

Berlin, 29 October 2025

BDEW Bundesverband
der Energie- und
Wasserwirtschaft e.V.
(German Association of Energy and
Water Industries)
BDEW Representation at the EU

Avenue de Cortenbergh 52
1000 Brussels
Belgium

www.bdew.de

Position Paper

BDEW response to ACER's consultation on the Registra- tion Format and changes to the CEREMP platform

The German Association of Energy and Water Industries (BDEW), Berlin, represents over 1,900 companies. The range of members stretches from local and communal through regional and up to national and international businesses. It represents around 90 percent of the electricity production, over 60 percent of local and district heating supply, 90 percent of natural gas, over 90 percent of energy grid as well as 80 percent of drinking water extraction as well as around a third of wastewater disposal in Germany.

BDEW is registered in the German lobby register for the representation of interests vis-à-vis the German Bundestag and the Federal Government, as well as in the EU transparency register for the representation of interests vis-à-vis the EU institutions. When representing interests, it follows the recognised Code of Conduct pursuant to the first sentence of Section 5(3), of the German Lobby Register Act, the Code of Conduct attached to the Register of Interest Representatives (europa.eu) as well as the internal BDEW Compliance Guidelines to ensure its activities are professional and transparent at all times. National register entry: R000888. European register entry: 20457441380-38

Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Objective	4
1.2	Target group.....	4
1.3	Contact and deadline	4
1.4	Background of public consultation	4
1.5	Scope of public consultation.....	5
1.5.1	In-scope changes.....	5
1.5.2	Out-of-scope changes	6
1.6	Related documents	6
2	Public consultation questions on proposed amendments to Annex 1 to ACER Decision.....	7
2.1	Reorganisation of Section 1 (Data related to Market Participant).....	7
2.2	Addition of fields.....	8
2.2.1	Addition of fields in Section 1 (Data related to Market Participant).....	8
2.2.2	Addition of field in Section 2 (Data related to natural persons linked to Market Participant).....	17
2.2.3	Addition of field in Section 3 (Data related to Ultimate Controller or beneficiary of the Market Participant)	17
2.2.4	Addition of fields in Section 5 (Data related to delegated parties (RRMs) reporting on behalf of the Market Participant)	18
2.3	Removal of fields.....	19
2.3.1	Removal of fields across sections	19
2.3.2	Removal of Section 5 (Data related to delegated parties (RRMs)..... reporting on behalf of the Market Participant).....	20
2.4	Reformulation of fields	21
2.4.1	Reformulation of fields across sections.....	21
2.4.2	Reformulation of fields in Section 2 (Data related to natural	21

persons linked to Market Participant)	21
2.4.3 Reformulation of field in Section 3 (Data related to Ultimate Controller or beneficiary of the Market Participant)	22
2.4.4 Reformulation of field in Section 4 (Data related to corporate structure of the Market Participant)	22
2.4.5 Reformulation of field in Section 5 (Data related to delegated parties (RRMs) reporting on behalf of the Market Participant)	23
3 Public consultation questions on proposed functional changes to the CEREMP platform	23
4 Publication of register extracts and improved interoperability	33
5 Confidentiality and data protection	34
5.1 Confidentiality.....	34
5.2 Data protection.....	35

1 Introduction

1.1 Objective

The aim of this public consultation is to collect feedback from all interested stakeholders on proposed amendments to the Registration Format adopted in Annex 1 to ACER Decision no 01/2012 relating to the Registration Format pursuant to Article 9(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1227/2011 (hereinafter "ACER Decision 01/2012") and changes to the Centralised European Register of Energy Market Participants (hereinafter "CEREMP") platform.

1.2 Target group

This consultation is addressed to all interested stakeholders, including but not limited to Market Participants (MPs), National Regulatory Authorities (NRAs), Registered Reporting Mechanisms (RRMs), Inside Information Platforms (IIPs), and Organised Marketplaces (OMPs).

1.3 Contact and deadline

The contact point for this public consultation is remit@acer.europa.eu.

The Agency invites all interested stakeholders to provide comments to this Consultation Paper by 29/10/2025 17.00 (CET).

1.4 Background of public consultation

[Regulation \(EU\) No 1227/2011](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 on wholesale energy market integrity and transparency, as amended by Regulation (EU) 2024/1106 and Regulation (EU) 2024/1789 (hereinafter referred to as "REMIT") is the EU framework that prohibits market manipulation and insider trading in the wholesale energy market.

Under Article 9(1) of REMIT, all market participants must register with the national regulatory authority of the country in which they are established or resident. Pursuant to Article 9(3) of REMIT, each national regulatory authority is responsible for transmitting the information in their national registers to ACER, in a format determined by the latter, in cooperation with those authorities; ACER adopted the [Registration Format](#) in 2012.

Pursuant to the same Article 9(3) of REMIT, ACER also established and manages the [European Register of Market Participants](#); to this aim, ACER collects NRAs' national registers through the CEREMP platform. To keep up with evolving regulatory and technical requirements (including the [2024](#) revision of REMIT), ACER seeks to update the Registration Format and the CEREMP platform.

To inform its decision-making process, ACER will consult on possible amendments and gather stakeholder's feedback.

1.5 Scope of public consultation

The European Register of Market Participants was first published on 17 March 2015 (available on the REMIT Portal) and has since been regularly updated. As of April 2025, over 19 000 market participants were registered in the European Register of Market Participants.

The CEREMP platform became operational on 16 June 2014 and can be used as a software by NRAs for the establishment of national registers of market participants.

The purpose of this public consultation is to:

1. collect stakeholders' feedback on proposed amendments to Annex 1 to ACER Decision 01/2012;
2. collect stakeholders' feedback on proposed amendments to the public European Register of Market Participants;
3. collect stakeholders' feedback on proposed changes to the CEREMP platform.

Based on the input received from the public consultation and its own assessment, the Agency may:

1. update the Registration Format annexed to ACER Decision 01/2012. NRAs would then have to update their national registers accordingly. As a consequence, market participants already registered would be asked by NRAs to update the new or updated fields of the registration form in due time;
2. update the public European Register of Market Participants;
3. implement changes in the CEREMP platform. The technical feasibility of any updates to the CEREMP platform will be further assessed by ACER after public consultation. If confirmed, these changes will not go live before late 2026.

1.5.1 In-scope changes

The proposed changes originate from feedback collected from NRAs (including market participant's input), ACER and reporting entities.

All the proposed changes to the Registration Format are reflected in Annex 1 of ACER Decision 01/2012 as per the draft Registration Format (available as a background document to this public consultation). To facilitate review, all amendments to Annex 1 have been presented in red font, thereby enabling clear recognition of the proposed changes.

1.5.2 Out-of-scope changes

- I. Changes to the Registration Format which are already reflected in CEREMP, due to:
 - a) Regulation (EU) 2024/1106 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 April 2024 amending Regulations (EU) No 1227/2011 and (EU) 2019/942 as regards improving the Union's protection against market manipulation on the wholesale energy market:
 - Algorithmic trading and Direct Electronic Access as per Article 5a of revised REMIT (field no. 130, 135 and 136 of the draft Registration Format)
 - Designated representative as per Article 9 of revised REMIT (field no. 144 till 153 of the draft Registration Format)
 - b) Council Regulation (EU) 2022/2576 of 19 December 2022 on enhancing solidarity through better coordination of gas purchases, reliable price benchmarks and exchanges of gas across borders:
 - Collection of LNG market data as per Section 2 of Chapter III of Council Regulation (EU) 2022/2576 (field no. 128 and 129 of the draft Registration Format)
- II. Potential future amendments to the Registration Format and CEREMP that may result from the ongoing revision of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1348/2014 of 17 December 2014 on data reporting implementing Article 8(2) and Article 8(6) of Regulation (EU) No 1227/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council on wholesale energy market integrity and transparency (hereinafter "REMIT Implementing Regulation").
- III. Proposals concerning the amendment to the format of the Registration Format or the description of the field, e.g. selection of True/False, addition of N/A, from optional to mandatory, description of either company name as in the document of establishment in national register if legal person or full name if natural person, use of special characters, etc.

1.6 Related documents

- [Regulation \(EU\) No 1227/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council on wholesale energy market integrity and transparency](#)
- [Regulation \(EU\) 2024/1106 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 April 2024 amending Regulations \(EU\) No 1227/2011 and \(EU\) 2019/942 as regards improving the Union's protection against market manipulation on the wholesale energy market](#)
- [Open letter on the implications of the revision of Regulation \(EU\) No 1227/2011 on REMIT data reporting aspects and notification obligations](#)

- [Open letter on the notifications of algorithmic trading and direct electronic access according to the revised Regulation \(EU\) No 1227/2011](#)
- [ACER Decision No 01/2012 relating to the registration format pursuant to Article 9\(3\) of Regulation \(EU\) No 1227/2011](#)

2 Public consultation questions on proposed amendments to Annex 1 to ACER Decision

01/2012

In this section the Agency would like to collect stakeholders' views on proposed amendments to Annex 1 to ACER Decision 01/2012. The main types of changes in Annex 1 to ACER Decision 01/2012 are reorganisation of Section 1, additions of new fields, removal of fields, and changes in the content of existing fields.

2.1 Reorganisation of Section 1 (Data related to Market Participant)

1. Separation of **Section 1 into subsections** and reordering of fields in line with subsections' content:
 - a) Market participant identification
 - b) Market participant role
 - c) Disclosure of inside information
 - d) LNG market data
 - e) Algorithmic trading
 - f) Market participant's changes of identifiers
 - g) Designated representative
 - h) ACER required information
 - i) User and registration details

Justification: The organisation of Section 1 into subsections, each dedicated to a particular type of information requirements, and reordering of fields under specific subsections allows for improved structuring of Section 1 leading to enhanced readability and understanding of the information provided.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW considers that the rationale and practical implementation of the newly introduced subsections are not yet fully clear. In particular, it remains difficult to understand

how elements such as (d) LNG market data and (g) Designated representative are intended to be integrated into the existing registration framework.

In general, from BDEW's perspective, the update of CEREMP should be guided by the overarching EU objective of simplification — ensuring proportionality, flexibility, and low administrative barriers to registration. In this context, all data that can be obtained via transaction reporting — taking into account the forthcoming revised Implementing Regulation — should be sourced from that system. CEREMP should only require information that cannot be retrieved from transaction reporting.

2.2 Addition of fields

2.2.1 Addition of fields in Section 1 (Data related to Market Participant)

2. Addition in Section 1 a) of field '**VAT number notification**' as a 'Declaration whether market participant has a VAT number' through 'Selection from the list of admitted values (one value possible): True / False' that is a 'Mandatory selection'.

Justification: Declaration by an MP whether it has VAT number would enhance analysis of submitted information and allow for cross validation whether such number has been provided when 'True' is selected. The addition of 'VAT number notification' field would also simplify disclosure of VAT number and improve the quality of information provided in field 'VAT Number', as selection of 'False' eliminates the need for disclosure of a dummy VAT number or 'N/A'.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

3. Addition in Section 1 a) of field '**National company register website (VAT Number)**' as an 'URL of the national company register website where VAT Number can be verified' through 'Free Text, alpha- numerical' that is 'Mandatory if VAT number is provided by 3rd country market participant'.

Justification: Provision of this information would enhance the ability to verify the correctness of a VAT number provided by an MP.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** This mandatory field may create a disproportionate administrative burden and, in some cases, might not even be feasible for third-country market participants, as national

company registers are not always publicly accessible, centralized, or equipped with VAT number verification functionalities.

Therefore, BDEW suggests that entities should have the possibility to select an option such as *"No public register available"* and provide an accompanying explanation or reference to alternative documentation — for example, official VAT registration evidence such as government-issued certificates or extracts from tax authorities.

4. Addition in Section 1 b) of field **'Market participant role'** as 'Indication of role(s) of the market participant on wholesale energy markets. Possible values: Central energy player: producer, supplier, consumer; Financial player: bank, trading house, investment fund; Intermediate energy player: aggregator or trader, market access provider, oil and (or) gas player, consumer; Infrastructure operator: Transmission system operator (TSO), LNG system operator (LSO), and System storage operator (SSO); Other market participant role' through 'Selection from the list of admitted values (more than one value possible)' that is 'Mandatory'.

Addition in Section 1 b) of field **'Other market participant role'** as 'Description of other market participant role on wholesale energy markets' through 'Free Text, alpha- numerical' that is 'Mandatory if value for 'Market participant role' selected as 'Other market participant role'.

Justification: Provision by an MP of this information would enhance surveillance activities, such as when analysing positions on the futures markets. It would allow to better distinguish between market participants that enter into transactions for physical delivery, as opposed to financial trading. Addition of 'Other market participant role' with relevant free text field addresses a non-exhaustive list of items for market participant role.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** Market participants often perform several roles of equal importance and such field may require frequent updates, raising questions about necessity and potential data quality issues. In addition, the proposed role categories lack harmonized definitions under REMIT, risking inconsistent interpretations (e.g. does a biomethane producer count as gas producer?).

5. Addition in Section 1 b) of field **'Type of market participant's trading activities'** as an 'Indication of type(s) of market participant's trading activities on wholesale energy markets. Possible values: Hedging; Proprietary trading; Intermediation and thirdparty market

access; Other type of market participant's trading activities; N/A' through 'Selection from the list of admitted values (more than one value possible)' that is 'Mandatory'.

Addition in Section 1 b) of field '**Other type of market participant's trading activities**' as a 'Description of other type of market participant's trading activities' through 'Free Text, alpha- numerical' that is 'Mandatory if value for 'Type of market participant's trading activities' selected as 'Other type of market participant's trading activities'.

Justification: Provision by an MP of this information would enhance surveillance activities. Addition of 'Other type of market participant's trading activities' with relevant free text field addresses a non-exhaustive list of items for market participant's trading activities.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** In addition to our answer to question 4, as with other proposed free-text fields, we are not in favor of its introduction as it may introduce interpretative uncertainty for both reporting entities and NRAs responsible for data analysis. Moreover, free-text fields would provide little analytical value in a structured registry such as CEREMP, as they do not represent qualitative information.

6. Addition in Section 1 b) of field '**Market participant entering only into contracts reportable at request of the Agency under Article 4 of REMIT Implementing Regulation**' as a 'Declaration whether market participant enters only into contracts reportable at request of the Agency under Article 4 of REMIT Implementing Regulation' through 'Selection from the list of admitted values (one value possible): True / False' that is 'Mandatory selection'.

Addition in Section 1 b) of field '**Reason for market participant entering only into contracts reportable at request of the Agency under Article 4 of REMIT Implementing Regulation**' as a 'Description of reason why market participant enters only into contracts reportable at request of the Agency under Article 4 of REMIT Implementing Regulation' through 'Free Text, alpha- numerical' that is 'Mandatory if value for 'Market participant entering only into contracts reportable at request of the Agency under Article 4 of REMIT Implementing Regulation' selected as 'True'.

Justification: Provision by an MP of this information would improve transparency on why certain MPs are not reporting data and raise awareness among market participants. It

would also be helpful from a surveillance perspective and support investigations related to breaches of Article 8 of REMIT.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW does not agree with the introduction of these fields. Neither a binary True/False entry nor an additional explanation as to why a market participant does not engage in directly reportable contracts is necessary and would significantly increase the administrative burden, particularly for smaller market participants. ACER can already derive this information from the absence of reporting activity. In cases of suspected non-compliance, ACER or the respective NRA may request further information directly from the market participant. Furthermore, the proposed addition overlaps with the field suggested under Question 19 ("Reason for not having an RRM"), rendering this new field redundant.

7. Addition in Section 1 c) of field '**Reason for not expecting to require places/platforms for disclosing inside information under Article 4(1) of REMIT**' as a 'Disclosure of reason for not expecting to require places/platforms for disclosing inside information under Article 4(1) of REMIT' through 'Free Text, alpha- numerical' that is 'Mandatory if value for 'Market participant expects to require places/platforms for disclosing inside information under Article 4(1) of REMIT' selected as 'False'.

Justification: Provision by MPs of this information would make them aware of their responsibility to assess whether their trading activities and assets could possibly generate any inside information, which is a key step for complying with the obligation under Article 4 of REMIT.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion-

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** There is already a field requiring market participants to indicate whether they possess insider information. This information has already been provided during registration, and the added value of requesting it again appears questionable for the authorities.
8. Addition in Section 1 e) of field '**Place of algorithmic trading**' as an 'Indication of an Organised Market Place used for algorithmic trading' through 'Selection from the list of admitted values (more than one value possible)' that is 'Mandatory if value for 'Algorithmic trading notification' selected as 'True'. Select 'Other place of algorithmic trading' when relevant'.

Addition in Section 1 e) of field **'Other place of algorithmic trading'** as a 'Description of other place of algorithmic trading' through 'Free Text, alpha- numerical' that is 'Mandatory if value for 'Place of algorithmic trading' selected as 'Other place of algorithmic trading'.

Justification: Knowledge of algorithmic trading activities across different platforms is essential for NRAs to assess whether the systems and control measures implemented by MPs meet the requirements under Article 5a of REMIT II. If a market participant engages in trading on multiple platforms — especially where crosstrading is possible — their internal systems and controls must be proportionately more robust and detailed to prevent market abuse and ensure compliance. Provision of this information by an MP directly supports compliance with Article 5a and strengthens the NRA's ability to conduct effective surveillance. Addition of 'Other place of algorithmic trading' with relevant free text field addresses a non-exhaustive list of items for places of algorithmic trading.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW does not agree with the inclusion of this field, as the information can already be obtained through REMIT transaction reporting. In general, all data extractable via transaction reporting should be sourced from that system, while CEREMP should only cover information not available there. Moreover, multi-venue activity changes frequently, making regular updates in CEREMP burdensome and prone to errors, without providing clear additional surveillance value.

9. Addition in Section 1 e) of field **'Type of algorithmic trading used'** as an 'Indication of type of algorithmic trading used by market participant. Possible values: Internal (market participant's) algorithms; External (OMPs') "execution algorithms" without human intervention (trading functionalities with automated management of orders); Stand-alone vendor algorithms by third parties; External order types offered as standard functionalities by OMPs; Systems used for the confirmation of orders or post-trade processing executed transactions; Signal generators; Systems for pure order routing; Other type of algorithmic trading' through 'Selection from the list of admitted values (more than one value possible)' that is 'Mandatory if value for 'Algorithmic trading notification' selected as 'True'.

Addition in Section 1 e) of field **'Other type of algorithmic trading'** as a 'Description of other type of algorithmic trading' through 'Free Text, alpha- numerical' that is 'Mandatory if value for 'Type of algorithmic trading used' selected as 'Other type of algorithmic trading'.

Justification: Provision by an MP of this information would address requirements and would properly assess the adequacy of the participant's systems and control measures under Article 5a of REMIT II. The possible values in the list of types of algorithmic trading correspond to the categorisations provided in ACER 'Open letter on the notifications of algorithmic trading and direct electronic access according to the revised Regulation (EU) No 1227/2011'¹. Addition of 'Other type of algorithmic trading' with relevant free text field addresses a non-exhaustive list of items for types of algorithmic trading used.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

- › **Answer:** This proposal goes beyond the Level 1 text and contradicts Article 5a of REMIT. It is also not consistent with ACER's open letter on algorithmic trading notifications (30 July 2024), which clarifies that functionalities such as external order types offered by OMPs, order confirmation or post-trade processing systems, signal generators, and pure order-routing tools are outside the scope of algorithmic trading. Including these as mandatory selectable options in CEREMP would be inappropriate and risk inconsistent reporting by market participants.

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

10. Addition in Section 1 e) of field '**Place of offering DEA services**' as an 'Indication of Organised Market Place where Direct Electronic Access is offered' through 'Selection from the list of admitted values (more than one value possible)' that is 'Mandatory if value for 'Direct Electronic Access (DEA) notification' selected as 'True'.

Justification: Provision by an MP of this information would address requirements of Article 5a of REMIT. This field would be applicable to DEA providers as is the case currently for 'Direct Electronic Access (DEA) notification' field.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

¹ <https://www.acer.europa.eu/sites/default/files/REMIT/Guidance%20on%20REMIT%20Application/Open%20Letters%20on%20REMIT%20Policy/Open-letter-on-algorithmic-trading.pdf>

- › **Answer:** This proposal goes beyond the Level 1 REMIT text. Introducing such a field would create significant administrative effort for market participants, as updates would be required each time DEA is offered on a new OMP. Furthermore, as noted in response to Question 8, this information will already be available under the proposed changes to the REMIT Implementing Regulation on transaction reporting. In general, all data extractable via transaction reporting should come from that source, while CEREMP should only cover information not included there.

11. Addition in Section 1 e) of field '**ACER/EIC/LEI code of DEA provider client(s)**' as 'Either ACER/EIC/LEI code of client(s) using Direct Electronic Access provided by market participant' through 'Alpha-numerical chars, more than one value possible' that is 'Mandatory if value for 'Direct Electronic Access (DEA) notification' selected as 'True'. EIC or LEI to be provided when ACER code is not available'.

Justification: Provision by an MP of this information would address requirements of Article 5a of REMIT II. In addition, it might occur that the DEA provider client(s) are not registered in CEREMP and hence do not have an ACER code, so that EIC or LEI might be required to uniquely identify the client.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW does not agree with the proposed addition to Section 1 (e). This information will already be covered under the proposed changes to the REMIT Implementing Regulation on transaction reporting. As a general principle, all data extractable via transaction reporting should come from that source, while CEREMP fields should only include information not available there.

12. Addition in Section 1 f) of field '**Reason for changing ACER code**' as an 'Indication of reason of changes for a market participant. Possible values: Merger; Acquisition; Change of country of registration; Other reason of changes; N/A' through 'Selection from the list of admitted values (more than one value possible)' that is 'Mandatory'.

Addition in Section 1 f) of field '**Reason for changing EIC code**' as an 'Indication of reason of changes for a market participant. Possible values: Merger; Acquisition; Change of country of registration; Other reason of changes; N/A' through 'Selection from the list of admitted values (more than one value possible)' that is 'Mandatory'.

Justification: Provision by an MP of this information would foster the NRAs process to assess and approve or reject the information update in CEREMP. A brief note would help to follow the thread of the MP for surveillance purposes in an investigation.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW supports this introduction as it could eliminate the need to report novations that do not involve actual contractual changes. The proposed "Previous ACER Code" field is particularly useful if it allows omitting reports for non-commercial novations resulting solely from a counterparty's ACER code change. This field should be event-driven and designed to avoid unnecessary administrative burden.

13. Addition in Section 1 f) of field '**Previous ACER code of market participant**' as an 'ACER code of market participant assigned to that market participant before changes resulting in new ACER code' through '12 alpha-numerical chars' that is 'Mandatory if change in ACER code of market participant occurred'.

Addition in Section 1 f) of field '**Previous EIC code of market participant**' as an 'Energy Identification Code of market participant assigned to that market participant before changes resulting in new Energy Identification Code' through 'Free Text, 16 alpha-numerical chars' that is 'Mandatory if change in EIC code of market participant occurred. State 'N/A' when market participant does not possess EIC code'.

Addition in Section 1 f) of field '**Previous name of market participant**' as 'Full name of market participant before changes resulting in new name (either company name as in the document of establishment in national register if legal person or full name if natural person).' through 'Free Text, alpha- numerical' that is 'Mandatory if change in market participant's name occurred'.

Justification: Provision by an MP of this information would foster the NRAs process to assess and approve or reject the information update in CEREMP.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

- › **Answer:** See our response to question 12.

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

14. Addition in Section 1 h) of field '**Market participant's economic activities**' as an 'Indication of all economic sectors in which the market participant is active, following a standardized classification' through 'Selection from the list of admitted values based on NACE

nomenclature Rev. 2.1, at the letter level (Level 1 - Sections) (more than one value possible)' that is 'Mandatory'.

Justification: Pursuant to Article 12(2) of REMIT, ACER has an obligation to make public, by means of a Reference Centre, parts of the information that it possesses, in the interest of improving transparency of wholesale energy markets. Provision by a market participant of this information would increase transparency; at the same time, commercially sensitive information would be protected, as the data will only be published in an aggregated form. In addition, ACER's upcoming activities related to, among others retail, will make it necessary to aggregate data across types of consumers. In the long term, the use of established nomenclatures (such as NACE) will facilitate the future collaboration with other entities managing data, as it is compatible with both national instances' and EU-ROSTAT's classifications. Provision of this information entails the use of existing data for those companies that are already in CEREMP and therefore deploy analyses for the whole database, as all companies are mandated to indicate their economic sector of activity when registering with NRAs.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW does not see added value in this proposal, as the information does not provide any relevant insight into market participants beyond what is already collected under points 4 and 5. If included at all, the NACE field should be voluntary rather than mandatory.

15. Addition in Section 1 i) of field '**User responsible for registration request**' as a 'Name and surname of user responsible for registration request' through 'Free Text, alpha- numerical' that is 'Provided by the system'.

Addition in Section 1 i) of field '**E-mail of user responsible for registration request**' as an 'E-mail of user responsible for registration request' through 'Free Text, alpha- numerical' that is 'Mandatory'.

Justification: Provision by an MP of this information would enhance the NRAs process of verifying whether a user that initiated a registration request is the user responsible for registration request who possesses the required Power of Attorney. Only when the Power of Attorney is provided, the process of new registration can be carried out. This would contribute to making the process to receive an ACER code more efficient.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** The purpose of this new field is unclear. If it is meant to identify a contact person, it appears redundant, as this information is already covered under the existing section for individual contacts.

2.2.2 Addition of field in Section 2 (Data related to natural persons linked to Market Participant)

16. Addition in Section 2 of field '**Functional e-mail**' as a 'Shared mailbox or group email' through 'Free Text, alpha- numerical' that is 'Mandatory, when there is none provide personal e-mail'.

Justification: Provision by an MP of this information would ensure continuous communication with a market participant, in particular when a user indicated in CEREMP leaves a company and the personal email address is consequently deactivated.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW supports the introduction of the "Functional e-mail" field, provided that its use remains optional.

2.2.3 Addition of field in Section 3 (Data related to Ultimate Controller or beneficiary of the Market Participant)

17. Addition in Section 3 of field '**Ultimate Controller notification**' as a 'Declaration whether market participant has an Ultimate Controller' through 'Selection from the list of admitted values (one value possible): True / False' that is 'Mandatory selection'.

Justification: Provision by an MP of this information would allow it to explicitly declare whether there is a legal or natural person that exercises significant influence over the management of the market participant through a controlling interest or voting power in that market participant or its parent, irrespective of whether the control is interposed directly or through a combination of other companies.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW underlines the need for a clear and consistent definition of the term "Ultimate controller," as its interpretation has varied among NRAs over the years.

2.2.4 Addition of fields in Section 5 (Data related to delegated parties (RRMs) reporting on behalf of the Market Participant)

18. Addition in Section 5 of field '**Declaration about RRM**' as a 'Statement if the market participant has an RRM. Possible values: Yes; No; Both, depending on the reporting data' through 'Selection from the list of admitted values (one value possible)' that is 'Mandatory'.

Justification: Declaration by an MP of whether it has an RRM allows to collect information on selection of RRM for surveillance purposes, as it helps to assess whether the MP has delegated reporting to a third party. The provision of information in this field links with the information disclosed in other Section 5 field 'ACER code of RRM' that is mandatory when the MP either declares 'Yes' or 'Both, depending on the reporting data'. The answer provided in this field also has implications for the information disclosed in Section 5 field 'Reason for not having an RRM' that is mandatory when declaration is 'No' or 'Both, depending on the reporting data'.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** However, it is important that, in line with current practice, this field should not be required for data reported by OMPs on behalf of market participants, nor where reporting services are provided as an ancillary service under a WEP contract.

19. Addition in Section 5 of field '**Reason for not having an RRM**' as a 'Disclosure of reason for not having a Registered Reporting Mechanism. Possible values:

Counterparty to the transaction is arranging my reporting; TSO in charge of reporting transportation data pursuant to Article 6(2) of the REMIT Implementing Regulation; Organised market place on which the wholesale energy product was concluded; ENTSO-E as regards the data referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of Article 8 of the REMIT Implementing Regulation; ENTSG as regards the data referred to in Article 9(1) of the REMIT Implementing Regulation; TSO in charge of reporting data referred to in Article 8(3) and 9(2) of the REMIT Implementing Regulation; LNG system operator as regards the data referred to in Article 9(5) of the REMIT Implementing Regulation; Storage system operator as regards the data referred to in Article 9(9) of the REMIT Implementing Regulation; Market participant entering only into contracts reportable at the request of the Agency under Article 4 of the REMIT Implementing Regulation' through 'Selection from the list of admitted values (one value possible)' that is 'Mandatory if value for 'Declaration about RRM' is selected as 'No' or 'Both, depending on the reporting data'.

Justification: Those market participants that do not wish to become RRM, shall indicate in Section 5 of the registration form to whom they permanently delegate the reporting of data. However, such indication will not be necessary when the delegated party is one from the list of allowed values mentioned above. The introduction of a drop-down field in Section 5 of the registration form is intended to provide greater flexibility for exceptional cases and to avoid unnecessary bureaucracy, without compromising transparency for ACER and the NRAs. This field could be used, for example, by MPs who are active solely on organized marketplaces and therefore do not have a direct contract with an RRM.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** The proposed data fields, allowing only a single value, do not reflect the complexity of mixed reporting flows. In practice, many market participants have multiple reasons for not using an RRM — for example, MPs active on both OMPs and bilateral trading with delegated reporting. For transactions on OMPs, the OMP (acting as RRM) submits data, while for bilateral trades, the counterparties' RRM, do so. Clarification is also needed on how a market participant could operate without an RRM under the new exposure reporting obligations.

2.3 Removal of fields

2.3.1 Removal of fields across sections

20. Removal in Sections 1 to 5 of fields related to **date of validity**:

- a) **'Date of validity'** field in Section 1
- b) **'Date of validity'** field in Section 2
- c) **'Date of validity'** field in Section 3
- d) **'Date of validity Corporate Structure'** in Section 4
- e) **'Date of validity Delegated Party'** in Section 5.

Justification: Those fields are often not correctly filled in because they are wrongly understood by market participants, hence resulting in information that is not useful. Automatic application of a timestamp by the system in each section is more accurate and provides correct information.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

21. Removal of fields that are **considered no longer valid or useful**:

- a) 'Birth Date' field in Section 1
- b) 'Birth City' field in Section 1
- c) 'Birth State' field in Section 1
- d) 'Fax Person' field in Section 2
- e) 'Birth Date Ultimate Controller' field in Section 3
- f) 'Birth City Ultimate Controller' field in Section 3
- g) 'Birth State Ultimate Controller' field in Section 3.

Justification: The removal of these fields is based on perceived lack of usability of information collected in those fields.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

2.3.2 Removal of Section 5 (Data related to delegated parties (RRMs)

reporting on behalf of the Market Participant)

22. Removal of **Section 5** and its corresponding fields.

Justification: ACER would like to collect information on the usefulness of Section 5, since feedback provided thus far points to reasons for both maintaining and removing this section.

This section currently serves to raise awareness among market participants regarding their reporting obligations. Also, it reflects an actual demand for information by NRAs, because it is obligatory for an MP that reports transactions to do this through an approved RRM. Furthermore, when an MP performs over the counter or intragroup transactions, this section would provide information about an RRM, in case the latter needs to be approached in potential investigations. It would also help NRAs with the enforcement of Article 8 of REMIT II as not all NRAs have access to REMIT data.

On the other hand, the information in Section 5 is not used by some NRAs, as they already know which RRMs report on behalf of MPs from the data submitted to them.

Do you agree with the removal of Section 5? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

› **Answer:** This approach streamlines CEREMP while preserving supervisory clarity.

2.4 Reformulation of fields

2.4.1 Reformulation of fields across sections

23. Reformulation of existing fieldnames in Sections 2 to 5 into a **'Reference to registering market participant'** and change in fields description to **'ACER code of declaring market participant'**, with the following fields affected:

- a) 'Reference To Market Participant for Person' field in Section 2
- b) 'Market Participant for Ultimate Controller' field in Section 3
- c) 'Reference To Market Participant for Corporate Structure' field in Section 4
- d) 'Market Participant for Delegated Party' field in Section 5.

Justification: The change in fieldnames and fields' descriptions aims to adopt a consistent approach where the same type of information is requested, i.e. ACER code of the declaring market participant, and it serves to correctly identify the market participant providing more specific information requested in a given section.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW underlines the need for clarification on whether the term "Ultimate Controller" refers exclusively to another registered market participant.

2.4.2 Reformulation of fields in Section 2 (Data related to natural

persons linked to Market Participant)

24. Reformulation in description of field **'Role'** in Section 2 with addition of **'responsible for compliance'** to the list of possible values.

Justification: Addition of value 'responsible for compliance' would enable to collect information related to contact details of a person responsible for such matters. NRAs need to be able to contact compliance officers.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** This may lead requests to the right person(s) quicker.

25. Reformulation in notes to field **'Role Details'** in Section 2 to 'Mandatory, sensitive information should not be provided'.

Justification: The change aims to prevent market participants from disclosing sensitive information in this field. From feedback experience gathered with the use of CEREMP, it was noticed that some market participants define their role as shareholder or owner and disclose also the relevant share of ownership, which might be a sensitive financial information.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

2.4.3 Reformulation of field in Section 3 (Data related to Ultimate Controller or beneficiary of the Market Participant)

26. Reformulation in fieldname 'Corporate Vehicle' to '**Legal entity type**' in Section 3.

Justification: The change in fieldname would address the uncertainty on the type of information to be provided in this field and reduce the risk of possible mistakes.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

2.4.4 Reformulation of field in Section 4 (Data related to corporate structure of the Market Participant)

27. Reformulation in fieldname 'Type Relationship' to '**Relationship type**' in Section 4, with addition in the description of new types of undertakings and reference to the relevant legal act. The new types of undertakings added to the list of possible values are 'affiliated undertaking' and 'associated undertaking'.

Justification: The change in the fieldname and the addition in the description of new type of undertakings in the predefined list would be in line with the definitions provided in Directive 2013/34/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on the annual financial statements, consolidated financial statements and related reports of certain types of undertakings, amending Directive 2006/43/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing Council Directives 78/660/EEC and 83/349/EEC.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** Further clarification is needed regarding the new categories “affiliated undertakings” and “associated undertakings,” as their practical implications remain unclear. Additional guidance from ACER would be helpful to ensure consistent interpretation.

2.4.5 Reformulation of field in Section 5 (Data related to delegated

parties (RRMs) reporting on behalf of the Market Participant)

28. Reformulation in fieldname ‘Unique Code of Delegated Party’ to ‘**ACER code of RRM**’ in Section 5, as well as other changes in this field:
- a) the description field would be changed to ‘ACER code of the RRM for reporting on behalf of the market participant’;
 - b) the format field would be changed to ‘Selection from the list of admitted values (more than one value possible)’;
 - c) the notes field would be changed to ‘Mandatory if value for ‘Declaration about RRM’ is selected as ‘Yes’ or ‘Both, depending on the reporting data’.

Justification: The change in fieldname and in description of the field has been made to refer to RRM and reduce the risk of errors in the provision of information. The change in format field reflects the introduction of a predefined list of RRM sourced from the REMIT Portal from which a market participant will be able to select relevant RRM. The ability to select more than one value addresses also the possibility provided by Article 8(1) of REMIT to have more than one RRM. Application of the predefined list of RRM would increase efficiency when entering information and would result in improved transparency.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** It is essential that, consistent with current practice, this field is not required for data reported by OMPs on behalf of market participants or in cases where reporting is delegated.

3 Public consultation questions on proposed functional changes to the CEREMP platform

In this section the Agency would like to collect stakeholders’ views on proposed changes in the functioning of the CEREMP platform that in the long term can enhance the overall

transparency and integrity of wholesale energy markets and ensure a Union-wide level playing field for market participants.

29. Validations of information provided by market participants:

General justification: Currently, market participants sometimes provide incorrect or conflicting information in the registration that result in prolonging the registration process. Application of validation rules during the registration process, when technically feasible, would reduce the number of errors and increase its overall efficiency. It would also have the benefit of increasing the quality of provided information.

- a) **VAT number validation:** ACER considers applying (i) validation of VAT number as per individual Member States' patterns based on the 'Country' field in CEREMP, and (ii) validation of VAT number with VAT register.

Justification: This change would support the CEREMP user when providing the VAT number and reduce possible errors resulting from transposing numbers or typing mistakes. In addition, it would make the overall process of verifying and approving new ACER code registrations more efficient and avoid multiple draft requests from the same MP in the registration process. Such change would also increase data quality.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW agrees with the proposal. However, it must be ensured that the validation process does not block registration if ACER or NRAs identify inconsistencies. In such cases, they should inform the market participant but still allow the registration process to be completed.

- b) **LEI code validation:** ACER considers applying validation of LEI: (i) against defined pattern and (ii) in GLEIF register.

Justification: General justification on validations applies to LEI code validation.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW agrees with the proposal. However, it must be ensured that the validation process does not block registration if ACER or NRAs identify inconsistencies. In such cases, they should notify the market participant while still allowing the registration process to be completed.

- c) **BIC code validation:** ACER considers applying validation of BIC code against defined pattern.

Justification: General justification on validations applies to BIC code validation.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW agrees with the proposal. However, it must be ensured that the validation process does not block registration if ACER or NRAs identify inconsistencies. In such cases, they should inform the market participant but still allow the registration process to be completed.

›

- d) **EIC code validation:** ACER considers applying, when technically feasible, validation of EIC (type X) code against an ENTSO-E database and to validate the connection between EIC (type X) and VAT code against an ENTSO-E database.

Justification: General justification on validations applies to EIC code validation.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW agrees with the proposal. However, it must be ensured that the validation process does not block registration if ACER or NRAs identify inconsistencies. In such cases, they should inform the market participant but still allow the registration process to be completed.

- e) **Previous ACER code of market participant validation:** ACER considers applying validation of previous ACER code of market participant by checking: (i) previous ACER code of market participant against a defined pattern and (ii) whether previous ACER code was already registered in CEREMP.

Justification: General justification on validations applies to previous ACER code of market participant validation.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW agrees with the proposal. However, it must be ensured that the validation process does not block registration if ACER or NRAs identify inconsistencies. In such cases,

they should inform the market participant but still allow the registration process to be completed.

- f) **Date validation:** ACER considers applying date validations through: (i) setting date format to dd/mm/yyyy and (ii) restrictions preventing market participants from setting past dates when past date is not required.

Justification: General justification on validations applies to date validation.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW agrees with the proposal. However, it must be ensured that the validation process does not block registration if ACER or NRAs identify inconsistencies. In such cases, they should inform the market participant but still allow the registration process to be completed.

- g) **RRM validation:** ACER considers applying a validation to check information provided in field 'Unique code of RRM' in Section 5 with entity submitting reporting data on behalf of the market participant.

Justification: The aim of this validation would be to verify whether RRM's actually reporting on behalf of a market participant are correctly indicated by that market participant in this Section 5 field. This validation would inform which MPs need to correct their information in CEREMP.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** Many market participants use multiple RRM's to submit data on their behalf (e.g. through OMP or delegated reporting). As stated earlier, only the RRM used for direct reporting should be indicated in CEREMP. Delegated reporting RRM's, whether for bilateral or order book reporting, should not be included, as this information is dynamic and already available through transaction reporting.

30. ACER considers introducing a **visual representation of relationships/organogram** within CEREMP to be based on the parent/subsidiary indication in Section 4 that is either mapped by the application or provided by market participants in png format.

Justification: Feedback received from NRAs provides that market participants often face difficulties in completing information about relationships and the process for verifying the relationships by NRAs is also burdensome. Hence, a visual

representation/organogram would improve the overview of links between market participants and improve their understanding.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

31. ACER considers allowing **NRAs to view relationships that are in pending status** in the registration process.

Justification: Currently, NRAs are not able to view relationships indicated in the registration that have not yet been accepted (pending status) by another market participant.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW generally agrees with the proposal. However, it is essential to ensure that it does not limit market participants' ability to flexibly add or remove relationships in a timely manner.

32. ACER considers improving the process of **requesting changes during new registrations**, including:

- a) allowing NRAs to add comments directly to a data field in each section of the registration;
- b) allowing a user to modify its application in case of an error;
- c) sending an e-mail automatically after a new user has filed its application following the relevant changes.

Justification: This change would foster the process of new registrations, since the current possibility to let the CEREMP user know which sections require changes/ corrections is not the same in all of the sections of the registration (e.g. Section 1 provides the possibility to directly link a comment to a data field while in Section 5 it is not possible to add a comment). This creates confusion for market participants as corrections in some sections might appear more prominent than in other sections. This harmonisation would foster the process of new registrations and reduce CEREMP user confusion.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW supports the proposed improvements to the modification request process for new registrations, as they could streamline procedures and improve communication between market participants and NRAs.

33. ACER considers modification in CEREMP of the process for the **registration of a market participant with another NRA**.

Justification: Modification of the process for registering with a new NRA would consist in allowing that the registration with NRA A remains active until registration with NRA B is officially approved.

The current process for an MP wishing to change its registration to another NRA requires the complete cancellation of the existing registration before a new application can begin. This period between deregistration from NRA A and approval by NRA B creates uncertainty for MPs and such transition period complicates compliance. This also poses challenges for surveillance, as continuous supervision has to be ensured, and registration with the relevant NRA avoids disrupting compliance with MPs' reporting obligations.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW agrees with the proposed modification allowing registration with a new NRA without cancelling the existing one, as this reduces uncertainty and supports continuous compliance.

34. CEREMP possibly to notify market participants / users that they need **to verify information** in CEREMP:

- a) reminders to be automated (yearly) and manual (ad hoc) to verify whether information is up to date;
- b) reminders to be sent for designated fields to all registered market participants.

Justification: This change would ensure that market participants / users are reminded to keep the information in CEREMP up to date.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** We generally do agree to this amendment as it might increase accuracy.

35. ACER considers a possibility to **centrally manage RRM's which no longer provide services to market participants ("terminated RRM's")** in CEREMP (list of terminated RRM's), resulting in automatically removing them from the market participants' profile in CEREMP. This would still require market participants to select other RRM's.

Justification: Currently, when RRM's services are terminated, those RRM's are still visible in Section 5 of the registration form resulting in outdated and incorrect information. The

proposal to have a list of terminated RRM would be also relevant in order to know the current status of the RRM for surveillance purposes.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** Should the section on RRM be retained, BDEW would support introducing a notification mechanism. Such notifications should be ad hoc and addressed specifically to the relevant market participant, rather than sent as generic or periodic reminders.

36. Possibility of CEREMP to send **notification of account rejection** to users when a CEREMP user account application is rejected by NRA.

Justification: This change would ensure that a new CEREMP user is informed about account rejection by the NRA, with the information sent from the CEREMP system, in addition to decision communication from NRA.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

37. ACER considers allowing to provide **multiple file attachments**, i.e. more than one PDF document in CEREMP user account and considers increasing the allowed size for attached file(s).

Justification: Currently, the CEREMP system allows attaching only one file and users can only replace existing files and cannot add additional ones to those existing files. This change would also provide more flexibility for CEREMP users that are responsible for more than one market participant registration (which requires several Power of Attorney documents). With the current setup, it requires CEREMP users to merge several documents into a single file. Along the same lines, in some Member States two documents may be required (Power of Attorney and confirmation of payment of stamp duty) to be attached to the user's registration. When merging these two documents into a single file the electronic signature for Power of Attorney is deactivated.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** We support the proposal to allow multiple file attachment and increased file size in CEREMP.

38. ACER considers providing improved access to **NRA contact information** in the registration process.

Justification: This change would ease communications of a market participant with the NRA.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW strongly supports the introduction of the NRA contact information field, as it enhances registry accessibility and facilitates direct, efficient communication between market participants and the relevant NRAs.

39. Introduce a possibility for NRAs to **request mandatory provision of Power of Attorney (PoA)** for market participant's users within their jurisdiction. ACER also considers **automatic rejection** from CEREMP when Power of Attorney is not uploaded.

Justification: NRAs require provision of Power of Attorney document to be able to verify users' information and mandate. For some NRAs it frequently occurs to receive requests from market participants without a PoA, which results in rejections and additional information exchanges with applicants, that could be avoided if uploading a PoA was a mandatory requirement, customisable by NRA in its jurisdiction.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** A key issue is the need to clearly define and harmonise, across all NRAs, the documentation required during initial registration. Inconsistent requirements between jurisdictions create unnecessary administrative burden for market participants active in multiple Member States.

40. ACER considers improving **usability and user experience** in CEREMP, such as through:

- a) ensuring the same usability through different web browsers;
- b) ensuring that search fields activate a search by pressing 'enter' key;
- c) allowing to return to the task list from the submitted registration application.

Justification: Some NRAs provided feedback that there seem to be differences between the usability of the system depending on the web browser used. The possibility to press 'enter' on the keyboard to start a search in a search field, without being forced to directly click the button 'search', has also been considered by some users an improvement. The return to the task list would operate similarly to option available when reviewing an application for a user account and result in improving user experience in the registration process in CEREMP.

Enhanced user friendliness of the system would require less time from NRAs and ACER to manage questions from market participants.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** We support the introduction of a field to provide this detail, as it represents a positive step toward enhancing transparency and operational efficiency.

41. ACER considers improving **language used** in CEREMP, such as through:

- a) improved explanations about fields in CEREMP and the interface;
- b) allowing for special characters, e.g. as in 'Trade Register' field of Section 1;
- c) aligning information between instructions and info boxes in CEREMP.

Justification: Feedback received points out that explanations about fields and the interface need to be easy to understand. Some noted differences between instructions and info boxes that confuse CEREMP users, e.g. English instruction to set a password mentions that a 'special character' must be included, whereas the info sign next to the data field mentions that a 'punctuation character' is required.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW appreciates efforts to improve the usability and user experience of CEREMP, as these enhancements support its practical and efficient use.

42. ACER considers improving **user's identification** in CEREMP and in communication through:

- a) identifying users in notification emails not only by means of their ACER code but also by their name;
- b) identifying users in CEREMP not only by means of their ACER code but also by their name.

Justification: Currently, both in notification emails and in the system market participants are only identified by their ACER codes. It would be more appropriate to address market participants also by their name.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW appreciates efforts to enhance the usability and user experience of CEREMP, as such improvements are valuable for its practical application.

43. ACER considers introducing changes to **pending user requests**, such as through:

- a) highlighting changes made by user in CEREMP when displaying pending user requests;
- b) displaying both the previous and new content of a field with timestamps;
- c) ability to download by NRAs information from CEREMP on a market participant, including previous and current information with timestamps.

Justification: This change would enhance NRAs ability to compare historical information on user alongside the proposed updated information, when a CEREMP user submits a request to update its account details. It would increase efficiency during the NRA assessment of update requests (making the process faster).

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW supports the introduction of this field, as it represents a positive step toward improving transparency and operational efficiency.

44. ACER considers introducing changes related to **user accounts customization** through modification of the workflow of the system by making approvals of user accounts customizable by NRAs based on the fields that have been changed by users.

Justification: Change in the workflow of the system so that NRAs can choose if a modification that market participant applied in its profile requires approval.

Do you agree with this change? **Agree** / Disagree / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW supports the introduction of this field, as it enhances interoperability among national registers and promotes a more standardised registration process.

45. Introduce possibility for NRAs to **suspend ACER code** when a market participant or user, following a notification from NRA, does not confirm that its information is up to date, as a customizable function for NRAs.

Justification: As established by Article 9(5) of REMIT, MPs are obliged to always maintain their registration data in a correct and up-to-date manner. However, experience has shown that, in certain cases, MPs fail to meet these obligations. Despite multiple official notifications, such as letters to management or board members, MPs, especially in 3rd countries, may remain unresponsive or unreachable. In such cases, it is critical for NRAs to have the ability to suspend the ACER code. This ensures that MPs who are not in compliance with their obligations do not continue to distort market transparency, potentially undermining market integrity. The suspension of the ACER code would temporarily interrupt the ability to report data compliant with REMIT which can also serve as a signal to

OMPs/RRMs. If an MP later fulfils its obligations by updating or completing the required information, the ACER code can be reactivated, restoring the status in line with the regulation.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** REMIT does not foresee a functionality allowing NRAs to suspend an ACER code. Such suspension could lead to reporting failures even when the counterparty is fully compliant. Further clarification is also required on the standardised procedures and timelines applicable when a market participant or user, after NRA notification, does not confirm that its information is up to date.

4 Publication of register extracts and improved interoperability

46. ACER considers indicating **additional fields in CEREMP** to be **made public**. The information provided by market participants in the following fields of the registration format would become public:

a) Section 1:

- i. VAT Number
- ii. Market participant role
- iii. Other market participant role iv. LNG market participant
- v. Previous ACER code of market participant
- vi. Previous EIC code of market participant
- vii. Previous name of market participant

b) Section 4:

- i. Relationship type
- ii. Market participant involved

Justification: ACER considers making publicly available some of the data collected through Registration Format to improve transparency and quality of collected information as the public register is also used for verification of REMIT data. Fields that contain sensitive information should not be made public.

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum)

- › **Answer:** BDEW does not agree with making additional information public. The data currently available is sufficient. In particular, fields in Section 1 ("Market participant role" and "Other market participant role") and Section 4 ("Relationship type" and "Market participant involved") should not be made public, as they often contain commercially sensitive information that must be protected. Moreover, it remains unclear why information such as a market participant's corporate structure would be relevant or appropriate for public disclosure.

47. Would you find it beneficial to establish **interoperability between registers of entities** that fall **under various legal frameworks**? For example, between the European Register of Market Participants under the REMIT Regulation and [registers established under financial legislation](#)?

Do you agree with this change? Agree / **Disagree** / No opinion

Please justify your answer. (1000 character(s) maximum). If you are in favour of interoperability, please provide examples of how this could be achieved (e.g. by referencing other registers at the market participant level, or by ensuring that entities provide a common identifier, such as an LEI code, in all relevant registers).

- › **Answer:** BDEW has reservations regarding the practical implications, as the proposal does not account for the specific purpose of each type of registration. Each register serves a distinct function, and harmonising or interconnecting them without a clear understanding of the associated risks could undermine their integrity and effectiveness.

5 Confidentiality and data protection

5.1 Confidentiality

The Agency will make public the number of responses received in the scope of this public consultation, the names of the respondents (except those with a valid reason for not having their identity disclosed), and all non-confidential responses. The aggregated replies may form part of the publicly available document. Please indicate clearly in your response to this Public Consultation any part that you consider confidential and do not wish to have publicly disclosed including a valid reason.

48. ACER evaluates and may publish the received input. Do you consent that the submitted input is published?

Yes, ACER may publish the submitted replies and the name of my company/ Yes, ACER may publish the submitted replies anonymously / No, ACER may not publish the submitted replies.

49. Does your submission contain confidential information?

Yes / No

If your submission contains confidential information, you have to claim confidentiality.

How to do it:

- a) download a PDF version of your submission (see upper right corner of the page);
- b) redact confidential information and provide descriptions of the deleted information. Your descriptions must enable any party concerned with access to the file to determine whether the information deleted is likely to be relevant to their defence and whether there are sufficient grounds to request ACER to grant access to the information claimed to be confidential. You may use a PDF editor or print out your submission and manually replace confidential information with descriptions;
- c) upload the redacted (i.e. non-confidential) version of your submission with the descriptions of the deleted information. Maximum file size is 1 MB. If your file is bigger, please use the functional mailbox: remit@acer.europa.eu;
- d) upload a separate document where you:
 - clearly identify which persons/undertakings should not have access to the deleted information;
 - provide reasons why the persons/undertakings should not have access to the information.

(Maximum file size is 1 MB. If your file is bigger, please use the functional mailbox: remit@acer.europa.eu).

5.2 Data protection

ACER will process personal data of the respondents in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2018/1725, taking into account that this processing is necessary for performing ACER's consultation tasks. More information on data protection is available on ACER's website and in [ACER's data protection notice](#).

ACER will not publish personal data.

Contact

BDEW

Merlin Bähr

Cosultant · Market Design, Emission Trading &
Financial Market Regulation
Trade & Procurement Division

T +49 30 300199-1554

merlin.baehr@bdew.de