respect for stakeholders expressing diverging opinions. Febeliec also wonders how the chairman will ensure that the guidelines are respected, as it is unclear how the task force will be governed and which powers the president will have.