



## JRC TECHNICAL REPORT

# Harmonised system-wide cost-benefit analysis for candidate energy storage projects

*Pursuant to Article 11(8) of  
Reg. (EU) No. 2022/869*

7 October 2022

***[DRAFT FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION]***

This publication is a Technical report by the Joint Research Centre (JRC), the European Commission's science and knowledge service. It aims to provide evidence-based scientific support to the European policymaking process. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or opinion of the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use that might be made of this publication. For information on the methodology and quality underlying the data used in this publication for which the source is neither Eurostat nor other Commission services, users should contact the referenced source. The designations employed and the presentation of material on the maps do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the European Union concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

#### Contact information

Name: Tilemahos EFTHIMIADIS  
Address: European Commission –  
JRC, P.O. Box 2, 1755 ZG, Petten, the Netherlands  
Email: [tilemahos.efthimiadis@ec.europa.eu](mailto:tilemahos.efthimiadis@ec.europa.eu)  
Tel.: +31224565003

Name: Maciej Grzeszczyk  
European Commission  
DG ENER Unit C4 Energy Infrastructure  
Email : [maciej.grzeszczyk@ec.europa.eu](mailto:maciej.grzeszczyk@ec.europa.eu)

#### EU Science Hub

<https://joint-research-centre.ec.europa.eu>

JRC130913

Petten: European Commission, 2022  
©European Union



The reuse policy of the European Commission documents is implemented by the Commission Decision 2011/833/EU of 12 December 2011 on the reuse of Commission documents (OJ L 330, 14.12.2011, p. 39). Unless otherwise noted, the reuse of this document is authorised under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). This means that reuse is allowed provided appropriate credit is given and any changes are indicated.

# Contents

- Abstract..... 2
- Executive summary..... 3
- 1 Introduction and scope..... 4
  - 1.1 The TEN-E Regulation..... 4
  - 1.2 General criteria for candidate energy storage projects..... 4
  - 1.3 Specific criteria for candidate energy storage projects..... 5
- 2 General approach..... 6
  - 2.1 Scenarios and assumptions..... 6
- 3 Project assessment..... 8
  - 3.1 Benefits..... 8
    - 3.1.1 B1 - Variation of socio-economic welfare in electricity markets [€/a]..... 10
    - 3.1.2 B2 – Variation of GHG emissions [tonne/a, €/a]..... 13
    - 3.1.3 B3 – RES integration [€/a]..... 15
    - 3.1.4 B4 – Variation of non-GHG emissions [tonne/a, €/a]..... 18
    - 3.1.5 B5 – Variation in grid losses [€/a]..... 19
    - 3.1.6 B6 – Variation of electricity balancing markets services [€/a, ordinal scale]..... 22
    - 3.1.7 B7 – Variation in other ancillary services markets [€/a]..... 26
    - 3.1.8 B8 – Adequacy to meet demand [€/a]..... 27
    - 3.1.9 B9 – Generation capacity deferral [€/a]..... 29
    - 3.1.10 B10 – Transmission capacity deferral [€/a]..... 30
  - 3.2 Costs..... 31
  - 3.3 Project value calculation..... 31
  - 3.4 Transparency and confidentiality..... 31
- References..... 32
- List of abbreviations and definitions..... 34
- List of figures..... 35
- List of tables..... 36

## **Abstract**

This report presents the developed Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) methodology for candidate energy storage projects, in compliance with the requirements set in the Regulation (EU) 2022/869. The current methodology shall be used for candidate PCI energy storage project appraisals undertaken by project promoters 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.

## Executive summary

Recognising the importance of energy storage, the revised TEN-E Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2022/869) includes energy storage facilities as energy infrastructure category. Energy storage facilities can be in individual or aggregated form, used for storing energy on a permanent or temporary basis, in aboveground or underground infrastructure or geological sites, provided they are directly connected to high-voltage transmission lines and distribution lines designed for a voltage of 110 kV or more. For Member States and small isolated systems with a lower voltage overall transmission system, those voltage thresholds are equal to the highest voltage level in their respective electricity systems.

In this context, the JRC, in compliance with the requirements set in TEN-E Regulation, has developed a dedicated societal Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) methodology for candidate energy storage projects to be included in the list of Projects of Common Interest (PCIs). The current methodology shall be used by project promoters and provides for an analysis, utilising monetised, quantified and qualitative indicators. This CBA methodology will feed into the assessment of candidate PCI energy storage projects to assess whether their potential overall benefits outweigh their costs.

This methodology has identified the main benefits of energy storage storage in accordance with the specific criteria of sustainability, market integration, and security of supply in the revised TEN-E Regulation. Specific monetised, quantified and qualitative indicators have been developed for the assessment of these benefits that can be summarised in ten main categories:

- Variation of socio-economic welfare in electricity markets
- Variation of GHG emissions
- Variation in curtailment of electricity from Renewable Energy Sources
- Variation of non-GHG emissions
- Variation in grid losses
- Variation in electricity balancing markets
- Variation in other ancillary services markets
- Adequacy to meet demand
- Generation capacity deferral
- Transmission capacity deferral

The methods to quantify and monetise such benefits are described for cases with and without detailed modelling instruments available. Key parameters for quantification are presented, with potential data sources.

# 1 Introduction and scope

This Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) methodology for candidate energy storage projects (in the following, “energy storage CBA methodology”) has been developed by the JRC, the European Commission’s science and knowledge service, in compliance with the requirements set in Article 11(8) of Regulation (EU) 2022/869 (in the following, “TEN-E Regulation”) [1]. The energy storage CBA methodology has been developed to ensure a harmonised energy system-wide cost-benefit analysis at Union level and that it is compatible in terms of benefits and costs with the methodology developed by the ENTSO for Electricity and the ENTSO for Gas pursuant to Article 11(1) of TEN-E Regulation.

This energy storage CBA methodology was developed in a transparent manner, including extensive consultation of Member States and all relevant stakeholders.

## 1.1 The TEN-E Regulation

The Trans-European Networks for Energy (TEN-E) is a policy instrument focused on developing and linking the energy infrastructure of European Union (EU) countries<sup>1</sup>. A well-planned and integrated energy infrastructure is essential to achieve such objectives: energy infrastructure is the part of the system that enables renewable energy to be incorporated into the grid, and then transmits and distributes energy across the EU from the supply source (whether imported or generated within the EU) to the end user, or stores energy until it is needed. Energy infrastructure provides for a reliable and secure energy system that helps to keep energy prices in check<sup>2</sup>.

The revised TEN-E Regulation, entered into force in June 2022, lays down guidelines for the timely development and interoperability of the priority corridors and areas of trans-European energy infrastructure contributing at mitigating climate change by supporting the achievement of the EU climate and energy 2030 targets and the EU climate neutrality objective by 2050 at the latest, and to ensuring interconnections, energy security, market and system integration and competition that benefits all Member States, as well as affordability of energy prices. More specifically, the TEN-E Regulation:

- provides for the identification of projects on the Union list of projects of common interest (PCIs) and of projects of mutual interests (PMIs);
- facilitates the timely implementation of the Union list by streamlining, coordinating more closely and accelerating permit granting processes, and by enhancing transparency and public participation;
- provides rules for the cross-border allocation of costs and risk-related incentives for projects on the Union list.

A project of common interest needs to meet general criteria and is assessed against specific criteria as set out in the TEN-E Regulation.

## 1.2 General criteria for candidate energy storage projects

Candidate energy storage projects need to demonstrate that the:

- project is necessary for at least one priority corridor for electricity set out in points 1 and 2 in Annex I to the TEN-E Regulation, as described in Article 4(1)(a) of TEN-E Regulation;
- potential overall benefits of the candidate project, assessed in accordance with the relevant specific criteria, outweigh its costs, including in the longer term, in line with the provisions set in Article 4(1)(b) of TEN-E Regulation.

Pursuant to Article 4(1)(c) of TEN-E Regulation, the candidate project shall either:

- involve at least two Member States by directly or indirectly, via interconnection with a third country, crossing the border of two or more Member States or

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [https://energy.ec.europa.eu/topics/infrastructure/trans-european-networks-energy\\_en](https://energy.ec.europa.eu/topics/infrastructure/trans-european-networks-energy_en)

<sup>(2)</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/info/news/in-focus-making-eus-energy-infrastructure-fit-climate-neutrality-2021-jun-15\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/news/in-focus-making-eus-energy-infrastructure-fit-climate-neutrality-2021-jun-15_en)

- be located in the territory of one Member State, either inland or offshore, including islands, and has a significant cross-border impact as set out in point (1)(b) of Annex IV to TEN-E Regulation: *“the project provides at least 225 MW installed capacity and has a storage capacity that allows a net annual electricity generation of 250 GW-hours/year”*.

In its assessment of applications received, the Regional Group shall check the compliance with respect to the rules in terms of energy infrastructure categories set for storage facilities in Annex II(1) to TEN-E Regulation. In particular, project promoters must ensure that their applications are compliant with the following rules:

- energy storage facilities, in individual or aggregated form, used for storing energy on a permanent or temporary basis in above-ground or underground infrastructure or geological sites, provided they are directly connected to high-voltage transmission lines and distribution lines designed for a voltage of 110 kV or more. For Member States and small isolated systems with a lower voltage overall transmission system, those voltage thresholds are equal to the highest voltage level in their respective electricity systems;
- any equipment or installation essential for the energy storage facilities to operate safely, securely and efficiently, including protection, monitoring and control systems at all voltage levels and substations.

### **1.3 Specific criteria for candidate energy storage projects**

Pursuant to Article 4(3)(a) of the TEN-E Regulation, the project promoter shall clearly show how the candidate project contributes significantly to sustainability through the integration of renewable energy into the grid, the transmission or distribution of renewable generation to major consumption centres and storage sites, and to reducing energy curtailment, where applicable, and contributes to at least one of the following specific criteria:

- (i) market integration, including through lifting the energy isolation of at least one Member State and reducing energy infrastructure bottlenecks, competition, interoperability and system flexibility;
- (ii) security of supply, including through interoperability, system flexibility, cybersecurity, appropriate connections and secure and reliable system operation;

## 2 General approach

The aim of the current CBA methodology is to deliver a general guideline on how to assess energy storage projects from a cost and benefit point of view. In compliance with the provisions about specific criteria set in Article 4(3)(a) of TEN-E Regulation (see section 1.2), this CBA methodology is taking into consideration the criteria of sustainability, market integration and the security of supply for developing a systematic method for quantifying the total expected benefits of the candidate PCI energy storage project. Following this process, the potential overall benefits are compared to the projected or estimated costs of the candidate PCI project, as the main purpose of this CBA is to determine whether the total benefits outweigh the total costs.

In line with the provisions set in Article 11 of TEN-E Regulation and similarly to the methodological approach used for candidate electricity transmission projects [7] and gas infrastructure projects [8], the assessment of candidate energy storage projects shall take into consideration pertinent assumptions concerning future scenarios, the definition of the reference network used to assess the impact of the project; and the techniques to be used in calculating costs and benefits for the candidate energy storage project.

This methodology is based on the multi-criteria approach, which allows to look and consider and combine monetized, quantified and qualitative benefits. This approach is also consistent with the ENTSOs methodologies.

### 2.1 Scenarios and assumptions

Scenarios are a description of contrasted yet plausible futures that can be characterised by a combination of demand and supply assumptions. With reference to the assessment of candidate storage projects, such scenarios shall consider possible development for the electricity, gas and hydrogen systems, energy exchanges within the modelled system (according to the different level of detail, it can encompass the geographical area immediately affected by the project or a wider area) and with the modelled systems. These different future developments can be used as input parameter sets for subsequent simulations and analyses.

The following list of assumptions and parameters need to be consistent for all candidate projects' applications:

- duration of the CBA horizon. As a general assumption, the horizon should be the minimum between a) the longest technical lifetime of any equipment and b) the maximum reference period for energy projects as referred to in Article 15(2) and Annex I to Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 480/2014 [13]. The duration of the CBA horizon shall not be in any case higher than the CBA horizon of the harmonised energy system-wide cost-benefit analysis methodology for projects on the Union list falling under the energy infrastructure categories set out in point (1)(a), (b), (d) and (f) and point (3) of Annex II to TEN-E Regulation;
- fuel prices for each Member State and for each year within the CBA horizon. This assumption should be consistent with the most updated TYNDP scenarios;
- EU Emissions Trading System (EU ETS) carbon price for each year within the CBA horizon. This assumption should be consistent with the most updated TYNDP scenarios;
- shadow cost of carbon for each year within the CBA horizon. As a general assumption, values for the shadow cost of carbon within the CBA horizon should be aligned, where applicable, to shadow cost of carbon values in Tables 5 and 6 of Commission Notice 2021/C 373/01 [10];
- discount rate. As a general assumption, a 4% discount rate should be assumed, in agreement with the current value assumed for other PCI energy infrastructure categories. The discount rate should in any case be compatible with the same value defined in the harmonised energy system-wide cost-benefit analysis methodology for projects on the Union list falling under the energy infrastructure categories set out in point (1)(a), (b), (d) and (f) and point (3) of Annex II to TEN-E Regulation;
- electricity demand: for each Member State and for each year within the CBA horizon. This assumption should be consistent with the most updated TYNDP scenarios;
- green-house gases (GHG) (see B1) and relative Global Warming Potential (GWP<sup>3</sup>) factors;

---

<sup>3</sup> Global warming potential (GWP) is the heat absorbed by any greenhouse gas in the atmosphere, as a multiple of the heat that would be absorbed by the same mass of carbon dioxide



- emission and, when possible, monetisation factors for indirect non-GHG emissions, for each Member State and for each year within the CBA horizon. Examples of reference monetisation values for select pollutants as found in [17] are reported here below:

**Table 1.** Reference monetisation values for select pollutants

€2015/kg	NOx	NH3	SO2	PM2.5	PM10	VOC
low	24.10	19.70	17.70	56.80	31.80	1.61
middle	34.70	30.50	24.90	79.50	44.60	2.10
high	53.70	48.80	38.70	122.00	69.10	3.15

Source:[17]

- classification of synthetic fuels (see B4) and prices, for each Member State and for each year within the CBA horizon. This assumption should be consistent with the most updated policy scenarios from the Commission and/or TYNDP scenarios;
- value of lost load (VOLL) for each Member State (or zone if available) and for each year within the CBA horizon. This assumption should be consistent with the most updated policy scenarios from the Commission and/or TYNDP scenarios;
- monetisation factors for RES curtailment for each Member State and for each year within the CBA horizon.

### 3 Project assessment

The assessment of candidate PCI energy storage projects shall be carried out taking the societal perspective: in line with the provisions set in Article 4(1) of TEN-E Regulation, their potential overall benefits, assessed in accordance with the relevant specific criteria, shall outweigh their costs.

- “with case”, where the candidate project is realised and inserted in the system, and generates during its lifetime benefits that are larger than total costs; and
- “without case” where the candidate project is not realised.

The reference network is the version of the network that is used as the starting point for the computation of benefit indicators, to calculate the incremental contribution of the project that is assessed. To determine the incremental contribution of each project, market and network simulations are performed in which the project is either included in the reference grid or removed from it.

The calculation of the difference in indicators between the “with” and the “without” cases allows to compute benefits. For instance, the amount of energy stored by a candidate storage project is equal to the difference in storage in the “with” case (i.e. the project is built) and the “without case” (i.e. the project is not built).

In some cases, the calculation of benefits does not need a complex modelling exercise representing the whole system: in other cases, however, system modelling activities are required in case of indicators capturing system properties. For instance, an accurate assessment of the benefit “reduction of RES curtailment” would require an exhaustive modelling of the electricity system if the energy storage project is directly interconnected to the electricity system, as the candidate storage project might affect RES curtailment in function of different operating characteristics of the system (i.e. availability of transmission capacity to transfer RES curtailment from its origin to the electricity node where the storage project is connected). In some cases, simplifications might be introduced to reduce the modelling complexity (for instance, analysis in specific snapshots extended through duration curves to the whole year of operation), although there is trade-off between modelling tractability<sup>4</sup> and accuracy of the analysis.

Benefits and costs are calculated for one year of operation, although the technical lifetime of a candidate energy storage project is higher. To fully capture the net benefits created by the candidate project in time, then, this energy storage project CBA methodology requires the use of the discounted cash-flow method: in particular, annual cash flows (considering costs and benefits for the system) will be discounted using the discount rate defined in the information set accompanying the project submission template.

#### 3.1 Benefits

While the calculation of each benefit should aim for a monetary value, the lack of data and models may impede the full monetization of some benefits, although such monetization may be feasible in future assessments. In such cases the quantitative/qualitative assessment of the benefits are to be considered. In general, the indicators can be:

- **Monetised:** they are expressed in monetary terms.
- **(Non-monetised) quantified:** they are quantified but not expressed in monetary terms
- **Qualitative:** they are expressed in qualitative terms (for instance, “++”, “+”, “0”, etc.).

In Table 2 we present the indicators and their relevant criterion.

**Table 2.** Benefit indicators, criteria and legal references.

Benefit code/name	Specific Criterion	Article 4 of TEN-E Regulation
-------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------

<sup>4</sup> Model tractability refers to the increased model granularity (e.g. from hours to quarter) which raises the computational time and the requirements.

B1: Socio-economic welfare in electricity markets	Market integration	point 3(a)(i)
B2: GHG emissions	Sustainability	point 3(a)
B3: RES integration	Sustainability	point 3(a)
B4: Non- GHG emissions	Sustainability	point 3(a)
B5: Grid Losses	Sustainability	point 3(a)
	Market integration	point 3(a)(i)
	Security of supply	point 3(a)(ii)
B6: Electricity balancing markets services	Sustainability	point 3(a)
	Market integration	point 3(a)(i)
	Security of supply	point 3(a)(ii)
B7: other ancillary services markets	Sustainability	point 3(a)
	Market integration	point 3(a)(i)
	Security of supply	point 3(a)(ii)
B8: Adequacy to meet demand	Security of supply	point 3(a)(ii)
B9: Generation capacity deferral	Sustainability	point 3(a)
B10: Transmission capacity deferral	Sustainability	point 3(a)

Source: Own elaboration.

The following subsections describe how benefit indicators must be calculated in line with the specific criteria set in Article 4(3) of TEN-E Regulation.

### 3.1.1 B1 - Variation of socio-economic welfare in electricity markets [€/a]

#### **Indicator definition:**

- Definition: variation of Social Economic Welfare (SEW) in day-ahead and intra-day electricity markets achievable thanks to the candidate storage project
- Relevance: candidate storage projects can enhance flexibility and efficiency of electricity markets, resulting in an increase of SEW for the Union

#### **Indicator Calculation:**

- Modelling needs: modelling for the calculation of the benefit must cover energy storage facilities as set out in point (1)(c) of Annex II to the TEN-E Regulation. The accurate assessment requires a detailed modelling exercise simulating a larger portion of the electricity system beyond the project (i.e. up to the European level). The modelling shall be able to capture different phases of electricity markets, in particular the forward, Day-Ahead, and Intra-Day markets, simulating the flexibility capability and related benefits that candidate storage projects can supply to such markets.
- Data needs: scenarios must be compliant with TYNDP scenarios (Article 12 TEN-E Regulation). Simulation model and analysis for day-ahead markets shall have at least the same level of detail of the ones used and performed by ENTSO-E in its TYNDP. Level of detail of representation of intra-day markets shall be consistent with the modelling approach used for day-ahead markets. Estimations of RES amount potentially stored, RES marginal cost, and expected bids of displaced peakers (or expected peak prices) are required in case of simplifying assumptions.
- How the benefit is expressed: the benefit is expressed in monetary terms, either based on the generation cost approach or on the total surplus approach.

#### **Link with other CBA indicators**

- B2, B3

#### **Link with specific criteria TEN-E Regulation**

- Market integration: point 3(a)(i) of Art. 4

#### **Notes**

- Economic effect of the related GHG reduction is included based on ETS prices. Potential further benefits from the difference between Social Cost of Carbon and such prices are taken into account through the sensitivity analysis in benefit B2.

#### Introduction

Socio-economic welfare (SEW) is defined in economics via the concept of utility, i.e. the value that different actors in the market associate to a particular good or service. Individuals tend to maximise their utility through their actions and consumption choices and the interactions of sellers/producers and buyers/consumers as resp. supply and demand in competitive markets yield to consumer and producer surplus. A natural equilibrium point is achieved when the highest overall (social) level of satisfaction is created among the different actors.


In power system economics, SEW is often defined as the economic surpluses of electricity consumers, producers and, given the nature of the transportation problem, network operators (collecting congestion rents). Any infrastructural project inserted in the system affects either the generation or the consumption mix or the transmission capacity, resulting into a variation and/or redistribution of SEW within the modelled system (between different actors and/or among different modelled zones). In particular, storage resources allow to relieve the fundamental intertemporal constraint of electricity systems, namely, the fact that the demanded energy has to be generated contemporaneously. This does much to alleviate supply reliability issues at times of stress, especially where shares of firm generation are shrinking. Consequently, the value of storage soars in systems dominated by vRES.

We now proceed to sketch out an example illustrating the fundamental logic behind the estimation of SEW benefits from storage in the simplest possible terms. For the sake of simplicity, absence of binding constraints

to the availability of transmission capacity (“copper plate”) will be assumed here, but the analysis can be readily extended to a context where these instead are present.

Figures 1 and 2 describe the general logic of socio-economic welfare benefits flowing from storage.

**Figure 1.** Storage charging impact on demand




Source: Own elaboration.

Figure 1 is a Price/Quantity (P/Q) graph which depicts the effect of an increase in storage capacity shifting up load at low-demand low-price times. Merely by way of illustration, it is built assuming a vertical (i.e. perfectly inelastic) demand curve D: this equates positing that changes in prices will not lead demand to increase or decrease. Assuming a classic downward-sloping demand curve would only complicate the analysis as the key conclusions would carry over.

In Figure 1 one can see that the added demand from storage shifts the demand curve outward from D to D', so that prices are driven up from P to P', which shifts some surplus from consumers to producers (blue-shaded area), obviously due to previous consumers having to pay more for the same energy. A new flow of profits is created for low-cost generation (orange-shaded area), which is a net social welfare addition.

**Figure 2.** Storage discharging impact on supply



Source: Own elaboration.

We can see here above the effects of adding the same amount of storage capacity to supply at a time of high demand. The capacity expansion shifts the upward-sloping supply curve S outward by an amount equivalent to the demand curve’s outward shift in the previous graph. The new supply curve S' is depicted by the red step-wise segment. This leads to prices decreasing from P to P'. Their drop shifts a large amount of social welfare from former producers’ infra-marginal rents to consumer surplus (blue-shaded area). On top of this, it creates net gains in social welfare through storage’s infra-marginal rents (orange-shaded area below P') and newly

minted consumer surplus (orange-shaded area above P'), equivalent to the overall decrease in generation marginal costs.

The way the graphs are drawn, proving that storage can create large net gains in consumer surplus requires no more than a glance at the relative size of the shaded areas. Their wide horizontal difference brings to graphical evidence that this is precisely due to storage's key technical feature: intertemporal arbitrage allows it to buy its energy low and sell it high. One could build examples were most of the gain flows to producers instead (in case peak prices don't fall) or, on the other hand, no loss is caused to consumers (in case trough prices don't rise). Even in the case where no prices change (so that no shifts in surpluses occur), new net social welfare is created by the decrease in generation costs which is the direct feeder of storage's newly gained infra-marginal rents. The general idea is hard to miss: rationally exploited storage has the potential to significantly relieve supply constraints, right at the time when this is most needed, and this can add significant social value. Let us further point out that the gains to be made on balancing provision, hence system security, may well be as large, or even larger, than through price smoothing on the Day-Ahead Market.

Based on mechanism above, energy storage projects can create social surplus by operating on the EU's electricity markets. The current EU electricity market design offers them the following opportunities to do so:

- participating in the day-ahead electricity market, acting as implicit (price-based) demand response. In this respect, energy storage projects can vary their consumption according to price signals: for instance, they can quickly ramp up their demand at times where there is RES surplus (reducing RES curtailment, see benefit) and especially in hours where operational constraints on inflexible generation might result in negative prices, increasing societal SEW;
- participating in the intraday electricity market: energy storage projects can adjust their consumption profile in continuous trading, matching buy or sell orders in order to balance positions: in this respect, energy storage projects might act as an additional flexibility resource in intraday electricity markets, contributing at increasing societal SEW.

#### Calculation process

Benefit  $B_1$  can be calculated as follows:

1. Project promoters evaluate the increase in SEW based on the following approach:
  - a detailed modelling exercise is carried out, in which the project promoter must evaluate the operation of the modelled electricity system in both "with" and "without" cases. Given the objective function of the optimisation algorithm and the balance demand constraints, the model provides as output the level of SEW variation, in each modelled zone.

If detailed modelling is not feasible, the approach with simplified assumptions should be followed:

- the project promoter shall calculate the estimated SEW variation that can be created by redirecting a certain amount of RES generation infeed to the candidate energy storage project, and the difference between its marginal cost of production and the expected bid of production of the non-RES generation it displaces (proxied by expected peak prices if not directly available). All the assumptions must be duly justified and referenced.

2. The hourly monetised benefit related to SEW variation in the z-th zone of the modelled electricity system can be calculated by project promoters as follows:

$$B_1 = \sum_z [SEW_{wholesale} |_{with} - SEW_{wholesale} |_{without}]$$

3. The hourly monetised benefit related to SEW variation in the z-th zone of the non-modelled electricity system can be calculated by project promoters as follows:

$$B_1 = \sum_z (E(bid)_z |_{peaker} - MC_z |_{RES}) \cdot K_{RES\_stored\ z}$$

where  $bid_z |_{peaker}$  can be proxied by expected peak prices if not directly available.

4. The economic present value of indicator  $B_1$  is calculated within the CBA horizon using the discounted cash-flow approach.

### 3.1.2 B2 – Variation of GHG emissions [tonne/a, €/a]

#### **Indicator Definition:**

- Definition: economic valorisation of the variation of greenhouse gases emission achievable thanks to the project.
- Relevance: energy storage projects are key infrastructural projects for serving electricity demand with a lower carbon footprint by enabling the integration of additional RES, so to replace usage of GHG-emitting fuels.

#### **Indicator Calculation:**

- Modelling needs: modelling for the calculation of the benefit must cover energy storage facilities as set out in point (1)(c) of Annex II to the TEN-E Regulation. The accurate assessment would require a detailed modelling exercise simulating a larger portion of the electricity system beyond the project (i.e. up to the European level). The modelling shall be able to capture different phases of electricity markets, in particular the forward, Day-Ahead, Intra-Day, and balancing markets, simulating the flexibility capability and related benefits that candidate storage projects can supply to such markets.
- Data needs: scenarios must be compliant with TYNDP scenarios (Article 12 TEN-E Regulation). Simulation model and analysis for day-ahead markets shall have at least the same level of detail of the ones used and performed by ENTSO-E in its TYNDP. Level of detail of representation of intra-day and balancing markets shall be consistent with the modelling approach used for day-ahead markets. Estimations of RES amount potentially stored and expected emissions of displaced peakers or Balancing Service Providers (BSPs) are required in case of simplifying assumptions.
- How the benefit is expressed: the benefit is originally calculated in quantitative terms (tonnes of equivalent carbon emission savings) and it is converted in monetary terms by means of the shadow cost of carbon defined in the information set accompanying the project submission template.

#### **Link with other CBA indicators**

- B1, B3, B6

#### **Link with specific criteria TEN-E Regulation**

- Sustainability: point 3(a) of Art. 4

#### Introduction

Energy storage projects can reduce GHG emissions by displacing polluting peak generation with low-carbon low-cost energy stored off-peak. EU emissions in the electricity sector are covered by the EU ETS cap-and-trade scheme, whereby a certain price is associated with the permission to release one tonne of CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere. GHG-emitting technologies are therefore faced with higher costs, which in turn translate into the prices they are able to bid on electricity markets. To the extent that ETS prices capture the social cost of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, then, electricity prices determining the Socio-Economic Welfare at benefit B1 and B6 already include part of the shadow cost of carbon. This should not be considered again in order to avoid double counting. Consequently, differences not included therein should be assessed by way of sensitivity analyses on the assumed shadow cost of carbon, as elaborated below.

#### Calculation process

1. The amount of avoided emissions equals to the amount of polluting generation displaced by stored low-carbon generation multiplied by the difference in their emission factors (defined as coefficients describing the rate at which a given activity releases greenhouse gases).
2. The project promoter evaluates the amount of GHG emissions avoided thanks to the candidate energy storage project based on the following approach:
  - a detailed modelling exercise is carried out, in which the project promoter must evaluate the operation amount of GHG-emitting generation in both the “with” and “without” cases. Given the objective function of the optimisation algorithm and the combination of the active constraints of the problem, the model provides as output the variation in GHG emissions achievable thanks to the project.

If detailed modelling is not feasible, the approach with simplified assumptions should be followed:

- the project promoter shall calculate the Emission Factor difference based on the most granular carbon intensity data available, and the amount of GHG-emitting generation displaced based on their knowledge of the operational capability of the project. Current and past zonal emission factors can be sourced from data underlying real-time zonal carbon intensity maps available at Electricity Maps website [14]. Prospective carbon intensities can be imputed by interacting such data with installed generation capacities in the scenarios considered, as compliant with TYNDP scenarios (Article 12 TEN-E Regulation). All the assumptions must be duly justified and referenced.
3. The z-th zone variation of GHG emissions achievable thanks to the candidate project is converted into monetary terms. The European Commission’s Vademecum [15] provides guidance on appropriate shadow costs of carbon for 2020-2050 as best available evidence on the cost of meeting the temperature goal of the Paris Agreement. The social cost of carbon used for monetisation should be provided in the information set accompanying the project submission template:

$$B_1 = \sum_z [emission|_{without} - emission|_{with}] \cdot ShCost_{CO_2}$$

4. The economic present value of indicator  $B_2$  is calculated within the CBA horizon using the discounted cash-flow approach.
5. Sensitivity analyses could be run to check the monetary values of benefits from avoided GHG emissions under different assumptions about their social costs (Annex V(2) of the TEN-E Regulation). This is a separate exercise from checking the effect of assumptions on future ETS CO2 prices contained in different scenarios, for it is carried out leaving the merit order, and hence the whole simulation, thoroughly unchanged.



### 3.1.3 B3 – RES integration [€/a]

#### **Indicator Definition:**

- Definition: Reduction of renewable generation curtailment in MWh (avoided spillage) and/or the additional amount of RES generation that is connected by the project in MW.
- Relevance: Reduction of RES curtailment by using the RES surplus to feed energy storage projects connected to the electricity network and enabling connecting more RES and increases sustainability of the Union energy system

#### **Indicator Calculation:**

- An explicit distinction is made between RES integration benefit related to either:
  - Increase in the capacity of the electricity system to integrate RES without curtailment risk - The capacity-based indicator is expressed as the avoided curtailment (in MWh) due to (a reduction of) congestion in the main system; or
  - The direct connection of RES to the main system - Direct connection is expressed in MW RES-connected (without regard for actual avoided spillage).
- Both types of indicators may be used for the project assessment, provided that the method used is reported. In both cases, the basis of calculation is the amount of RES foreseen in the scenario or planning case.
- Modelling needs: modelling for the calculation of the benefit must cover energy storage facilities as set out in point (1)(c) of Annex II to the TEN-E Regulation. The accurate assessment would require a detailed modelling exercise simulating a larger portion of the electricity system beyond the project (i.e. up to the European level). An alternative solution without significant modelling requirements would be based on project and system assumptions and relative calculations.
- Data needs: scenarios must be compliant with TYNDP scenarios (Article 12 TEN-E Regulation). Extensive data requirement to simulate the whole electricity system (i.e. simulations up to the European level would require additional data). In absence of extensive modelling, the benefit can be calculated by using operative data about the estimated amount of additional RES whose curtailment can be avoided thanks to the candidate storage project as well as about the amount of available RES curtailment.
- How the benefit is expressed: the benefit can be expressed in quantitative terms as avoided RES curtailment in the electricity system (in GWh/a) achievable thanks to the candidate project and in monetary terms, by multiplying the avoided RES curtailment for RES curtailment valorisation factors to be provided in the information set accompanying the project submission template.

#### **Link with other CBA indicators**

- B1, B2

#### **Link with specific criteria TEN-E Regulation**

- Sustainability: point 3(a) of Art. 4
- Market integration: point 3(a)(i) of Art. 4
- Security of supply: point 3(a)(ii) of Art. 4

#### Introduction

Energy storage can either directly help connecting more RES, e.g. for an aggregator of variable RES, energy storage can enable a higher RES uptake as it facilitates managing imbalances (and optimising the bidding); or avoid RES curtailment, e.g. when there is too much RES in (a part of) the system, instead of curtailing the infeed the aggregator can absorb the energy internally in the storage. Both aspects can be somehow overlapping, but not 100% (i.e. not all additional enabled RES MW will translate in a 1-to-1 relation of avoided RES curtailments).

RES curtailment arises in the electricity system when the instantaneous production of variable renewable energy sources exceeds the instantaneous electricity demand, taking also in consideration the inflexibility of certain components of the electricity system (for instance, minimum up time and downwards ramp constraints of dispatchable thermal power plants). In this occurrence, if the electricity system is not able to store or transmit such surplus in other areas of the system, system operators might force RES to reduce their output to ensure system security: consequently, the system is not exploiting a source of cheap and clean energy output.

While energy storage projects might have technical operational constraints, they can still provide additional flexibility to the energy system as a whole, increasing their intake in RES surplus moments to store energy that can be released at peak load. This capability can be beneficial under different perspectives:

- by reducing the curtailment of renewable energy that it is instead stored to be used at a second stage, candidate energy storage projects can enable additional decarbonisation of end-uses increasing the sustainability of the whole energy system;
- the reduction of curtailment for RES generation contributes at increasing the safety and the stability of network operation, enhancing security of supply; and
- the flexibility provided by candidate energy storage projects can be seen as a measure of demand response in the electricity system enabling energy storage: consequently, candidate energy storage projects contributing at reducing RES curtailment facilitate market integration, competition and system flexibility, promoting the intertemporal convergence of market prices, and ultimately unlocking cost savings for the Union.

#### Calculation process

##### **B3.1 Reduction of renewable generation curtailment**

The benefit, conceptually similar to part of the benefit B3 “RES Integration Benefit” considered in the ENTSO-E methodology [7], can be calculated as follows:

1. Project promoters evaluate the reduction of RES curtailment based on the following approach::
  - a detailed modelling exercise is carried out, in which the project promoter must evaluate the operation of the modelled electricity system in both “with” and “without” cases. Given the objective function of the optimisation algorithm and the balance demand constraints, the model provides as output the level of curtailed RES generation, in each modelled zone;

If detailed modelling is not feasible, the approach with simplified assumptions should be followed:

- the project promoter shall calculate the estimated amount of RES curtailment that can be avoided by redirecting such infeed to the candidate energy storage project. All the assumptions must be duly justified and referenced.
2. The monetised benefit related to the reduction of avoided RES curtailment in the z-th zone of the modelled electricity system can be calculated by project promoters as follows:

$$B_{3.1} = \sum_z (RES\_curtailment_z |_{without} - RES\_curtailment_z |_{with}) \cdot K_{RES\_curtailment_z}$$

3. The economic present value of the indicator is calculated within the CBA horizon using the discounted cash-flow approach.

##### **B3.2 Share of electricity generated from new renewable sources (non-monetised)**

The project promoter should clarify the increment of renewable capacity that can be incorporated in the system thanks to the energy storage project. For the avoidance of doubt, this means the change ( $\Delta$ ) in renewable capacity uptake that the project enables further to what would have been incorporated anyhow without the

energy storage project, and not the absolute / total amount of renewables expected in the geographical area of the project neither the change in uptake with respect to the current amount of renewables at the time of submission of the PCI candidate application.

This indicator quantified as requested in terms of percentage variation of the share of electricity generated from renewables that can be safely integrated in the system between the SG and the BAU scenarios (over a defined period of time), assuming the same total amount of electricity consumed in both scenarios:

$$B_{3.2} = \frac{E_{RES\ with} - E_{RES\ without}}{E_{total}}$$

Where:

- $E_{RES\ with}$  and  $E_{RES\ without}$  represent the amount of electricity generated from renewable sources in the “with” and “without” cases [MWh];
- $E_{total}$  is the total energy consumption in the geographical area affected by the project under consideration in the defined period (it is assumed constant before and after the project realisation) [MWh].

The calculation of RES energy requires the estimation of the installed capacity [MW] and of the equivalent running hours of the different types of RES units considered [h/year]. Project promoters should demonstrate clearly and transparently how the estimations were carried out.

### 3.1.4 B4 – Variation of non-GHG emissions [tonne/a, €/a]

#### **Indicator Definition:**

- **Definition:** economic valorisation of the variation of non-greenhouse gases emission achievable thanks to the project.
- **Relevance:** energy storage projects are key infrastructural projects for serving electricity demand with a lower emission footprint by replacing usage of polluting fuels.

#### **Indicator Calculation:**

- **Modelling needs:** modelling for the calculation of the benefit must cover energy storage facilities as set out in point (1)(c) of Annex II to the TEN-E Regulation. The accurate assessment would require a detailed modelling exercise simulating a larger portion of the electricity system beyond the project (i.e. up to the European level). The modelling shall be able to capture different phases of electricity markets, in particular the forward, Day-Ahead, Intra-Day, and balancing markets, simulating the flexibility capability and related benefits that candidate storage projects can supply to such markets.
- **Data needs:** scenarios must be compliant with TYNDP scenarios (Article 12 TEN-E Regulation). Simulation model and analysis for day-ahead markets shall have at least the same level of detail of the ones used and performed by ENTSO-E in its TYNDP. Level of detail of representation of intra-day and balancing markets shall be consistent with the modelling approach used for day-ahead markets. Estimations of RES amount potentially stored and expected emissions of displaced peakers or Balancing Service Providers (BSPs) are required in case of simplifying assumptions.
- **How the benefit is expressed:** the benefit is originally calculated in quantitative terms (tonnes of equivalent non-GHG emission savings) and it is converted in monetary terms by means of the social cost of non-GHG emissions defined in the information set accompanying the project submission template.

#### **Link with other CBA indicators**

- B1, B3

#### **Link with specific criteria TEN-E Regulation**

- Sustainability: point 3(a) of Art. 4

#### Introduction

Further benefits from energy storage projects can be realised thanks to the reduction in non-GHG emissions. These projects can reduce such emissions by displacing polluting peak generation with low-emission low-cost energy stored off-peak. As elaborated below, effects of potential differences in the assumed social costs of pollutants should be investigated through sensitivity analyses.

#### Calculation process

1. The amount of avoided non-GHG emissions equals to the amount of polluting generation displaced by stored low-carbon generation multiplied by the difference in their emission factors (defined as coefficients describing the rate at which a given activity releases pollutants).
2. The project promoter evaluates the amount of non-GHG emissions avoided thanks to the candidate energy storage project based on the following approach:
  - a detailed modelling exercise is carried out, based on the emission factors per pollutant of the various technologies displaced, in which the project promoter must evaluate the amount of polluting generation in both the “with” and “without” cases. Given the objective function of the optimisation algorithm and the combination of the active constraints of the problem, the model provides as output the variation in non-GHG emissions achievable thanks to the project.

If detailed modelling is not feasible, the approach with simplified assumptions should be followed:

- the project promoter shall calculate the Emission Factor difference based on the most granular emission intensity data available, and the amount of polluting generation displaced based on their knowledge of the operational capability of the project. Prospective emission intensities can be imputed by interacting such data with installed generation capacities in the scenarios considered, as compliant with TYNDP scenarios (Article 12 TEN-E Regulation). All the assumptions must be duly justified and referenced.
3. The z-th zone variation of emissions per each non-GHG pollutant achievable thanks to the candidate project is converted into monetary terms by using the social cost of carbon provided in the information set accompanying the project submission template.

$$B_4 = \sum_z [non - GHG emission]_{without} - non - GHG emission]_{with}] \cdot ShCost_{non - GHG}$$

4. The economic present value of indicator  $B_4$  is calculated within the CBA horizon using the discounted cash-flow approach.
5. Sensitivity analyses shall be run to check the monetary values of benefits from avoided non-GHG emissions under different assumptions about their social costs (Annex V(2) of the TEN-E Regulation).

### 3.1.5 B5 – Variation in grid losses [€/a]

#### **Indicator Definition:**

- Definition: value of changes in grid losses, hence the amount of generation needed to cover demand, induced by variations in power flow patterns linked to energy storage projects.
- Relevance: installation of storage projects in the system can modify flow patterns and lead to higher or lower network losses, hence generation costs and pollutant emissions.

#### **Indicator Calculation:**

- Modelling needs: accurate assessment would require a detailed modelling exercise simulating a larger portion of the electricity system beyond the project (i.e. up to the European level). An alternative solution without significant modelling requirements would be based on project assumptions and relative calculations.
- Data needs: if detailed modelling is introduced, extensive data requirement to simulate the whole electricity system (i.e. simulations up to the European level would require data requirements similar to the ones for ENTSOs TYNDPs). In absence of extensive modelling, the benefit can be calculated but using operative data about the estimated amount of energy potentially stored, hypotheses on the most prevalent sources of generation employed for recharging and replaced by discharging, and the related fuel cost prices, emission factors, and social costs of pollutants.
- How the benefit is expressed: the benefit can be expressed in quantitative terms as the losses-related variation in generation needed to cover demand. It can be converted into monetary terms when the amount of variation is multiplied by cost of generation avoided or required, possibly proxied by relevant electricity prices.

#### **Link with other CBA indicators**

- B1, B2, B3, B6

#### **Link with specific criteria TEN-E Regulation**

- Sustainability: point 3(a) of Art. 4
- Market integration: point 3(a)(i) of Art. 4
- Security of supply: point 3(a)(ii) of Art. 4

## Introduction

Electricity losses are an inevitable consequence of transferring energy across electricity networks. Technical losses, in particular, are caused by the physical properties of the components of the power system and consist mainly of power dissipation in electrical system component such as transmission lines, power transformers, and substations. Technical losses are computable based on load and dispatch patterns within the system at hand.

A higher share of generation close to consumers would reduce energy losses and grid congestion. However, renewable energy sources are not always thus sited, and their production is not always dispatchable. As a result, generation production might not coincide with demand requirements, and storage capacity needs to be readily available for this purpose. Clearly, this does not mean that the addition of storage facilities comes without costs.

At constant power-flow levels, network development generally decreases losses, thus increasing network efficiency. However, the addition of storage capacity may increase flows and network utilisation, and therefore technical network losses. Given detailed system modelling of Day Ahead Market (DAM) and balancing dispatch, an accurate assessment of flows can be derived that induces a certain variation in power generation patterns needed to serve demand. This will determine changes in losses that can then be monetised based on marginal costs in relevant zonal supply schedules, possibly proxied by prices.

## Calculation process

The benefit can be calculated as follows:

1. Project promoters evaluate the variation in losses on the following approach:
  - a detailed modelling exercise is carried out, in which the project promoter must evaluate the operation of the modelled electricity system in both “with” and “without” cases. Given the objective function of the optimisation algorithm and the balance demand constraints, the model provides as output the amount of losses, in each modelled zone. Their variation can be quantified as follows:

$$\Delta losses_z = \sum_z [losses|_{with} - losses|_{without}]$$

If detailed modelling is not feasible, the approach with simplified assumptions should be followed:

- the project promoter shall calculate the variation in losses in the z-th zone as a given fraction of demand in the “with” and “without” cases, given the project’s expected impact on prices. Average system losses vary widely across EU Member State. It is therefore recommended to adopt relevant recent estimates by the TSOs. All the assumptions must be duly justified and referenced.

$$\Delta losses = \sum_z [K(demand|_{with} - demand|_{without})]$$

where  $K$  is the fraction of demand composing losses.

2. Monetisation can be carried out as follows:

- a. In the modelled case, the hourly monetised benefit (or cost) related to losses variation in the z-th zone of the modelled electricity system can be calculated by project promoters as follows:

$$B_5 = \sum_z [losses * P_z|_{with} - losses * P_z|_{without}]$$

- b. The hourly monetised benefit related to losses variation in the z-th zone of the non-modelled electricity system can be calculated by project promoters as follows:

$$B_5 = \sum_Z MC_Z [K(demand|_{with} - demand|_{without})]$$

where  $MC$  is the Marginal Cost of generation needed to cover the difference in losses, possibly proxied by an interpolation of zonal prices in the “with” and “without” cases.

In principle, losses are part of demand. Adjustments in demand and flows based on price shifts induced by the candidate project determine variations in losses that in turn change demand. By iteration, ideally an equilibrium is found where prices sustain a pattern of flows (and thus losses) whose associated demand is induced by those same prices. By such a procedure, losses would be entirely included in SEW. However, according to the characteristics and approximations of the simulation model, there could be risk of double counting with other indicators, for instance with B1 and B6: in this case, project promoter should clearly identify these risks and remove the share of the indicator which is already accounted in another one. A discussion of how to address this- within the specific ENTSO-E TYNDP modelling context - can be found in ENTSO-E [7], pp. 66 ff.

3. The economic present value of indicator is calculated within the CBA horizon using the discounted cash-flow approach.

### 3.1.6 B6 – Variation of electricity balancing markets services [€/a, ordinal scale]

#### **Indicator Definition:**

- Definition: variation of electricity balancing markets services achievable thanks to the candidate storage project.
- Relevance: candidate storage projects can enhance flexibility and efficiency of electricity markets, resulting in an increase of SEW for the Union.

#### **Indicator Calculation:**

- Modelling needs: if the project is connected to the electricity network and not to a dedicated and exclusive RES infeed, the accurate assessment would require a detailed modelling exercise simulating a larger portion of the electricity system beyond the project (i.e. up to the European level). The modelling shall be able to capture different phases of electricity markets, in particular closer to real-time (for instance, balancing markets and ancillary services markets), simulating the flexibility capability and related benefits that candidate storage projects can supply to such markets.
- Data needs: Scenarios must be compliant with TYNDP scenarios (Article 12 TEN-E Regulation). Simulation model and analysis for balancing markets shall be consistent with the modelling approach used for day-ahead and intra-day markets for benefit B1. Estimations of balancing capacity needs based on largest trip in the relevant area, or RES amount potentially stored, of RES marginal cost, of expected bids of displaced Balancing Service Providers (BSPs) (or expected balancing energy prices), and of relative frequency of balancing activation, are required in case of simplifying assumptions.
- How the benefit is expressed: the benefit is expressed in monetary terms either by following the generation cost approach or the total surplus approach. Alternatively the benefit can be expressed qualitatively, using the ordinal scale.

#### **Link with other CBA indicators**

- B1, B2, B3

#### **Link with specific criteria TEN-E Regulation**

- Sustainability: point 3(a) of Art. 4
- Market integration: point 3(a)(i) of Art. 4
- Security of supply: point 3(a)(ii) of Art. 4

#### **Notes**

- Economic effect of the related GHG reduction is included based on ETS prices. Potentially different benefits due to divergence between the Shadow Cost of Carbon and such prices are taken into account through the sensitivity analysis in benefit B2.

Social Economic Welfare (SEW)

#### **Introduction**

The purpose of the balancing market is to correct the imbalance between production and demand in real time, maintaining the technical standards of the system. Exchange and sharing of ancillary services products, in particular balancing energy exchanges, is crucial to increase RES integration and to enhance the efficient use of available generation capacities. Storage projects are expected to increase electric system capabilities for balancing energy needs thus having positive impact on exchange balancing energy in the context of high penetration of non-dispatchable electricity generation.

The balancing services indicator shows welfare savings through the exchange of balancing energy and imbalance netting. Balancing energy refers to products such as Replacement Reserve (RR), manual Frequency Regulation Reserve (mRR), and automatic Frequency Regulation Reserve (aFRR). Another important indicator for system balancing is exchanging/sharing balancing capacity. TSOs procure the balancing capacity needed at the national level. However, to lower the procurement costs, TSOs may opt for exchanging balancing capacity with



other TSO(s). In this context, exchanging/sharing balancing capacity (i.e., RR, mFRR and aFRR) that requires guaranteed or reserved cross-zonal capacity is also taken into account.

#### Calculation process in monetary terms

The monetisation of balancing benefits would follow essentially the same logic as for those accruing on the Day-Ahead Market (benefits B1), only with higher granularity. The quantity of balancing generation capacity to be procured can be determined stochastically or deterministically. The former option, i.e. stochastic reserve dimensioning, requires a detailed simulation model of the EU electricity system (forward, day-ahead, intraday, balancing markets). Scenarios must be compliant with TYNDP scenarios (Article 12 TEN-E Regulation). Simulation model and analysis for day-ahead markets shall have at least the same level of detail of the ones used and performed by ENTSO-E in its TYNDP. Level of detail of representation of intra-day and balancing markets shall be consistent with the modelling approach used for day-ahead markets. This exercise yields estimates of the yearly frequency where demand cannot be covered by available supply (Loss of Load Expectation, LoLE), of how much balancing capacity is needed to bring this down to the regulatory targets for such frequency (Reliability Standards), and how often such capacity is activated to this end. Thus, it allows to compare the relative balancing capacity and energy procurement costs of attaining such targets by additional peak generation capacity, or instead by deploying the candidate energy storage project.

Deterministic reserve dimensioning simplifies the analysis by assuming a fixed balancing capacity need, set equal to the largest possible trip in the relevant area. The cost difference with and without the project constitutes the monetary value of the same.

For each year within the CBA horizon, project promoters shall evaluate the variation of socio-economic welfare (SEW) in the EU electricity balancing markets achievable thanks to candidate projects connected to the electricity transmission network. Calculation is carried out as follows:

Project promoter shall evaluate the variation of SEW [€/a] achievable thanks to the project (SEW in “with” case – SEW in “without” case) calculated by means of a detailed model for EU electricity balancing markets.

$$B_6 = \sum_z [SEW_{balancing}|_{with} - SEW_{balancing}|_{without}]$$

The monetised benefit related to SEW variation in the z-th zone of the non-modelled electricity system can be calculated by project promoters as follows:

$$B_6 = \sum_z (E(bid)_z|_{BSP} - MC_z|_{RES}) \cdot Freq_{balancing}_z$$

where  $Freq_{balancing}_z$  is average frequency of balancing energy activation in the z-th zone, and represents the expected bid of the displaced provider (given the typical Pay-As-Bid structure of balancing markets), and can be proxied by expected balancing energy prices if not directly available.

The economic present value of the variation of SEW achievable thanks to the project is calculated within the CBA horizon using the discounted cash-flow approach.

Depending on the characteristics of the simulation model, there could be risk of double counting with other indicators, notably B1 and B2: in this case, project promoter should clearly identify these risks and remove the share of this indicator that is already accounted in another one.

#### Calculation process in qualitative terms

In the absence of full models for balancing energy markets and considering the challenges for choosing the right balance between the complexity and feasibility of completing assessments, the indicator for balancing

market services can be also addressed by qualitative assessment. In this context, for the assessment of the candidate project, different technical KPIs, can be used. For instance, indicators like the frequency support reserve (FCR), could be of major relevance for the assessment, since storage systems can be used for balancing the fluctuating feed-in from renewable energies and participate in the market for frequency support reserve (FCR). Furthermore energy storage systems can participate in the frequency restoration process providing<sup>5</sup> frequency restoration reserves (FRR) to the electricity balancing market. Taking into consideration dedicated KPIs like FCR and FRR this assessment should be based on the expert view, considering the existing studies and the technology information. In this context, the qualitative assessment of storage projects is defined in the following Table 3.

**Table 3:** Qualitative assessment of Balancing Market Services Benefits of a candidate storage project

<b>KPIs</b>	<b>Score “0”</b>	<b>Score “+”</b>	<b>Score “++”</b>	<b>Details-Reference Indications</b>
FCR-Response time	more than 30 sec.	less than 30 sec.	less than 1 sec.	30 sec : ramp time of FCR 1 sec: typical inertia time scale
Response time – including delay time of IT and control systems	more than 200 sec.	less than 200 sec.	less than 30 sec.	200sec: FRR ramp time 30sec: FCR ramp time
Duration at rated power – total time during which available power can be sustained	less than 1 min.	less than 15 min.	15 min. or more	1 min : double the response time of FCR 15 min : Typical PTU <sup>6</sup> size
Available power – power that is continuously available within the activation time	below 20 MW	20 - 225 MW	225 MW or higher	20 MW : 1%-2% of a typical power plant is reserved for FCR and reachable from a project perspective 225 MW : PCI size

Calculation process in mixed terms (use of monetary and qualitative terms)

In the absence of full models for balancing energy markets and considering the challenges for choosing the right balance between the complexity and feasibility of completing assessments, the indicator for balancing market services can be also addressed by qualitative assessment. Following the principles of the Implementation Guidelines for TYNDP 2022 (ENTSOE 2022), the balancing benefits are addressed by qualitative assessment with the use of the following unit of measure: 0/+/>++ where:

<sup>5</sup> This provision can be either negative to compensate for excess power supply, or positive to compensate for excess demand on the power market.

<sup>6</sup> PTU = program time unit

“0” indicates that the project has marginal impact on the indicator.

“+” indicates that the project has only a small to moderate impact on the indicator.

“++” indicates that the project has significant impact on the indicator.

Based on the TYNDP 2020 results and the public studies on market integration benefits three different range thresholds can be assigned to the scores (0/+/++). In this way, the indicator can be tested to be statistically meaningful, and the range thresholds for levels of reduction of energy balancing costs are set, applying the equivalences in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Values and corresponding qualitative indicators

<b>Value submitted within the range (in M €)</b>	<b>Corresponding qualitative indicator</b>
<1.4	0
[1.4;14]	+
≥14	++

Source: Own elaboration.

### 3.1.7 B7 – Variation in other ancillary services markets [€/a]

#### **Indicator Definition:**

- **Definition:** variation in other ancillary services markets achievable thanks to the candidate storage project.
- **Relevance:** candidate storage projects can provide a variety of non-frequency ancillary services, resulting in an increase of security of supply and SEW for the Union.

#### **Indicator Calculation:**

- **Modelling needs:** accurate assessment would require a detailed modelling exercise simulating a larger portion of the electricity system beyond the project (i.e. up to the European level). The modelling shall be able to capture different phases of electricity markets, in particular closer to real-time (for instance, balancing markets and ancillary services markets), simulating the flexibility capability and related benefits that candidate storage projects can supply to such markets.
- **Data needs:** Scenarios must be compliant with TYNDP scenarios (Article 12 TEN-E Regulation). Simulation model and analysis for ancillary services markets shall be consistent with the modelling approach used for day-ahead, intra-day, and balancing markets for benefits B1 and B6. Estimations of ancillary services needs in the relevant area, or RES amount potentially stored, of RES marginal cost, of expected bids of displaced providers of ancillary services are required in case of simplifying assumptions.
- **How the benefit is expressed:** the benefit is expressed in monetary terms based on expected prices for the services offered.

#### **Link with other CBA indicators**

- B1, B6

#### **Link with specific criteria TEN-E Regulation**

- Sustainability: point 3(a) of Art. 4
- Market integration: point 3(a)(i) of Art. 4
- Security of supply: point 3(a)(ii) of Art. 4

#### **Notes**

- Economic effect of the related GHG reduction is included based on ETS prices. Potentially different benefits due to divergence between the Shadow Cost of Carbon and such prices are taken into account through the sensitivity analysis in benefit B2.

#### Introduction

Network stability and reliability have always been top priorities for TSOs, but with the growth of renewable energy sources on the grid, the challenges of maintaining that stability and reliability are growing. In case of black-out, storage is capable of providing black-start services. This is regularly contracted by the TSO, based on deterministic hour-by-hour demand. Storage can reduce the cost of this service at times, providing a straightforward avenue to its monetisation.

- Energy storage projects can efficiently provide a variety of ancillary services, including:
- Black start capability
- Reactive power supply
- Voltage control
- Congestion management.

## Calculation process

For each year within the CBA horizon, project promoter shall evaluate the variation of socio-economic welfare (SEW) in the EU ancillary services markets achievable thanks to candidate projects connected to the electricity transmission network. Calculation is carried out as follows:

1. Project promoters shall evaluate the variation of SEW [€/a] achievable thanks to the project (SEW in “with” case – SEW in “without” case) calculated by means of a detailed model for EU ancillary services markets.

$$B_7 = \sum_z [SEW_{ASM}|_{with} - SEW_{ASM}|_{without}]$$

2. The monetised benefit related to SEW variation in the z-th zone of the non-modelled electricity system can be calculated by project promoters as follows:

$$B_7 = \sum_z (E(bid)_z|_{ASM} - MC_z|_{ASM})$$

3. where  $bid_z|_{ASM}$  represents the expected bid of the displaced provider (given the typical Pay-As-Bid structure of ancillary services markets), and can be proxied by the expected marginal cost of such provider if not directly available.

### **3.1.8 B8 – Adequacy to meet demand [€/a]**

#### **Indicator Definition:**

- **Definition:** Reduction in Loss of Load Expectation and Expected Energy not Served due to the additional capacity to serve demand due to the energy storage project.
- **Relevance:** candidate storage projects can reduce Loss of Load Expectation and Expected Energy not Served of the electricity system given the scenario’s level of installed generation capacity, resulting in an increase in the Union’s security of supply.

#### **Indicator Calculation:**

- **Modelling needs:** accurate assessment would require a detailed modelling exercise simulating a larger portion of the electricity system beyond the project (i.e. up to the European level). An alternative solution without significant modelling requirements would be based on project assumptions and relative calculations.
- **Data needs:** Scenarios must be compliant with TYNDP scenarios (Article 12 TEN-E Regulation). If detailed modelling is introduced, extensive data requirement to simulate the whole electricity system (i.e. simulations up to the European level would require data requirements similar to the ones for ENTSOs TYNDPs). In absence of extensive modelling, the benefit can be calculated based on project assumptions and relative calculations..
- **How the benefit is expressed:** the benefit can be expressed in quantitative terms as the variation in Loss of Load Expectation and Expected Energy not Served, defined respectively as the relative frequency of demand shedding and the amount of energy that is not served in such event. It can further be converted in monetary terms based on assumptions on the Value of Lost Load relevant to the zone under investigation.

#### **Link with other CBA indicators**

- B1, B6, B7

### **Link with specific criteria TEN-E Regulation**

- Security of supply: point 3(a)(ii) of Art. 4

### **Notes**

- The difference in cost for reaching a given reliability target for LoLE is already captured by benefits B1 and B6. In order to avoid double counting with B1 and B6, the indicator needs to be designed so to only capture the benefit from lower Loss of Load.

### Introduction

For any given generation capacity level in a scenario, installation of additional storage capacity decreases the frequency with which available supply is not sufficient to serve concurrent electricity demand. This results in system adequacy benefits expressed by the decrease in Loss of Load Expectation (LoLE) and in the Expected Energy not Served, that can be monetised based on the Value of Lost Load (VoLL) relevant to the area.

### Calculation process

The benefit can be calculated as follows:

1. Project promoters evaluate the variation in losses based on the following approach:
  - in case a detailed modelling exercise is carried out, the project promoter must evaluate the Loss of Load Expectation in both “with” and “without” cases. Given the objective function of the optimisation algorithm and the balance demand constraints, the model provides as output the frequency of load shedding in each modelled zone. Its variation can be quantified as follows:

If detailed modelling is not feasible, the approach with simplified assumptions should be followed:

- the project promoter shall calculate the variation in Expected Energy not Served in the z-th zone in the “with” and “without” cases, computing the project’s capacity to cover previously unserved demand using assumptions based on their knowledge of the operational capability of the project. All the assumptions must be duly justified and referenced.

$$\Delta EEnS = \sum_z [EEnS_z|_{with} - EEnS_z|_{without}]$$

2. The variation in Expected Energy not Served shall be monetised based on the regulatory unitary Value of Lost Load relevant to the area under analysis.
3. The economic present value of the indicator B8 is calculated within the CBA horizon using the discounted cash-flow approach.

### 3.1.9 B9 – Generation capacity deferral [€/a]

#### **Indicator Definition:**

- Definition: deferral and/or reduction of the investment need in conventional, thermal generation capacity due to the energy storage project (if storage is a more cost-effective solution).
- Relevance: candidate storage projects can reduce the need for conventional thermal generation thus resulting in cost reduction or avoided cost which is the societal benefit associated with capacity deferral. In this context, this benefit may contribute to the sustainable development in the Union.

#### **Indicator Calculation:**

- Modelling needs: accurate assessment would require a detailed modelling exercise for the monetization via investment costs of peaking units which requires further modelling activities that is beyond the scope of this report. An alternative solution without significant modelling requirements would be based on project assumptions and relative calculations.
- Data needs: Scenarios must be compliant with TYNDP scenarios (Article 12 TEN-E Regulation). If detailed modelling is introduced, extensive data requirement to simulate the whole electricity system and present the future investment needs for conventional thermal generation. In absence of extensive modelling, the benefit can be calculated based on project assumptions and relative calculations.
- How the benefit is expressed: the benefit can be expressed in monetary terms as the deferred generation investments for peak load plants and for spinning reserves. Thereby the societal benefit is monetized through avoided investments.

#### **Link with other CBA indicators**

- B1, B7, B8

#### **Link with specific criteria TEN-E Regulation**

- Sustainability: point 3(a) of Art. 4

#### **Notes**

- Capacity deferral of thermal generation is within the scope of B7 and B8 indicators, since investment into generation capacity could be driven by the need to increase the system margin (B8) or the need for the provision of flexibility and system services (B7).

#### Introduction

For the investment costs of peaking units, figures need to be derived for the investment costs of generation units in the respective region and market area, including a forecast of the future development of these figures throughout the time span considered for PCI candidate assessment.

#### Calculation process

For the calculation of this benefit, the impact on the amount of generation capacity investments of peak load plants should be considered. The underlying assumption concerning the monetization of this benefit is that the candidate energy storage project will potentially allow reducing consumption and peak load and will provide additional solutions to cope with supply variability. Taken cumulatively, these effects would lead to a reduction of maximum installed capacity and consequently to a deferral of generation investments. The calculations take into account the price of the marginal unit at peak and assumes that generation deferral is based on reducing peak demand. The monetised benefit related to deferred investments in generation can be calculated by project promoters as follows:

*Deferred generation investments for peak load plants (€) = Annual investment to support peak load generation (€/year) \* Time deferred (# of years)*

### 3.1.10 B10 – Transmission capacity deferral [€/a]

#### **Indicator Definition:**

- Definition: deferral and/or reduction of the investment need for grid capacity extension.
- Relevance: candidate storage projects can reduce the need for grid capacity extension thus resulting in cost reduction or avoided cost which is the societal benefit associated with transmission capacity deferral. In this context, this benefit may contribute to the sustainable development in the Union.

#### **Indicator Calculation:**

- Modelling needs: A reduction of the grid capacity need can be quantified through network studies. An alternative solution without significant modelling requirements would be based on project assumptions and relative calculations.
- Data needs: Scenarios must be compliant with TYNDP scenarios (Article 12 TEN-E Regulation). In absence of extensive modelling, the benefit can be calculated based on project assumptions and relative calculations.
- How the benefit is expressed: the benefit can be expressed in monetary terms as the deferred transmission investments for serving peak load shift and energy consumption variations. Thereby the societal benefit is monetized through avoided investments.

#### **Link with other CBA indicators**

- B1, B7

#### **Link with specific criteria TEN-E Regulation**

- Sustainability: point 3(a) of Art. 4

#### **Notes**

- The benefit of transmission investment deferral is within the general scope of flexibility criterion since flexibility can be provided by storage or by flexible generation, connected through additional transmission capacity.

#### Introduction

Due to their flexible operation storage projects may reduce stress on the grid, alleviate congestion and thereby reduce the need for grid capacity extension. Thus, storage projects can potentially defer investment in transmission assets. However, in some cases a storage project may increase the need for additional transmission capacity.

#### Calculation process

For the calculation of this benefit several steps should be followed. First, the future incremental cost for the reinforcement of the grid due to the growing peak demand should be estimated. This implies the necessity to estimate the incremental cost per MW of peak demand [€/ΔMW] and can be achieved by considering the planned reinforcement projects to meet growing peak demand. Projections about growing peak demand are based on the projected growth rates. These rates can be determined on the basis of historical growth, economic, social and industrial factors.

The second step is to understand the reasons of peak reduction. It is observed that peak reduction can be mainly achieved through two different ways: consumption reduction and peak load shifting.



The third step is the calculation of the benefit for both the consumption reduction and peak load shift. The benefit is calculated as a percentage of reduction on the Incremental cost per MW of peak demand. The formulas for the calculations are the following:

- Deferred distribution capacity investments due to consumption reduction:

*Value (€) = Peak demand reduction due to energy savings [MW]\* Incremental cost per MW of peak demand [€/ΔMW]*

- Deferred distribution capacity investments due to peak load shift:

*Value (€) = Peak demand reduction due to peak load shift [MW]\* % of networks where the peak corresponds with general peak \*Incremental cost per MW of peak demand [€/ΔMW]*

where Peak demand reduction due to energy savings [MW] = % demand reduction \* peak demand \* % contribution of domestic and commercial load (or whatever load-type is influenced by the project in question)

## **3.2 Costs**

The project promoter shall provide CAPEX and OPEX for each year analysed in the CBA horizon, assumptions on authorisation, construction time and decommissioning (if relevant). Information shall be provided in a format allowing the Commission to check and verify the impact of the assumptions and the relevant calculations (e.g., Excel spreadsheet). Confidentiality of sensitive information is ensured in line with the provisions of the TEN-E Regulation.

## **3.3 Project value calculation**

The Net Present Value (NPV) represents the difference between the present value of all monetised benefits and the present value of all costs, discounted using the discount rate. Another indicator to be calculated is the benefit-cost ratio (BCR), which is the ratio between the present value of all monetised benefits divided by the present value of all costs.<sup>7</sup>

## **3.4 Transparency and confidentiality**

In submitting their CBA application, project promoters for candidate energy storage projects must provide all the necessary information with the appropriate level of transparency, also taking into consideration the provisions of the TEN-E Regulation, to allow the Commission to be able to rebuild the NPV and BCR calculations.

Confidentiality of sensitive information must be ensured in line with the provisions of TEN-E Regulation.

---

<sup>7</sup> More detailed information on the project value calculation can be found in the latest CBA methodology developed by the ENTSOs.

## References

1. Regulation (EU) 2022/869 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2022 on guidelines for trans-European energy infrastructure, amending Regulations (EC) No 715/2009, (EU) 2019/942 and (EU) 2019/943 and Directives 2009/73/EC and (EU) 2019/944, and repealing Regulation (EU) No 347/2013.
2. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. The European Green Deal. COM(2019) 640 final.
3. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee, the Committee of the Regions and the European Investment Bank. A Clean Planet for all. A European strategic long-term vision for a prosperous, modern, competitive and climate neutral economy. COM(2018) 773 final.
4. Directive (EU) 2019/944 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 June 2019 on common rules for the internal market for electricity and amending Directive 2012/27/EU.
5. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. REPowerEU Plan. COM(2022) 230 final.
6. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. 'Fit for 55': delivering the EU's 2030 Climate Target on the way to climate neutrality. COM(2021) 550 final.
7. 3<sup>rd</sup> ENTSO-E Guideline for Cost Benefit Analysis of Grid Development Projects – Draft version – 28 January 2020.
8. 2<sup>nd</sup> ENTSO-G Methodology for Cost-Benefit Analysis of Gas Infrastructure Projects – October 2018.
9. Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 480/2014 of 3 March 2014 supplementing Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund.
10. COMMISSION NOTICE - Technical guidance on the climate proofing of infrastructure in the period 2021 - 2027 (2021/C 373/01)
11. Directive (EU) 2018/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2018 on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources (recast).
12. Energy Storage for a Decarbonised Europe by 2050. European Association for Storage of Energy 2019. URL: <https://ease-storage.eu/publication/decarbonised-europe-2050/>
13. Third call for large-scale projects. European Commission Climate Action 2022. URL: [https://ec.europa.eu/clima/eu-action/funding-climate-action/innovation-fund/large-scale-calls\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/clima/eu-action/funding-climate-action/innovation-fund/large-scale-calls_en)
14. Electricity Maps Carbon Intensity. Electricity Maps 2022. URL: <https://app.electricitymaps.com/map>.
15. Economic Appraisal Vademecum 2021-2027. General Principles and Sector Applications, 2021; URL: [https://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/guides/vademecum\\_2127/vademecum\\_2127\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/guides/vademecum_2127/vademecum_2127_en.pdf)
16. Energy Storage: The Key To a Reliable, Clean Electricity Supply. What Is the Potential Impact? Mathew, Loveless, 2012. Energy.Gov., URL: <https://www.energy.gov/articles/energy-storage-key-reliableclean-electricity-supply>.
17. Chemical Energy Storage in the Book "Storage and Hybridization of Nuclear Energy: Techno-Economic Integration of Renewable and Nuclear Energy". Revankar, Shripad T., 2019. Science Direct, pp. 177-227. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-813975-2.00006-5> (Chapter Six).
18. Handboek Milieuprijzen 2017", S.M. de Bruyn, S. Ahdour, M. Bijleveld, L. de Graaff, A. Schrotten, Delft, 2017, URL: <https://ce.nl/method/milieuprijzen/>
19. Study on energy storage – Contribution to the security of the electricity supply in Europe. European Commission. March 2020. URL: <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/a6eba083-932e-11ea-aac4-01aa75ed71a1>

20. Belton V, Stewart T. Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis: An Integrated Approach. Springer Science & Business Media, Boston, MA, USA (2002)
21. Saaty, T.L. (1977), "A Scaling Method for Priorities in Hierarchical Structures", J. Math. Psychology, Vol. 15, 234–281.
22. Evaluation of Smart Grid projects within the Smart Grid Task Force Expert Group 4 (EG4): Application of the Assessment Framework for Energy Infrastructure Projects of Common Interest in the field of Smart Grids. URL: <https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC79968>

## List of abbreviations and definitions

ACER	European Union Agency for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators
BSPs	Balancing Service Providers
CAPEX	Capital Expenditure Cost
CBA	Cost Benefit Analysis
DAM	Day Ahead Market
EASE	European Association on Storage for Energy
EC	European Commission
ENTSO-E	European Network of Transmission System Operators for Electricity
ENTSO-G	European Network of Transmission System Operators for Gas
ETS	EU Emissions Trading System
EU	European Union
GHG	Greenhouse Gases
JRC	Joint Research Centre
LoLE	Loss of Load Expectation
MC	Marginal Cost
NPV	Net Present Value
OPEX	Operational Expenditure Cost
PCI	Project of Common Interest
PMI	Project of Mutual Interest
RES	Renewable Energy Sources
SEW	Socio-economic welfare
TEN-E	Trans-European Networks for Energy
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
TSO	Transmission System Operator
TYNDP	Ten-Year Network Development Plan
VoLL	Value of Lost Load
vRES	variable Renewable Energy Sources

**List of figures**

**Figure 1.** Storage charging impact on demand.....11

**Figure 2.** Storage discharging impact on supply.....11

## List of tables

<b>Table 1.</b> Reference monetisation values for select pollutants.....	7
<b>Table 2.</b> Benefit indicators, criteria and legal references.....	8
<b>Table 3.</b> Values and corresponding qualitative indicators.....	25

## **GETTING IN TOUCH WITH THE EU**

### **In person**

All over the European Union there are hundreds of Europe Direct centres. You can find the address of the centre nearest you online ([european-union.europa.eu/contact-eu/meet-us\\_en](https://european-union.europa.eu/contact-eu/meet-us_en)).

### **On the phone or in writing**

Europe Direct is a service that answers your questions about the European Union. You can contact this service:

- by freephone: 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (certain operators may charge for these calls),
- at the following standard number: +32 22999696,
- via the following form: [european-union.europa.eu/contact-eu/write-us\\_en](https://european-union.europa.eu/contact-eu/write-us_en).

## **FINDING INFORMATION ABOUT THE EU**

### **Online**

Information about the European Union in all the official languages of the EU is available on the Europa website ([european-union.europa.eu](https://european-union.europa.eu)).

### **EU publications**

You can view or order EU publications at [op.europa.eu/en/publications](https://op.europa.eu/en/publications). Multiple copies of free publications can be obtained by contacting Europe Direct or your local documentation centre ([european-union.europa.eu/contact-eu/meet-us\\_en](https://european-union.europa.eu/contact-eu/meet-us_en)).

### **EU law and related documents**

For access to legal information from the EU, including all EU law since 1951 in all the official language versions, go to EUR-Lex ([eur-lex.europa.eu](https://eur-lex.europa.eu)).

### **Open data from the EU**

The portal [data.europa.eu](https://data.europa.eu) provides access to open datasets from the EU institutions, bodies and agencies. These can be downloaded and reused for free, for both commercial and non-commercial purposes. The portal also provides access to a wealth of datasets from European countries.

## The European Commission's science and knowledge service

Joint Research Centre

### JRC Mission

As the science and knowledge service of the European Commission, the Joint Research Centre's mission is to support EU policies with independent evidence throughout the whole policy cycle.



**EU Science Hub**  
[joint-research-centre.ec.europa.eu](https://joint-research-centre.ec.europa.eu)

 @EU\_ScienceHub

 EU Science Hub - Joint Research Centre

 EU Science, Research and Innovation

 EU Science Hub

 EU Science