

Technical support to the Energy Community and its Secretariat to assess the candidate Projects of Energy Community Interest in electricity, smart gas grids, hydrogen, electrolysers, and carbon dioxide transport and storage, in line with the EU Regulation 2022/869

- Cost-benefit analysis (CBA 4.0) an<mark>d Multi-criteria analysis (MCA) -</mark>

TEN-E (PECI) Groups meeting – 4th meeting of the "Electricity" Group

19 June 2024

Contents



- 1. Cost-benefit analysis (CBA 4.0)
- 2. Multi-criteria analysis (MCA)



TEN-E Regulation specific criteria for project assessment

According to the **TEN-E Regulation**, the PECI eligible candidates falling under **electricity transmission**, distribution and **energy storage** infrastructure categories shall contribute:

• **significantly to sustainability** through the integration of renewable energy into the grid, the transmission or distribution of renewable generation to major consumption centers and storage sites, and to reducing energy curtailment, where applicable,

and to at least one of the specific criteria:

- **market integration**, including through lifting the isolation of at least one CPs and reducing energy infrastructure bottlenecks, competition, interoperability and system flexibility,
- **security of supply**, including through interoperability, system flexibility, cybersecurity, appropriate connections and secure and reliable system operation.



Methodologies for project assessment

- Relevant methodologies for assessment of overhead high-voltage transmission lines and energy storage projects (according to Article 11(1) and Article 11(8) of the TEN-E Regulation as adopted in the Energy Community)
 - CBA Methodology of the ENTSO-E (applied for the OH transmission lines projects)
 ✓ 4th ENTSO-E Guideline for Cost-Benefit Analysis of Grid Development Projects, April 2024
 - Methodology developed by the European Commission (applied to the energy storage project)
 - ✓ Harmonised system-wide cost-benefit analysis for candidate energy storage projects, May 2023
- The methodology which is also considered in the PECI selection process is the one developed by the EU Commission and agreed/used by the respective groups in the 2023 PCI/PMI process at the EU level:
 - Methodology for assessing the electricity and offshore infrastructure candidate PCI and PMI 1st Union PCI-PMI list 2023, June 2023



- The 4th ENTSO-E Guideline for the CBA of Grid Development Projects was prepared by ENTSO-E in compliance with the requirements of the TEN-E Regulation
- The Guideline is the 4th version of the document produced by ENTSO-E and is built upon the 3rd CBA Guideline, which was the result of an extensive consultation process
- It describes the common principles and procedures for performing the analysis of costs and benefits for projects using network and market simulation methodologies
- A multi-criteria approach is used to describe the indicators associated with each project
- To ensure a full assessment of all transmission benefits, some of the indicators are monetised, whereas others are quantified in their typical physical units (i. e. tons or GWh)



General approach

	Scenarios	Study horizons	Modelling framework	Sensitivities
	Based on the TEN-E	Mid-term horizon (typically 5 to 10 years)	Market simulations	Sensitivity analysis should be conducted to increase the validity of CBA results
	Regulation, scenarios have to be used for the	Long-term horizon (typically 10 to 20 years)	Network simulations	
ca	calculation of CBA	Very long-term horizon (typically 30 to 40 years)	Redispatch simulations	
EIHP				



General assumptions for project assessment

- Net Present Value (NPV) or Benefit-to-Cost Ratio (BCR) are used to determine the viability of an investment
- Assessment period: 25 years
- A common discount rate: **4%**
- The benefits are accounted from the first year after commissioning
- To evaluate projects on a common basis, benefits should be aggregated across the years, as follows:
 - For years from the first year after commissioning (i. e. the start of benefits) to the first mid-term: to extend the first mid-term benefits backwards;
 - For years between different mid-term, long-term and very long-term (if any): to linearly interpolate benefits between the time horizons; and
 - For years beyond the farthest time horizon: to maintain benefits of this farthest time horizon



Nine categories of possible benefits/indicators (B1-B9) for OHLs



- Some indicators are developed to meet specific requirements of the TEN-E Regulation concerning market integration, security of supply (SoS) and sustainability
- Some indicators can be quantified and monetised, while others can only be qualitatively described

Market integration: Increase in Annual Socio-Economic Welfare (**B1 ΔSEW** indicator, M €/year) Sustainability: Additional societal benefit due to CO₂ variation (B2 ΔCO₂ indicator, M €/year)

Monetised indicators based on 4th ENTSO-E CBA Guideline

Energy efficiency: Grid losses (**B5 ΔLosses** indicator, M €/year) Security of supply: Adequacy to meet demand (B6 ΔSoS indicator, M €/year)



B1. Socio – economic welfare (SEW)

- The indicator reflects the contribution of the project in increasing transmission capacity(ies) over the borders of the EnC CPs (excluding the EU Member States), making an increase in commercial exchanges possible so that electricity markets can trade power in a more economically efficient manner
- The monetisation of SEW is done in EUR/yr
- Generation cost method is used to monetize the increase in SEW, by determining a difference between the total generation costs in the power systems of EnC countries with and without the project, based on the PLEXOS market simulation results



B2. Additional Societal benefit due to CO₂ variation

- The indicator is used to properly reflect the objectives of CO₂ emissions reduction
- To avoid double counting with the CO₂ variation already monetised into the SEW (B1) and the losses (B5), changes in CO₂ emission (without and with a project) are multiplied by the difference between the CO₂ societal cost and the ETS price used in the scenario
- CO₂ societal cost is assumed according to the high levels in the TYNDP 2024: **189 EUR/t in 2030 and 498 EUR/t in 2040**



B5. Grid losses

- The indicator is used to reflect the changes in transmission system losses that can be attributed to a project
- The energy efficiency benefit of a project is measured through the change of thermal losses in the grid
- For the grid losses calculation, both market and network models are used
- In the network model the amount of losses (GWh) is calculated and then multiplied by marginal prices acquired from the market model in order to fully monetize this benefit

B6. SoS: Adequacy

 this indicator is calculated in case there is an occurrence of unserved energy in the modelling results and is then monetised by multiplying that unserved energy with the value of lost load (VoLL)



Harmonised system-wide CBA for candidate energy storage projects

- Harmonised system-wide cost-benefit analysis for candidate energy storage projects was published by the European Commission in compliance with the requirements of the TEN-E Regulation
- The current methodology is used for candidate PCI energy storage projects and provides for a societal CBA with the use of monetised, quantified and qualitative indicators
- Taking account of the Guidelines for CBA of Grid Development Projects, the methodology is designed to be compatible in terms of benefits and costs with the CBA methodologies developed by the ENTSO-E



Harmonised system-wide CBA for candidate energy storage projects

- CBA methodology for energy storage projects is similar to the ENTSO-E CBA methodology and recognises the following main benefits that must be calculated:
 - Market integration: increase in Annual Socio-Economic Welfare (B1 ΔSEW indicator, M €/year)
 - Sustainability: additional societal benefit due to CO₂ variation (B2 ΔCO₂ indicator, monetised by using societal costs of CO₂ (M €/year))
 - Security of supply: adequacy to meet demand (B8 ΔSoS indicator, M €/year)
 - Grid losses: (B5 ΔLosses indicator, M €/year)



Methodologies for project assessment

Costs and benefits for electricity storage and overhead lines based on the relevant methodologies





Multi-criteria analysis

- Along with monetised indicators, some indicators are given in the methodology as non-monetized that can be described qualitatively or quantified
- A combined multi-criteria and CBA assessment allows for a project evaluation based both qualitative assessments and quantified and monetised assessments to ensure that all the costs and benefits of a project are represented



Multi-criteria analysis

Project assessment indicators

- Positive impact of the proposed project will be analysed within the benefits defined by the relevant methodologies
- The benefits, i.e. indicators that will be calculated in the project assessment process refer to monetised, and non-monetised
- CBA and MCA analyses will address both monetised and non-monetised indicators



Energy storage project benefit indicators





Structure of results

B/C ratio

- The Benefit/Cost (B/C) ratio the present value of all monetised benefits divided by the present value of all project costs (CAPEX and OPEX)
- Discount rate of 4% is used
- If the B/C ratio is lower than one, then the project does not comply with the general eligibility criterion set out by the TEN-E Regulation
- For projects with B/C ratio higher than one, points are allocated to enable project ranking under the same infrastructure category
- Maximum points that a project can receive is 20

Range of B/C ratio value	Points
1	10
1-2	11
2-3	12
3-4	13
4-5	14
5-6	15
6-7	16
7-8	17
8-9	18
9-10	19
>10	20

Structure of results

SoS - System stability

- System stability non-monetized indicator which shows quantitatively how much the project supports the voltage stability, transient stability and frequency stability
 - ✓ '0' no change: the technology/project has no (or just marginal) impact on the respective indicator,
 - '+' small to moderate improvement: the technology/project has only a small impact on the respective indicator,
 - ✓ '++' significant improvement: the technology/project has a large impact on the respective indicator
- Data regarding this indicator requested in the project questionnaire
- According to the 4th ENTSO-E Guideline for Cost-Benefit Analysis of Grid Development Projects, a project can attain a maximum of 5 '+'
- For small to moderate impact on system's stability ('+'), a 0.4 points will be assigned, and for significant impact ('++'), 0.8 points will be assigned



Structure of results

Project maturity

- Project maturity determined based on the data about status/completion of project development phases delivered by the project promoters through project questionnaires
- For the completion of each project development phase a score of **0.5 point** is assigned
- A maximum of 5 points can be received for completion of all project phases before the construction

Project development phase	Possible points for phase completion
Prefeasibility study	0.5
Technical feasibility study	0.5
Economic feasibility study (CBA)	0.5
Environmental impact assessment	0.5
Detailed design study	0.5
Resloved financing	0.5
Obtained approvals/permits	0.5
Approval by regulatory authority	0.5
Final investment decision	0.5
Tendering procedure	0.5



Relative rankings of projects

- Based on the calculated total scores of each individual project a relative ranking of all eligible projects will be provided as the final output of the assessment
- The candidate project will be ranked if it proves that its overall benefits outweigh its costs
- For electricity transmission overhead lines and energy storage projects a maximum of 27 points can be assigned based on the indicator scoring
- The projects will be ranked from top to bottom in line with the total score, e.g. from 27 points to 10 points (which is a threshold for a project to be economically viable, e.g. to have B/C > 1)

Indicator	Maximum points
B/C ratio	20
SoS - System stability (OHL) or Balancing services (Storage)	2
Project maturity	5
TOTAL	27

Thank you for your attention



Contacts:

Goran Majstrović, <u>gmajstrovic@eihp.hr</u> Ivana Milinković Turalija, <u>imilinkovic@eihp.hr</u> Lucija Išlić, <u>lislic@eihp.hr</u> Dražen Balić, <u>dbalic@eihp.hr</u>

Energy Institute Hrvoje Požar

www.eihp.hr