

- 1. point: „On the IP Baumgarten, EUS will set aside 40% of the total incremental capacity 7 800 000 KWh/h (18.00 mcm/d).”

Question: Why will you set aside 40% of the total incremental capacity instead of 10%?

- **Regarding the 4.2.1. point of the Rulebook we would like to suggest the following wording:** „Termination by Bidder through step back right: The value of its Bid shall be calculated by multiplying the Reserve Price as stipulated in this Alternative Allocation Procedure, as applicable, as a result of a binding Alternative Allocation Procedure, **with the capacity that was submitted to the Bidder.**”

- According to the 4.2.1. point: „Bid submission window III: In case one or more Successful Bidder(s) make use of their right to step back from concluded contracts upon a positive Economic Test I or II, TSOs shall inform and submit requirements to Bidders which submitted the Bids in Bid submission window I/II and capacity to them were not allocated or partly allocated (Non allocated Bidders) that may submit new Bids for the remaining available capacity to TSOs.”

We would recommend a follow up economic test and in case of positive outcome, there is no need for the third bidding round.

- 4.2.1 point: „Bid submission window III: In case of GCA, the remaining available capacity is limited with the sum of the available capacity at the entry points Baumgarten GCA and Baumgarten WAG as of 22 March 2019.”

Question: What is the reason for the **limitation that begins 22 March 2019?**

What will be expected the available capacity as of 22 March 2019?

- Regarding the **4.4 point of the Rulebook we would suggest to deleting** this point, since the bidder can submit a minimum capacity demand in the bid form, thus there is no need the fill or kill rule.
- How will you allocate the capacities at the Balassagyarmat/Velke Zlievce interconnection point if the aggregated capacity demand is between the 1st offered level and the 2nd offered level?
- Please publish the technical capacities in the rulebook.
- Is it possible to participate in the 2nd bidding round if we didn't participate in 1st bidding round?
- What the technical developments are needed on the Hungarian and Slovakian side? What are the current costs?
- Please upload the questions and answers to your website.

Bank guarantee:

MGT

- Please confirm that system user shall provide two types of contractual collaterals: (1) according to GTC (“*ÁSZF szerinti szerződéses biztosíték*”) which has to be submitted latest until the day preceding the first delivery day amounting to 1 month capacity and 2 month of transmission fee and shall be in force at least for one gas year plus 60 days and (2) an implementation guarantee (“*Megvalósítási szerződéses biztosíték*”) which has to be submitted latest on the 30th day after the contract has been signed and which amount to the value of the 1 year capacity fee and has to be in force until the last day of the contractual period. It is not clear under which circumstances does System User have to provide either or both guarantees. Please clarify. /see Framework Contract §6.2; GTC §13.3.1(f) and §13.3.2(e)
- According to the GTC (ÁSZF) the contractual guarantees have to be issued in HUF, according to the Rulebook they have to be issued in EUR. Please clarify. /see Rulebook 5.2.1(a) vs. GTC/

EUS

- regarding the external rating of the financial institutions: we accept that EUS prescribes investment grade level, but we do not understand why this level is not set top BBB- / Baa3 , but one step above. We kindly ask EUS to revise this condition and set the minimum level to the bottom of the investment grade. /see Framework contract §11.1/
- it is not clear why EUS differentiates according to the value of the guarantee based on the rating of the system user. It is not neutral. If EUS face a risk of 2 month or a risk of 6 month capacity fee, then we suggest requiring a guarantee in the same value, otherwise it causes a distortion in the position of the terminal users. Since the service fee is to be paid in the month following the service month, we believe that a guarantee in the amount of 2.-months' capacity fee should be sufficient in all cases regardless the rating of the system user. Please consider. /see Framework contract §11.2/
- it is not clear for us why we do have to submit the contractual guarantee latest until 26.09.2018. At this point of time system users are not aware of the quantity of the allocated capacity, consequently they are not aware of the required collateral amount. This deadline should be after the result of the tender had been communicated. Please revise. /see Framework contract §11.1/
- we could not find clear requirements regarding the duration of the contractual collateral. Is it suitable to EUS if the duration is one year and the system user prolongs it each year before the expiry?

GCA

➤ Bid security

- This is to cover the potential termination fee payment obligation (if any)
- Rulebook 5.3.1: The system user shall provide a financial security equal to the termination fee within five (5) working days after receipt of the acceptance of its bid. This should be submitted in the form set out in Rulebook Annex 7 Please confirm the above written part.

➤ Contractual security

- This is to cover the payment obligation of the system user for monthly fees. /see GTC Part IV art. (12)/
- This should be submitted on the 5th working day after the successful auction. How long does this guarantee stay in force? It is sufficient to issue it with duration of 1 year and prolong it by another year before its expiry?
- The amount of the guarantee has to be the 3 (three) months' capacity fee for long-term? Please confirm
- The form of the guarantee should be the one set out in GTC Annex 5 "security deposit") Please confirm