

49 – Anonymous 16	
<b>2.1 Do you agree that the emergency oil stocks are necessary to guarantee the security of supply in the EU?</b>	Yes, fully
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	
<b>2.2 Do you agree that the EU needs to have its own rules on emergency oil stocks?</b>	Yes, fully
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	
<b>2.3 Do you agree that the EU rules on emergency oil stocks need to be in line with the rules applied in the context of the IEA?</b>	Yes, fully
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	
<b>2.4. The Directive obliges to hold a level of oil stocks equivalent to 90 days of average daily net imports or 61 days of average daily inland consumption, whichever of the two quantities is greater. In your view, are these levels of emergency oil stocks requested by the Directive appropriate for the EU to cope with a serious oil supply disruption?</b>	Yes, partly
<b>Please explain your answer notably by clarifying if you think higher or lower level of stocks would be more adapted.</b>	The levels of emergency stocks required should be reviewed regularly. A lower level would be feasible if other energy sources were subject to similar requirements.
<b>2.5. The average daily net imports referred to in question 2.3. need to be calculated based on the crude oil equivalent of imports during the previous year. Annex I of Directive 2009/119/EC lays down the methodology based on which the imports of petroleum products are converted into crude oil equivalent. In your view, is this methodology well adapted for the calculation of the equivalent of crude oil import?</b>	Yes, fully
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	
<b>2.6. The average daily inland consumption referred to in question 2.3 need to be calculated based on the crude oil equivalent of inland consumption during the previous calendar year. Annex II of Directive 2009/119/EC lays down the methodology based on which the inland consumption is converted into crude oil equivalent of inland. In your view, is this methodology well adapted for the calculation of the inland consumption?</b>	Yes, fully
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	

<b>2.7. Annex III of Directive 2009/119/EC lays down the methodology for calculating the level of stocks held. In your view, is this methodology well adapted for calculating the actual level of stocks that would be actually accessible and available in case of oil supply disruption?</b>	Yes, fully
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	
<b>2.8. Any additional views related to the relevance of the objectives of Directive 2009/119?</b>	The objectives are relevant at country level. The Directive however has not sufficiently addressed that the burden imposed to individual agents at national level should not distort competition. In practice, many countries , including XXX have set the same obligation to all agents and this selectively penalises the business model of resellers because the additional unit costs imposed are much higher than in the case of manufacturing enterprises.
<b>3.1. In your view, has the Directive improved the availability of the stocks in case of oil disruption?</b>	Yes, partly
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	In XXX availability unchanged compared to earlier Directive.
<b>3.2. In your view, has the Directive improved the physical accessibility of the stocks in case of oil disruption?</b>	Yes, partly
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	Emergency stocks are useful for protection against (fortunately seldom) global disruptions. There should be a mechanism allowing temporary use of these stocks to deal with local supply crisis.
<b>3.3. In your view, has the Directive achieved a better harmonization with the International Energy Agency (IEA) system?</b>	Yes, partly
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	
<b>3.4. If you are a public administration, how would you rate the impact of the Directive on the administrative burden?</b>	
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	
<b>3.5. If you are an economic operator, how would you rate the impact of the Directive on the administrative burden?</b>	The administrative burden increased slightly
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	

<b>3.6. In your view, has the Directive improved the transparency as regards the level of emergency oil stocks held in the Member States and the European Union as a whole?</b>	Yes, partly
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	There is not a uniform interpretation across countries as to the differentiation of commercial stocks and qualifying stocks
<b>3.7. Emergency oil stocks may be held at any location across the EU. The previous rules allowed cross-border stockholding only if there was a bilateral agreement between the Member States concerned. The Directive removed this requirement, but Member States need to authorize in advance cross-border arrangements between operators. In your view, has the Directive improved transparency as regards the cross border stocks?</b>	Yes, partly
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	Member States should list installations where due control can be executed. Any arrangement between operators where stock is held in a listed installation should not be subject to pre-authorisation.
<b>3.8. Are you aware of any unexpected or unintended effects of the Directive?</b>	Yes
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	In XXX, further distortion of competition. Explained under 3.9
<b>3.9. Any additional views on the effectiveness of Directive 2009/119?</b>	Country obligation with the new Directive is now higher, because it includes 100% of jet fuel sales (previously only 50%) and because of the effect of non-fuel crude components (lubricants, bitumen, coke...). However the extra cost has internally been allocated to agents disregarding involvement in these product segments. It may only be an XXX issue of implementation, but illustrates that the Directive doesn't sufficiently address the issue of being neutral to competition.
<b>4.1. In your view, the costs related to the implementation of the Directive were:</b>	high
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	

4.2. How would you estimate the economic burden resulting from the Directive on the different stakeholders? (0 stands for no impact 1 for minimum impact and 5 for a maximum impact): CSE	2
4.2. How would you estimate the economic burden resulting from the Directive on the different stakeholders? (0 stands for no impact 1 for minimum impact and 5 for a maximum impact): SME	5
4.2. How would you estimate the economic burden resulting from the Directive on the different stakeholders? (0 stands for no impact 1 for minimum impact and 5 for a maximum impact): Industry	4
4.2. How would you estimate the economic burden resulting from the Directive on the different stakeholders? (0 stands for no impact 1 for minimum impact and 5 for a maximum impact): Consumers	4
4.2. How would you estimate the economic burden resulting from the Directive on the different stakeholders? (0 stands for no impact 1 for minimum impact and 5 for a maximum impact): Tax payers	4
4.2. How would you estimate the economic burden resulting from the Directive on the different stakeholders? (0 stands for no impact 1 for minimum impact and 5 for a maximum impact): State finance	1
4.3. Did the Directive improve efficiency by simplifying reporting?	No
Please explain your answer	
4.4. Did the Directive improve efficiency through better harmonisation with the IEA system?	Yes, partly
Please explain your answer	Criteria for qualifying stocks still different. Also different implementations at country level.
4.5. Considering your answers to chapter 3 and to questions 4.3 and 4.4, do you think that the costs related to the implementation of the Directive are proportionate to the benefits achieved?	No
Please explain your answer	
4.6. Any additional views on the effectiveness of Directive 2009/119?	
5.1. The IEA requires its members to hold oils stocks equivalent 90 days of net imports and imposes no obligation on net oil exporters. Contrary to the EU system, stocks held for commercial or operational use can be counted to this purpose. 20 EU Member States have to comply with both the EU and the IEA mechanism. In your view, is the system resulting from the Directive coherent with IEA obligations?	Yes, partly
Please explain your answer	The Directive creates a higher stockholding obligation without proportional benefits.

<p>5.2. The Energy Union means making energy more secure, affordable and sustainable. The Energy Union strategy is made up of 5 dimensions: (1) energy security, solidarity and trust; (2) a fully integrated European energy market; (3) energy efficiency contributing to moderation of demand; (4) decarbonising the economy and (5) research innovation and competitiveness. <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/priorities/energy-union-and-climate_en">http://ec.europa.eu/priorities/energy-union-and-climate_en</a> In your view, is the Directive coherent with the Energy Union objectives? : Energy security, solidarity and trust</p>	<p>Yes, partly</p>
<p>5.2. The Energy Union means making energy more secure, affordable and sustainable. The Energy Union strategy is made up of 5 dimensions: (1) energy security, solidarity and trust; (2) a fully integrated European energy market; (3) energy efficiency contributing to moderation of demand; (4) decarbonising the economy and (5) research innovation and competitiveness. <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/priorities/energy-union-and-climate_en">http://ec.europa.eu/priorities/energy-union-and-climate_en</a> In your view, is the Directive coherent with the Energy Union objectives? : Fully integrated European energy market</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>5.2. The Energy Union means making energy more secure, affordable and sustainable. The Energy Union strategy is made up of 5 dimensions: (1) energy security, solidarity and trust; (2) a fully integrated European energy market; (3) energy efficiency contributing to moderation of demand; (4) decarbonising the economy and (5) research innovation and competitiveness. <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/priorities/energy-union-and-climate_en">http://ec.europa.eu/priorities/energy-union-and-climate_en</a> In your view, is the Directive coherent with the Energy Union objectives? : Energy efficiency contributing to moderation of demand</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>5.2. The Energy Union means making energy more secure, affordable and sustainable. The Energy Union strategy is made up of 5 dimensions: (1) energy security, solidarity and trust; (2) a fully integrated European energy market; (3) energy efficiency contributing to moderation of demand; (4) decarbonising the economy and (5) research innovation and competitiveness. <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/priorities/energy-union-and-climate_en">http://ec.europa.eu/priorities/energy-union-and-climate_en</a> In your view, is the Directive coherent with the Energy Union objectives? : Decarbonising the economy</p>	<p>No</p>

5.2. The Energy Union means making energy more secure, affordable and sustainable. The Energy Union strategy is made up of 5 dimensions: (1) energy security, solidarity and trust; (2) a fully integrated European energy market; (3) energy efficiency contributing to moderation of demand; (4) decarbonising the economy and (5) research innovation and competitiveness. <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/priorities/energy-union-and-climate_en">http://ec.europa.eu/priorities/energy-union-and-climate_en</a> In your view, is the Directive coherent with the Energy Union objectives? : Research, innovation and Competitiveness	No
Please explain your answer	
5.3. In your view, is the Directive coherent with other EU rules in the energy sector ? <a href="https://ec.europa.eu/energy/en/topics">https://ec.europa.eu/energy/en/topics</a>	Yes, partly
Please explain your answer	Expecting oil to be the sector providing supply security and ruling to move out of oil seems inconsistent
5.4. In your view, is the Directive coherent with other EU rules relating to the oil sector? <a href="https://ec.europa.eu/energy/en/topics/oil-gas-and-coal">https://ec.europa.eu/energy/en/topics/oil-gas-and-coal</a> <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/growth/tools-databases/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=8630&amp;lang=en">http://ec.europa.eu/growth/tools-databases/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=8630&amp;lang=en</a>	Yes, partly
Please explain your answer	
5.5. In your view, is the Directive coherent with other EU policies? <a href="https://ec.europa.eu/info/index_en">https://ec.europa.eu/info/index_en</a>	No opinion
Please explain your answer	
5.6. Any additional views on the coherence of the Directive with other rules, policies and actions?	
6.1. Do you see an added value in having a coordinated mechanism for emergency oil stocks?	Yes
6.2. Do you think that the existence of a separate EU system for emergency oil stocks is justified?	Yes
Please explain your answer	
6.3. Do you consider that the EU system is a good complement of the IEA system?	No
Please explain your answer	
6.4. What would be the consequences on the levels of oil stocks available in case of disruption if the EU no longer required Member States to hold emergency stocks?	Decrease the level of oil stocks held
Please explain your answer	
6.5. What would be the consequences on the security of oil supply if the EU no longer required Member States to hold emergency stocks?	Increase the vulnerability in case of oil disruption
Please explain your answer	
6.6. Is there a need for EU additional policy on emergency oil stocks?	No
Please explain your answer	It would be enough to correct

	outstanding implementation and competition issues.
<b>6.7. Any additional views on Directive 2009/119 added value?</b>	
<b>7.1. The 7% naphtha threshold might have an impact on the stockholding obligation for some Member States with naphtha yield fluctuating around 7%. Do you consider annex I should be amended to limit the trigger effect of the 7% naphtha yield?</b>	Yes
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	
<b>7.2. Under the IEA methodology, for calculating the stock levels, the 4% naphtha yield is deducted from "crude oil, NGL, and feedstock" which is the abbreviation for the full name of Crude, NGL, Feedstocks, Additives/oxygenates and Other Hydrocarbons; compared to 4% reduction of "crude oil" in Annex III of the Directive. "Crude oil" in the sense used in Annex III of the Directive comprises also Crude, NGL, Feedstocks, Additives/oxygenates and Other Hydrocarbons. Do you consider Annex III of the Directive should be amended to explicitly indicate the full name of Crude, NGL, Feedstocks, Additives/oxygenates and Other Hydrocarbons?</b>	Yes
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	
<b>7.3. Under the IEA methodology, naphtha for gasoline production is included in the calculation for stock levels if it is reported as gasoline blending component while naphtha for petrochemical uses is excluded. According to Annex III of the Directive, stocks of naphtha are not included in the emergency stocks. Do you consider Annex III of the Directive should be amended to further detail the possible reporting of naphtha as gasoline blending component?</b>	No
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	
<b>7.4. In your view, is a 10% deduction still justified?</b>	No
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	
<b>7.5. if not justified, how should Annex III be amended?</b>	Other (specify)
<b>Please explain your answer</b>	Amendment of Annex three while countries still subject to IEA rules will be inoperative. A joint agreement with IEA should be sought before introducing changes.
<b>Do you have other specific views that could not be expressed in the context of your replies to the above questions?</b>	49