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# Introduction

This report outlines the key technical activities and considerations undertaken as part of the feasibility study for the future configuration of the Closed Distribution System (GDS) at the Biotech Campus Delft. The study, commissioned by Centrient, aims to evaluate four potential scenarios for the continuation or restructuring of the current private electricity network, in light of the upcoming decommissioning of DSM’s yeast production facilities.  
  
The activities for this project are divided in two phases: focus on the technical, legal, and organizational implications of each scenario and the development of a trade-off matrix to support decision-making in the first phase. And the assessment of the current network’s condition and associated risks of the selected scenario in a second phase. This report focuses on the first phase.

# Current situation and future plans

## Parties in BCD and assets

## Energy consumption

## Electrical installations

## Future plans

# Scenario 1: Whole site

## Consequences for Centrient

In this scenario, Centrient would assume full ownership and operational responsibility for the entire private electricity network on the Biotech Campus, effectively taking over the role currently held by DSM. This includes the obligation to supply electricity not only to its own facilities but also to third parties such as DSM, ASR, and Plant One.

The primary consequence of this approach is a significant increase in Centrient’s strategic control over its energy infrastructure, which may offer long-term benefits in terms of flexibility and autonomy. However, this also introduces a high level of complexity and risk. Centrient would become accountable for the continuity, safety, and regulatory compliance of the entire network, including the performance of assets outside its direct operational scope.

In short:

* Centrient assumes full ownership and operational responsibility for the entire private electricity network, including delivery to third parties (DSM, ASR, Plant One).
* This increases strategic control but also introduces operational and legal complexity.
* Centrient becomes liable for continuity, compliance, and performance across the entire Biotech Campus.

## Estimate global costs for private network operation

## Admin requirements for private network takeover

From an administrative perspective, this scenario requires a formal exemption from the Dutch Authority for Consumers and Markets (ACM) to operate a private network. Centrient would need to establish a governance framework for network management, register all connected entities, and ensure compliance with the Electricity Act and Netcode. This includes setting up metering, billing, and service agreements with third parties, as well as maintaining transparent communication with regulatory bodies.

In short:

* Application for ACM exemption as a private network operator.
* Formal registration of all connected entities.
* Establishment of internal governance and external reporting structures.
* Coordination with Stedin and ACM for compliance with the Electricity Act and Netcode.
* Setup of billing, metering, and service agreements with third parties.

## Time schedule

# Scenario 2: Industrial area

## Consequence for Centrient and other connected

Under this scenario, Centrient would acquire and operate only the industrial portion of the network, while DSM retains responsibility for the lab and office areas. Centrient would still supply electricity to Plant One, which qualifies it for an ACM exemption as a private network operator.

This approach reduces Centrient’s operational scope compared to Scenario 1, limiting its exposure to third-party risks while still maintaining a degree of control over its energy infrastructure. However, it introduces a dependency on DSM for the management of the remaining network, which may require close coordination to avoid operational or legal conflicts.

In short:

* Centrient takes over only the industrial portion of the network and supplies Plant One to qualify for exemption.
* DSM retains control over the lab and office areas.
* Centrient’s operational scope is reduced compared to Scenario 1, but still includes third-party delivery.

## Estimate global costs for Centrient

## Admin requirements for Centrient

Administratively, Centrient would need to apply for an exemption specific to the industrial section of the campus. Clear demarcation of network boundaries and responsibilities would be essential, along with formal agreements with DSM and Plant One. Centrient would also need to implement internal compliance mechanisms and ensure that its operations align with the requirements for private network operators.

In short:

* ACM exemption application for the industrial portion.
* Definition and documentation of network boundaries and responsibilities.
* Coordination with DSM to avoid overlap or gaps in service.
* Setup of limited third-party agreements (e.g., with Plant One).
* Internal compliance with private network obligations.

## Time schedule

# Scenario 3: Centrient only

## Consequences for Centrient as 'MV installation" owner

In this scenario, Centrient would limit its scope to managing only its own electrical infrastructure, which would be classified as an installation rather than a network. This means Centrient would not deliver electricity to any third parties and would therefore not require an ACM exemption.

The key advantage of this scenario is its simplicity. Centrient avoids the regulatory and operational complexities associated with network ownership and focuses solely on its internal energy needs. However, this also limits future flexibility, particularly if Centrient wishes to expand or collaborate with other campus users in the future.

For this scenario, the option to take over the grid connection from DSM will be checked.

In short:

* Centrient operates only its own infrastructure, which is legally considered an installation rather than a network.
* No third-party delivery means no exemption is required.
* Operational simplicity, but limited flexibility for future expansion or collaboration.

## Estimate global costs for Centrient

## Admin requirements for Centrient

From an administrative standpoint, the requirements are relatively light. Centrient would need to ensure that its installation complies with safety and maintenance standards, and coordinate with Stedin for connection and metering. No formal exemption is needed, but internal documentation and operational clarity remain important.

In short:

* No ACM exemption needed.
* Internal maintenance and safety responsibilities must be clearly defined.
* Coordination with Stedin for connection and metering.
* Documentation of installation boundaries and compliance with safety standards.

## Time schedule

# Scenario 4: Joint venture

## Consequences for Centrient

This scenario envisions a joint venture between Centrient and DSM to co-own and manage the GDS. Responsibilities for maintenance, investment, and compliance would be shared, requiring a high degree of coordination and mutual trust.

The main consequence for Centrient is the need to engage in a collaborative governance model, which can offer shared benefits but also introduces shared risks and potential delays in decision-making. The success of this model depends heavily on the quality of the partnership and the clarity of contractual arrangements.

In short:

* Shared ownership and management of the network with DSM.
* Requires strong governance and alignment on operational decisions.
* Potential for shared investment and risk, but also shared complexity.

## Estimate global costs for Centrient

## Admin requirements for Centrient

Administratively, this scenario would require either a joint exemption application or a shared compliance framework that satisfies ACM requirements. Legal agreements would need to define roles, responsibilities, and liabilities in detail. Joint planning for maintenance, investment, and reporting would be essential, along with a unified interface towards regulatory authorities and third parties.

In short:

* Joint exemption application or shared compliance framework.
* Legal agreements defining roles, responsibilities, and liabilities.
* Joint maintenance planning and cost allocation.
* Coordination with ACM and Stedin as a unified entity.

## Time schedule

# Comparison and selection
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