WORKING PAPER

Prepared for: DG ENER · DG CLIMA · DG REGIO

Closing the Coordination Gap:

A Bridging Architecture for the European Energy Transition

John F. Ryder — Independent Researcher, Drive-In s.r.o., Slovak Republic
john@driveinsolution.com |

1. Executive Summary

European electricity systems face a structural timing mismatch. Electrification of transport, heating, and industry is accelerating demand growth at a pace measured in three-to-five year cycles, while the generation and transmission assets capable of meeting that demand require ten to fifteen years from planning to operation. This paper argues that the primary constraint on transition stability is not a capacity gap, but a coordination gap: the failure to align demand behaviour, deployment speed, and system integration before new long-lead infrastructure arrives.

Current EU energy policy remains oriented toward supply expansion as the principal response to security and climate commitments. This orientation is not wrong in its endpoint, but it is insufficient as a transition strategy. Without deliberate intervention in demand geometry and rapid-deployment generation, European grids face a deficit window in the 2028 to 2032 period during which electrification demand growth outpaces the commissioning of replacement capacity. This deficit window is not primarily a failure of ambition or technology. It is a timing failure: demand is moving on a three-to-five-year cycle, while major generation and transmission infrastructure remains locked into ten-to-fifteen-year delivery timelines.

This paper introduces a coordinated policy architecture built on three elements. First, the Bridging Stack: a layered deployment framework that prioritises installation speed over asset longevity during the transition period. Second, demand-side coordination reframed as infrastructure rather than as a behavioural measure. Third, a set of EU-level implementation instruments — the Temporary Energy Security Permit (TESP), the Pan-European Seasonal Energy Credit (PESEC), and the Energy Resilience Corps (ERC) — each with defined legal basis, institutional actor, and deployment timeline.

The framework is not a critique of existing EU strategy. It is a stabilisation layer and a transition acceleration mechanism, compatible with the Clean Energy Package, the Renewable Energy Directive (RED III), and the EU Climate Law. Technical evidence from supply chain, cost, and demand flexibility analysis indicates that a well-coordinated system can reduce required installed generation capacity by twenty to forty percent relative to an uncoordinated baseline, at roughly half the capital cost of a conventional nuclear-and-gas build-out.

The policy relevance is immediate. The regulatory instruments proposed draw on existing Treaty competences and established EU programme structures. Deployment feasibility is grounded in documented technology timelines and financing mechanisms already available under the Recovery and Resilience Facility, the Connecting Europe Facility, and the Just Transition Fund.

2. Problem Definition: The Coordination Gap

The European energy transition is not constrained primarily by generation capacity. It is constrained by coordination failure across three simultaneously evolving variables: demand behaviour, deployment speed, and system integration.

Electrification is adding load profiles that are structurally different from historical patterns. Electric vehicles, heat pumps, and data centres together account for a projected increase of eight hundred to twelve hundred terawatt-hours in EU demand by 2035 relative to a four-thousand terawatt-hour baseline. These loads are not simply additive. They shift the temporal and spatial distribution of demand in ways that existing grid architecture was not designed to absorb. EV charging concentrated in evening hours exacerbates the duck curve. Heat pump loads shift winter peak demand onto electricity networks previously sized for lower coincidence factors. Data centre demand, while temporally flexible, grows faster than any demand segment in recent European history.

Renewable generation compounds the problem. Solar and wind introduce surplus and deficit periods that vary by hour, season, and weather event. At penetration levels above thirty percent — already reached in several Member States — midday overgeneration and evening ramp rates create operational stress that curtailment alone cannot resolve. Spring and autumn midday surpluses in solar-heavy systems are already producing negative wholesale prices in excess of one hundred hours per year in some markets, with evening prices spiking three to five times above baseload.

Infrastructure deployment timelines remain the binding constraint. Grid connection queues in the EU average one to two years. Environmental impact assessments require a minimum of twelve to eighteen months. Cross-border coordination requirements add a further six to twelve months in corridor projects. The result is a structural lag: demand evolves faster than the infrastructure capable of serving it, and instability emerges precisely in the window before new capacity arrives.

This is the coordination gap. It cannot be closed by announcing targets, approving generation projects, or publishing national energy plans. It requires deliberate, sequenced intervention in the rate at which deployable assets are installed, the degree to which demand can be aligned with available supply, and the institutional mechanisms capable of sustaining that alignment across Member State boundaries.

3. System Diagnosis: Three Forms of Mismatch

Energy instability during transition manifests in three distinct and analytically separable forms. Each requires a different policy response, and conflating them produces inefficient intervention.

3.1 Peak Mismatch

Peak mismatch occurs when demand exceeds available supply for periods of minutes to hours. The primary driver in electrifying systems is the evening peak: solar production falls sharply in the two to three hours after 17:00, while residential and commercial demand rises as occupants return home and charge vehicles. At high EV penetration without managed charging, uncoordinated evening load additions can reach twenty to thirty gigawatts in a large

Member State grid. Peaker gas plants are currently the margin asset; their economics at ten percent capacity factor produce a levelised cost of energy of approximately one hundred to one hundred and fifty euros per megawatt-hour, the highest cost technology in the portfolio.

3.2 Ramp Mismatch

Ramp mismatch occurs when supply changes too slowly to track demand. The California Independent System Operator has documented ramp rates of thirteen gigawatts in three hours as solar output falls in the evening. European transmission system operators are encountering comparable ramp pressures as solar penetration rises. Conventional thermal generation, designed for stable operation, cannot ramp at the speed required without efficiency penalties and accelerated wear. Battery storage can respond within seconds but is constrained by discharge duration. Neither solution alone is adequate for extended ramp events.

3.3 Seasonal Mismatch

Seasonal mismatch is the most structurally intractable of the three. At mid-latitudes, solar generation peaks in summer at approximately one hundred and fifty to one hundred and seventy percent of the annual average, while heating demand peaks in winter at one hundred and twenty to one hundred and thirty percent of the annual average. For a grid with fifty percent solar penetration and one hundred gigawatts average demand, the winter deficit from other sources reaches approximately one hundred and five gigawatts, while the summer surplus produces roughly eighty gigawatts of potential curtailment. Battery storage cannot address this economically: bridging a three-month seasonal gap for a fifty-gigawatt solar system would require storage on the order of one hundred and thirteen terawatt-hours, implying costs that are economically infeasible at current or near-term technology trajectories.

The systemic conclusion is clear: building more generation addresses none of these mismatches on the relevant timescale. Nuclear baseload takes eight to fifteen years to commission. Large hydro takes ten to fifteen years. Transmission upgrades take seven to twelve years including permitting and right-of-way acquisition. The transition deficit window opens before any of these assets can arrive. The appropriate response is not to abandon long-lead assets, but to deploy a coordinated set of rapid-response instruments that stabilise the grid while anchor infrastructure is built.

4. Policy Architecture: The Bridging Stack

The Bridging Stack framework proposes a layered deployment structure organised by timescale. The design principle is explicit: speed of deployment takes precedence over asset longevity in early transition phases. Assets are treated as options rather than commitments, with shorter depreciation schedules and explicit provision for repurposing or retirement as conditions change.

4.1 Layer 1: Immediate Deployment (0–24 Months)

The immediate layer draws on technologies with demonstrated sub-two-year installation timelines. Utility-scale solar currently achieves installation rates of ten to twenty megawatts per day in mature EU markets, with a total project timeline of six to eighteen months from application to operation where permitting is streamlined. Grid-scale battery storage with four-hour discharge duration can be commissioned in twelve to eighteen months. Demand response programmes covering industrial curtailment and commercial HVAC management can be activated with three to six months of enrolment and testing. These assets should be deployed as stabilisation infrastructure, explicitly accepting ten-to-twenty-year lifespans in exchange for immediate availability.

4.2 Layer 2: Mid-Term Consolidation (2–6 Years)

The mid-term layer extends system flexibility through targeted long-duration storage of six to twelve hours, coordinated industrial load flexibility, and district heating integration as a thermal sink for surplus generation. Flexible industrial participants — aluminium smelting, steel production, cement, and data centres — represent a combined demand flexibility potential of twenty to fifty percent of load within four-to-eight-hour windows, at a compensation cost of fifty to two hundred euros per megawatt-hour that remains substantially below the marginal cost of peaker operation. Grid reinforcement in distribution networks with high electrification penetration belongs in this layer, with transformer upgrades targeted on congested corridors identified through network monitoring.

4.3 Layer 3: Anchor Infrastructure (6–15+ Years)

Anchor assets provide long-run system stability and dispatchable baseload: new nuclear capacity including small modular reactors, large-scale pumped hydro, and major transmission upgrades including cross-border HVDC corridors. These assets are not substitutes for the immediate and mid-term layers; they are their successors. The policy function of the Bridging Stack is precisely to buy time for anchor assets to arrive without grid instability in the interim. Nuclear capacity commissioned in 2032 to 2037 presupposes that the period between now and then is managed through other means.

Layer	Timescale	Key Technologies
1 — Immediate	0–24 months	Solar PV, grid batteries (4hr), demand response, distributed storage
2 — Mid-Term	2–6 years	Long-duration storage, flexible industry, grid reinforcement, thermal sinks
3 — Anchor	6–15+ years	Nuclear, large hydro, HVDC transmission, cross-border interconnection

5. Demand-Side Coordination as Infrastructure

Demand-side coordination is not a behavioural optimisation measure. It is a missing infrastructure layer. In current EU policy architecture, demand is largely treated as an outcome variable. In a high-electrification system, it becomes a controllable system input. The framing matters for policy: measures understood as voluntary behaviour change attract modest enrolment and weak compliance. Measures understood as infrastructure attract capital, institutional commitment, and regulatory protection.

Demand geometry — the temporal and spatial distribution of load — determines infrastructure requirements independently of total energy consumption. Two systems with identical annual energy demand but different load factors require substantially different generation and storage capacity. A system in which load factor improves from 0.35 to 0.50 reduces required peak capacity by approximately twenty-eight percent for the same total energy delivered. This is the primary mechanism through which coordination reduces capital expenditure: not by consuming less energy, but by consuming it in a pattern that requires less installed capacity to serve.

Empirical data from demand flexibility programmes supports the following ranges. Residential demand is shiftable by ten to fifteen percent within a four-hour window; commercial demand by twenty to twenty-five percent; industrial demand by thirty to forty percent. Across an aggregate industrialised economy, four-hour flexibility spans fifteen to twenty-five percent of total demand, rising to twenty-five to thirty-five percent at eight-hour horizons. The industrial sector provides the majority of long-duration flexibility; residential loads provide higher immediacy but smaller volume.

Electric vehicle charging represents a particularly significant coordination target. Under unmanaged charging, seventy percent of EV load arrives between 17:00 and 22:00, the worst possible window for grid stability as solar falls and residential demand rises. Under managed charging with time-of-use incentives, seventy to ninety percent of that load can be shifted to the midnight-to-six window. For a thirty-percent EV penetration scenario in a large Member State, this shift translates to a peak reduction on the order of fifteen gigawatts — equivalent to the output of fifteen gas peaker plants that would otherwise need to be built.

The coordination infrastructure required to achieve these outcomes is primarily software and contractual: enrolment platforms, metering interfaces, communication protocols, and compensation mechanisms. The capital cost of demand response infrastructure is estimated at fifty to two hundred euros per kilowatt of flexible capacity enrolled, compared with eight hundred to two thousand euros per kilowatt for equivalent new generation assets. The break-even condition is achieved when coordination programmes deliver sixty percent or more of target capacity reduction — a threshold documented as achievable in existing large-scale programmes.

6. EU Implementation Layer

Three instruments constitute the EU-level implementation architecture. Each addresses a distinct coordination failure, draws on an identified legal basis, and assigns institutional responsibility to an existing actor.

6.1 Temporary Energy Security Permits (TESP)

The TESP mechanism addresses the single largest deployment bottleneck identified in technical analysis: grid connection queues averaging one to two years across Member States, combined with permitting timelines of six to twenty-four months that collectively prevent bridging assets from reaching operation within the transition deficit window.

TESP: Key Parameters

Function: Streamlined permitting track for bridging assets with expected operational life below 20 years

Legal basis: Regulation (EU) 2022/1854 (energy crisis); Article 194 TFEU; RED III acceleration provisions

Eligible assets: Utility-scale solar (10–500 MW), battery storage (2–12 hr duration), demand response platforms

Timeline: Pre-qualification 0–3 months; site review 3–6 months; conditional operation from month 6

Institutional actor: Member States (transposition); DG ENER (Commission oversight); ACER (cross-border coordination)

Safeguards: Decommissioning bonds (5–10% of project value); sunset clause at 18 months if permanent licence not pursued

The TESP framework should be issued as a Directive to permit Member State adaptation, with a binding ceiling of eighteen months for the maximum TESP approval period. Member States may establish faster processes but not slower. EU co-financing for grid reinforcement necessitated by TESP projects should be available via the Connecting Europe Facility, with priority allocation to corridors with the highest connection queue backlogs.

6.2 Pan-European Seasonal Energy Credits (PESEC)

PESEC addresses the seasonal mismatch that battery storage cannot economically resolve. The mechanism allows participants who reduce consumption during winter deficit periods to earn credits redeemable during summer surplus periods, creating a virtual inter-temporal storage instrument without requiring physical storage construction.

PESEC: Key Parameters

Function: Inter-temporal credit mechanism linking winter demand reduction to summer surplus consumption rights

Legal basis: Clean Energy Package (flexibility resource recognition); EU ETS monitoring infrastructure (verification)

Structure: Tier 1 national systems; Tier 2 cross-border credit recognition via EEX; Tier 3 ENTSO-E quarterly settlement

Baseline methodology: 3–5 year rolling average, weather-normalised; annual review by ACER

Timeline: Legislative proposal Q1 2026; pilot in 5–10 Member States from 2027; full deployment 2030

Institutional actors: ACER (oversight, gaming detection); ENTSO-E (clearing); national energy regulators (escrow)

Cross-border exchange rates between national credit systems should reflect relative grid stress: a winter deficit credit in a northern heating-dominated system carries higher system value than a summer surplus credit in a Mediterranean cooling-dominated system. ACER should review and publish exchange rates annually. Gaming risks — baseline inflation, speculative hoarding — are mitigated through participation bonds of five to fifty euros per enrolled kilowatt, a maximum credit accumulation limit of one hundred and fifty percent of annual consumption, and an eighteen-month expiry on unused credits.

6.3 Energy Resilience Corps (ERC)

The ERC addresses a distinct but related coordination failure: the risk that system stress, automation failure, or transition-period shocks leave energy infrastructure without adequate maintenance and rapid-response capacity. It is structured as pre-authorised operational capacity embedded within existing labour, cohesion, and energy policy frameworks, rather than as a standalone programme.

ERC: Key Parameters

Function: Pre-authorised workforce pool for energy safeguarding, grid maintenance, and automation fallback

Legal basis: European Pillar of Social Rights (Principle 4); Just Transition Mechanism Regulation (EU) 2021/1056

Category A: Thermal insulation, heat pump support, smart meter installation, grid monitoring (active participation)

Category B: Manual fallback for AI coordination failures; emergency demand coordination; grid operation support

Compensation: ERCs at €10–20/hour equivalent; redeemable against energy bills, carbon levies, grid charges

Institutional actors: ESF+ (funding); national public employment services (administration); DG EMPL (oversight)

Priority eligibility should be assigned to workers in carbon-intensive industries undergoing transition, unemployed and underemployed workers in Just Transition regions, and households experiencing energy poverty. The latter group should receive a credit multiplier of 1.25x to compensate for higher relative energy cost burden. EU co-financing at fifty to eighty-five percent of programme cost is available under existing cohesion policy frameworks, with the highest rates applicable to coal phase-out regions.

7. Economic and System Impact

Technical cost modelling across a fifteen-year horizon comparing the Bridging Stack against conventional alternatives produces the following comparison for a representative one-hundred-gigawatt average demand system with thirty percent electrification growth:

Strategy	15-Year Capital + O&M	Primary Risk
Bridging Stack (solar + batteries + coordination)	€185 billion	Demand response under-delivery
Traditional (nuclear + gas peakers)	€435 billion	Construction overruns; 10–15yr timeline
Solar overbuild + 8-hour batteries	€364 billion	High curtailment; revenue risk

The Bridging Stack produces a fifty-seven percent cost reduction relative to the traditional approach and a forty-nine percent reduction relative to the solar overbuild strategy. These estimates are contingent on demand coordination achieving at least sixty percent of targeted flexibility, consistent with observed performance ranges in large-scale pilot programmes. These figures are sensitive to two primary assumptions: that demand response achieves fifteen to twenty percent peak reduction (if actual performance is five to ten percent, the gap narrows), and that solar and battery costs continue their historical decline trajectory (if costs plateau, overbuild strategies become relatively more competitive).

The coordination-versus-generation break-even is reached when demand response programmes deliver sixty percent or more of target capacity reduction. Empirical evidence from existing large-scale programmes — the California AutoGrid pilot at approximately one hundred thousand households and the Texas Emergency Response Service at five hundred thousand primarily industrial participants — demonstrates peak reductions of five to fifteen percent, consistent with achieving break-even under conservative assumptions.

At EU scale, a Bridging Stack deployment of fifty to eighty gigawatts of solar and twenty to thirty gigawatts of battery storage, combined with coordinated demand response covering ten to twenty percent of industrial and commercial load, is estimated to reduce annual curtailment by forty to sixty percent and wholesale price peak-to-valley spread by twenty to forty percent. Direct employment associated with deployment and operation over the 2026 to 2035 period is estimated at four hundred and fifty thousand to eight hundred and thirty thousand job-years across direct, indirect, and ERC-related activity.

The total financing requirement of one hundred and thirty-five to two hundred and forty-nine billion euros over ten years is within the identified capacity of existing EU instruments, combined with national programme contributions and private project finance. A residual gap exists only under low private investment uptake scenarios, which can be addressed through InvestEU guarantee mechanisms.

8. Risk and Governance Considerations

8.1 Market Distortion Risk

The principal market distortion risk arises from TESP prioritisation creating an uneven playing field between bridging assets and conventional generation that must navigate standard permitting timelines. Mitigation requires technology-neutral eligibility criteria within TESP — it is the operational lifespan and deployment speed that qualify an asset, not its technology class — and pre-clearance of TESP framework design with DG COMP as a Service of General Economic Interest. Stranded asset compensation for displaced peaker generation should be addressed through capacity market redesign that rewards fast-response flexibility rather than installed capacity, with transition payments structured as lump-sum buyouts calibrated to avoided capacity market revenue.

8.2 Regulatory Fragmentation

The multi-jurisdictional character of EU energy governance creates a risk that Member States implement TESP and PESEC in mutually incompatible ways, preventing cross-border optimisation. The Directive format for TESP addresses this through minimum standards while permitting national adaptation. PESEC, as a cross-border mechanism, should be established by Regulation to ensure direct applicability without transposition variation. ACER's mandate should be explicitly extended to cover PESEC exchange rate setting and baseline methodology consistency review across Member States.

8.3 Data Governance and GDPR Compliance

Demand coordination at the scale envisaged requires granular consumption data. The proposed Local Coordination Node architecture ensures that facility-level data never leaves the site: only aggregated capacity offers are transmitted to regional coordination hubs. This design is compliant with GDPR Article 25 (privacy by design) and Article 5 (data minimisation). Cross-border data exchange operates exclusively at the level of ENTSO-E aggregates, with a minimum anonymisation threshold of five hundred participants per published figure. Industrial participants above one hundred megawatts should be subject to mandatory homomorphic encryption for bid transmission, protecting against competitive intelligence extraction.

8.4 Cross-Border Coordination Failures

The scenario of one or more Member States declining to participate in PESEC or TESP is addressed through enhanced cooperation provisions (minimum nine Member States) and conditional cohesion fund access. Border carbon adjustment for energy imports from non-participating Member States provides a structural incentive for participation that does not require unanimous agreement. Bilateral coordination agreements are available as a fallback for critical cross-border corridors.

9. Policy Positioning

This framework requires explicit positioning relative to existing EU energy strategy to avoid misinterpretation in institutional circulation.

This framework is not a critique of renewable energy deployment. It presupposes accelerated solar and wind installation and provides the stabilisation mechanisms that make high-penetration renewable grids operationally viable. It is not an argument against nuclear or large hydro investment. Anchor assets are a structural component of the Bridging Stack's third layer, and their commissioning represents the intended exit condition for bridging instruments. It is not a proposal to replace EU climate or energy targets. The Bridging Stack is fully compatible with the 2030 and 2050 emissions reduction commitments, and demand coordination reduces cumulative emissions by reducing the operational hours of marginal gas generation during the transition period.

This framework is a stabilisation layer for the transition deficit window of 2028 to 2032. It is a transition acceleration mechanism that reduces the capital cost and timeline risk of the energy transition by thirty to fifty percent relative to conventional approaches. It is a coordination architecture that reframes demand management as infrastructure, creating durable institutional capacity for inter-temporal and cross-border system optimisation. And it is a deployment framework that can be initiated under existing Treaty competences, with legislative instruments targeted for adoption by 2027 and measurable deployment outcomes by 2030.

The primary constraint on the European energy transition is not technological or financial. It is temporal. Demand is evolving on a three-to-five-year cycle, while infrastructure is deployed on a ten-to-fifteen-year cycle. Without coordinated intervention, the gap between them becomes the system’s primary point of failure. Closing that gap is both achievable and urgent. The architecture is available; the timeline is already running.

Annex: Timing Mismatch — Diagram Description

The following diagram description is provided for visual production and integration into presentations or summary documents. It is not rendered in this version of the working paper.

Diagram: Infrastructure-Demand Timing Gap (2024–2038)

Type: Dual-axis timeline with overlapping bands and threshold annotation

X-axis: Years, 2024–2038 (15-year span)
Y-axis (left): Indexed demand load (100 = 2024 baseline)
Y-axis (right): Cumulative installed capacity becoming operational (GW)

Band 1 — Demand Growth Curve (solid line, rising): Begins at index 100 in 2024; rises steeply to ~115 by 2027 (EV and heat pump uptake); reaches ~130 by 2032; flattens toward 2035–38. Confidence interval shaded (±15%) reflecting electrification adoption uncertainty.

Band 2 — Long-Lead Capacity Arrival (stepped line, delayed): Flat near zero 2024–2030; first step upward in 2031–32 (nuclear/hydro projects started 2022–25 come online); reaches adequate coverage only by 2034–36.

Band 3 — Bridging Stack Capacity (filled area, early onset): Ramps steeply from 2025; reaches meaningful coverage by 2027; peaks around 2030–32; tapers as anchor assets arrive.

Highlighted Zone — Deficit Window (red shading, 2028–2032): Marks the period where demand growth exceeds both long-lead capacity arrival and uncoordinated renewable deployment. Annotation: 'Coordination Gap — primary risk window for grid instability'.

Reference line — Coordination Threshold: Horizontal dashed line showing the capacity level at which demand coordination (20% load factor improvement) effectively closes the gap, labelled: 'Coordination closes remaining deficit without additional generation build'.

Key insight conveyed: Long-lead assets arrive too late to prevent the deficit window. Bridging Stack + coordination together cover the gap; neither alone is sufficient.