

10th System Operation European Stakeholder Committee (SO ESC) and 15th Grid Connection European Stakeholder Committee (GC ESC)

Wednesday, 11 September 2019 from 9:00-15:00

ACER, Ljubljana

Draft Minutes

Participants			
Uros	GABRIJEL	ACER	Chair
Marie	WOITHE	ACER	GC & SO ESC
Maria	BARROSO GOMES	ACER	GC & SO ESC
Vincenzo	TROVATO	ACER	GC & SO ESC/connected online
Marco Savino	PASQUADIBISCEGLIE	ARERA	GC & SO ESC
Knud	JOHANSEN	ENTSO-E	SO & GC ESC
Alexander	DUSOLT	ENTSO-E	GC & SO ESC
Ioannis	THEOLOGITIS	ENTSO-E	GC & SO ESC/connected online
Pilar	MUÑOZ-ELENA	ENTSO-E	SO & GC ESC/connected online
Ralph	PFEIFFER	ENTSO-E	GC & SO ESC
Rafal	KUCZYNSKI	ENTSO-E	SO ESC
Knut	EGGENBERGER	ENTSO-E (CGM Program)	SO ESC
Jean-Philippe	PAUL	ENTSO-E	SO ESC/connected online
Jean-Christophe	GAULT	Enedis/EDSO for Smart Grids	GC & SO ESC
Marc	MALBRANCKE	CEDEC	GC & SO ESC/connected online
Alberto	BRIDI	CEDEC	GC & SO ESC
Thorsten	BUELO	SMA	GC & SO ESC

Participants			
Adolpho	LOPEZ	EURELECTRIC	SO ESC/connected online
Florentien	BENEDICT	CEDEC	GC & SO ESC
Luca	GUENZI	EUTurbines	GC & SO ESC
Eric	DEKINDEREN	VGB Powertech	GC & SO ESC
Garth	GRAHAM	EURELECTRIC	GC & SO ESC/connected online
Pavla	ERHARTOVA	Europex	GC & SO ESC
Mike	KAY	GEODE	GC ESC/connected online
Stein	OVSTEBO	IFIEC	GC & SO ESC
Bernhard	SCHOWE-VON DER BRELIE	EFAC	GC & SO ESC
Valerie	REIF	FSR	GC & SO ESC
Pierre	CASTAGNE	EURELECTRIC	SO ESC/via phone
Freddy	ALCAZAR	EUGINE	GC ESC
Francesco	CELOZZI	ENTSO-E	GC ESC/connected online
Cesar	CLAUSE	ENTSO-E	SO & GC ESC
Jakub	FIJALKOWSKI	European Commission	
Robert	WILSON	ENTSO-E	GC ESC/connected via phone
Emilie	MILAN	ENTSO-E	GC ESC/connected via phone
Jörg	KAISER	VGB	SO & GC ESC
Michaël	VAN BOSSUYT	IFIEC Europe	SO & GC ESC
Naomi	CHEVILLARD	SolarPower Europe	SO & GC ESC
Eleni	DIAMANTOPOULOU	ClientEarth	SO & GC ESC
Anneli	TEELAHKT	The European Association for Storage of Energy - EASE	SO & GC ESC
Michael	WILCH	EDSO for Smart Grids	SO & GC ESC
Eric	DEKINDEREN	VGB	SO & GC ESC
Vasiliki	KLONARI	WindEurope	SO & GC ESC

Participants			
Colin	BRODERICK	ENTSOE	SO & GC ESC
Jean-Noel	MARQUET	EDF	SO & GC ESC
Reinhard	KEISINGER	E-Control	SO ESC
Daniel	FRAILE	WindEurope	GC ESC

1. *Opening*

1.1. *Review of the agenda*

The chair welcomes the participants. The Agenda is approved with an addition to the AoB of questions from Garth Graham.

1.2. *Review and approval of minutes from previous meeting*

The minutes of the last meeting are approved.

1.3. *Review of actions*

Jean Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) informs on the status of the actions. He informs that the collection of the data for reserve sizing will be finalized by the end the year. Active library: Network Code Emergency and Restoration SPOCs within the TSOs have been reminded to share the National documents in the active library. For SOGL the development of the active library is work in progress.

Action 4: Availability of national defence and restoration plans

Jean Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) informs that national defence and restoration plans are often not available due to security reasons. Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) asks for the plans (at least the ones approved by NRAs) to be made available to the stakeholders. This is necessary for stakeholders to be aware of the measures which they are responsible for and to be sure that these measures are the ones approved by the NRAs. Rafal Kuczynski (ENTSO-E) noted that it is required to consult some parts of defence plans and those were made available on the websites of the TSOs. The NRAs' approval is still ongoing. TSOs already informed DSOs and SGUs about their responsibilities. There is no risk that someone responsible for implementation of measures is not informed. However, given the confidential nature of the defence plan, the entire document cannot be made public. Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) remarks the necessity for SGUs to acknowledge the documents approved/consulted by NRAs. He also mentions that in GB the entire plan has been made public. Cesar Clause (ENTSO-E) notes that NRAs should publish the part approved by them but however this still remains a national process and each Member State (MS) should follow their own approach concerning how much of the plan is made publicly available. Rafal Kuczynski (ENTSO-E) says that according to his understanding every TSO is obliged to inform SGUs.

Action 5: requirements to be a defence provider or a restoration provider

Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) notes that the actions taken by the SGUs involved in the defence plan should be made part of the active library so that SGUs can check which kind of measures are implemented by similar users in other MSs.

Action 6: consultation on every CCR for the SO GL Art.76 proposals

A workshop for all CCRs/NRAs/ACER is to be organized on the 2nd of October. Marco Pasquadibisceglie (ARERA) highlights that the workshop should focus on a regulatory perspective and not on a stakeholder's perspective. At CCR level, TSOs are encouraged to setup a workshop during the public consultation.

2. *Update on implementation actions at pan EU level*

Jean Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) presents slides (available [here](#)), point 2.2 of the presentation. Eric Dekinderen (VGB) remarks that a possible conflict could emerge between the CSAM (Coordinated Security Analysis Methodology) and Minimum Inertia. Knud Johansen (ENTSO-E) clarifies that the two topics are linked but remain different since they are based on two different articles (SO GL Art. 75 and Art. 39).

3. *NC Emergency and Restoration*

3.1. *Terms and conditions approved by NRAs ([Active library](#))*

Rafal Kuczynski (ENTSO-E) presents slides (available [here](#)), point 3.1 of the presentation. Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) asks to ensure that relevant parts are shared well in advance with the stakeholders, for them to be prepared for the discussion in the next ESC meeting. Moreover, he remarks that confirmation across the EU should be given concerning the implementation of the deliverables included in Art. 4(2). In at least one MS the TSO has not published the list of SGUs. The Chair invites the TSOs to submit for the upload to the Active Library the non-confidential information so as to allow for ENTSO-E implementation monitoring. Cesar Clause (ENTSO-E) highlights that in France a detailed list of SGUs has not been published, but instead the criteria for the selection of SGUs has been made available.

3.2. Planning the workshop on Market interactions

Rafal Kuczynski (ENTSO-E) presents slides (available [here](#)), point 3.2 of the presentation. The Chair (ACER) confirms that all market suspension and restoration related topics will be dealt with in the MESC to avoid possible overlaps. Pavla Erhartova (EUROPEX) asks if the planned workshop will be discussed at MESC. Rafal Kuczynski (ENTSO-E) confirms that the date will be discussed in the MESC.

4. Dynamic stability assessment

4.1. Response to open /pending questions from stakeholder workshops, and

4.2. Status on implementation of SOGL art 38 and 39

Knud Johansen (ENTSO-E) presents slides (available [here](#), point 4 of the presentation) and explains that the decision to publish the results of the study will be a topic for discussion with NRAs and ACER.

5. CGM related methodologies

5.1. State of discussion on extension of the CGM process to the week ahead time frame

The convenor of the CGM Methodologies Team, Cesar Clause (ENTSO-E) presents the slides (available [here](#), part 5 of the presentation) and gives an update on the work in progress on the consolidation of the CGM-related methodologies and the extension to the week-ahead time frame, noting that the SO GL does not provide a sufficient legal basis to make participation in the week-ahead CGM process mandatory. However, there will be an incentive for TSOs to deliver week-ahead IGMs even without an explicit legal obligation as several of the processes that use the CGM, in particular the outage planning coordination process (OPC) as well as the process for the assessment of short-term adequacy (STA), rely on week-ahead CGMs. Following the first review round of the key proposals with respect to the week-ahead CGM process, the drafting team will provide an updated/revised proposal (initially to the TSO community only).

In the discussion of the “All TSOs” voting modalities, the European Commission indicated that they were going to be able to support the TSO community by providing a consolidated list of the TSOs eligible to participate in “All TSOs” processes as well as their participation rights.

It was noted that as part of the consolidation of the CGM-related methodologies narrowly defined, the future switch to an imbalance settlement period (ISP) of 15 minutes is being assessed. This switch, required by the EB GL, may have implications both for the methodologies as well as for many TSO business processes. The assessment is currently ongoing within ENTSO-E working groups and will continue to be discussed with the EC as well as the NRAs and ACER.

Beyond the extension of the CGM process to the week-ahead, the Chair noted that the implementation of the CGM process is urgently required, as the CGM is the basis for many other processes both on the part of TSOs and RSCs. In light of this urgency, the Chair asked for an update on progress with the implementation of the CGM process at the subsequent meeting of the SO ESC.

Reinhard Keisinger (E-Control) highlights that a certain level of uncertainty still characterizes some topics i.e. the week-ahead stage. The tasks using CGM shall encourage TSOs to participate in week ahead processes (i.e. outages). In case a TSO still does not participate in the process, some kind of incentives could be put in place in order to favor wider participation. If further cooperation is needed, an operational decision between TSOs on these subjects could be made binding (not legally though). ACER suggests that week ahead services like short term adequacy, outage planning/consistency, critical grid situation could be run at the RSC level. Jakub Fijalkowski (EC) confirms that he will provide ENTSO-E with a consolidated list of certified TSOs by the end of September.

5.2. Presentation of DRAFT consolidated methodologies incl. open issues/questions identified in the revision.

Concerning slide 32, Florentine Benedict (CEDEC) mentions that the formal approval of consolidated methodologies is still under discussion. Moreover, she asks the reason for not merging the two documents (CGMM and GLDPM). Knut Eggenberger (ENTSO-E) explains that while the various versions of the methodologies are very similar, the two deliverables remain quite different and cannot be compared.

6. AOB -VGB questions

Eric Dekinderen (VGB) informs that VGB's questions were addressed by ENTSO-E and are presented among the materials for this meeting. Some contradiction remains between RfG and SO GL concerning the certification of power plants. Nevertheless, the document should be improved regarding its format and make it more readable. The Chair notes that his feedback to ENTSO-E's answers, as recorded in the current document, should be used to improve the final version and that his views should be construed as representing those of ACER.

https://entsoe.eu/Documents/Network%20codes%20documents/Implementation/stakeholder_committees/SO%20ESC/2019_09_11/191023_VGB%20Questions_Final.pdf

7. Actions

- i) ENTSO-E to invite TSOs to submit information regarding the publication of Terms and Conditions regarding defence and restoration providers.
 - ii) TSOs to be encouraged to organize a Stakeholders workshop per CCR on SO GL Art. 76 proposals.
 - iii) ENTSO-E to provide an overview on how implementation took place for the Art. 4(2) of NC ER.
 - iv) DSA/DSM: pending questions concerning DSA to be presented at the December 2019 SO ESC Meeting.
 - v) ENTSO-E is asked to provide an update on the CGM Implementation at the December SO ESC.
 - vi) ENTSO-E to review the VGB questions document in order to make it more readable while considering the Chair's comments.
-

14th GC ESC

1. **Opening**

1.1. Review of Agenda

The Chair welcomes the participants to the 15th GC SC session.

1.2. Review and approval of minutes from previous meeting

The minutes of the 14th GC ESC are approved (available [here](#)).

1.3. Follow-up actions from previous meeting/ new additions to Issue Logger (available [here](#)):

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) reports the status on the Action Tracker items.

On the respective implementation monitoring actions (Action 30), the Chair (ACER) communicates that the items concerning the implementation have been sent to ENTSO-E. ACER continues to facilitate the process through the collection of the implementation updates from NRAs and sending the new data for the monitoring file. ACER will also publish an implementation monitoring report in two months' time.

On Action 41 and the involvement of ACER/NRAs in the EGs work, the Chair (ACER) informed that an internal position paper was prepared by ACER, based on the analysed reports submitted by the EGs while collecting NRAs' feedback. ACER intends to be actively involved in the next step of the EGs work and use this position paper to form its views and input concerning the drafting of the legal text for amendment proposals. The position paper could be made available to the EGs during their activities.

Eric Dekinderen (VGB) asks clarifications on Action 36 and the difference between a general requirement and a site-specific requirement. Ralph Pfeiffer (ENTSO-E) clarified that a general requirement is for example a common value to be respected or a general parameter range. A site-specific requirement cannot be defined generally but must be specified for each project. An example of that is information exchange, which is hard to be defined at national level and can fall under the site-specific requirements. Luca Guenzi (EUTurbines) proposed to formalize a general criterion to define this different kind of requirements which will also facilitate the derogation procedures. The ongoing review of IGD '[Parameters of Non-exhaustive requirements](#)' could include a clarification concerning this topic.

No additional comments raised on the Action log.

2. **Report from the Network Code Implementation Monitoring Group (NC IMG) on July 12**

Alexander Dusolt (ENTSO-E) presents the current status of Network Codes implementation and CEP implementation.

The agenda and the conclusions of the meeting are available [here](#).

Regarding the SO GL proposals for the framework of the regional security coordinators (RSCs/future regional coordination centres - RCCs), the NC IMG welcomes the progress made towards appointing the RSCs in all regions. Close cooperation is required among all regions and ACER/EC to ensure consistency and a good transition to the RCC framework.

Based on the Commission's assessment in the next months on the changes needed in CACM and SO GL, the priorities and the concrete timing of the formal amendment process will be discussed at the next NC IMG.

Concerning the CEP implementation, the NC IMG recognises the challenging deadlines and the workload of ENTSO-E and ACER due to the new legal framework. In particular, regarding the future bidding zone review, the NC IMG highlights the need of a robust technical assessment, acknowledging that this will be the basis for the decisions to be taken in the future. While the methodology needs to be done with no delay, the BZ (Bidding Zone) study itself can be delivered by 2025.

For the implementation of the 70% threshold in capacity calculation, the NC IMG highlights the need for complete data provision to ACER in order to perform the necessary calculations for the starting point of the action plans/potential derogations.

On the amendment discussion, Luca Guenzi (EUTurbines) asks how stakeholders can contribute to the process of Network Codes Implementation Groups (NC IMG). If EUTurbines has to give any contribution by December, the inputs must be given sufficiently in advance. Alexander Dusolt (ENTSO-E) highlights that all involved parties can participate to the amendment process, but currently there is nothing that requires feedback. The ESC is aware of all updated information on this. Garth Graham (Eurelectric) recommends that the process should be clear in the definition of both the steps and the timeline, since once it starts a lot of proposals could arrive. In order to guarantee the efficiency of the amendment process, the procedure must be robust enough to sustain the expected volume of proposals delivered. The Chair (ACER) states that the procedure could be defined once the areas for the amendment have been cleared. EC should define a time table for the amendments of NCs. The work of the ESC and EGs can be used as an input to the amendments .

3. Connection Network Codes implementation:

3.1. Update from Technical Group High Penetration

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) presents slides (available [here](#)).

Daniel Fraile (WindEurope) observes that the report takes in consideration only converter-based systems but misses to address presently working technologies, such as synchronous condensers, which are able to sustain the reactive needs of the grid and help the system at least in the transition period.

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) acknowledges that there is a range of other solutions, but the objective of this Technical Group was to focus on the future innovative technology of grid forming. The report should not be read as a bibliographical list of all different technologies. This will be clarified in the report. However, there will be an additional effort to introduce further notes on the synchronous condensers.

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) highlighted that the report does not provide all the answers but tries to collate important knowledge on the topic and also leaves room for questions that are important to define a follow up work (not necessarily within the current expertise of this Technical Group).

Stakeholders were invited end of July to send their comments and feedback on the subject until mid-September.

Daniel Fraile (WindEurope) mentions that WindEurope will share comments by the suggested deadline and highlights that grid-forming will have a huge impact on OPEX of wind and solar PV technologies, and, in order to define a position on the matter, some assumptions must be made.

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) acknowledges the impact but indicates that regarding costs, a quantitative approach should be kept, with clear percentages and figures concerning potential increases. It is difficult to draw conclusions on the cost impact without such estimates.

Eric Dekinderen (VGB) asks what the impact on short circuit levels will be and which are the interactions between condensers and other equipment installed on different voltage levels of the system. The issues related to this subject should be investigated in the future.

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) agrees with the validity of this enquiry and any extra consideration that the report might not put forward in a clear manner. However, he recommends that the focus should be kept on finalizing the current work.

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) invites stakeholders to send their comments by the end of the week i.e. September 13, 2019.

The reports of phase 1 of the three EGs are close to final and will be published soon. In phase 2 the reports will be amended with the outcome of the work as described in the revised/new Annexes (ToRs) of the EGs

3.2. Active Library / Monitoring Excel File

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) presents the current status of the NC implementation, showing the relevant implementation maps, the active library and the monitoring file. Concerning the latter, the new file has been shared already with the GC ESC in June and is considered an improved version which consolidates information that was available in different files in the past. The readability of the file is also improved. The layout of the Active Library will also be updated in the future, focusing on final documentation and archiving existing material collected during the implementation phase.

4. GC National Implementation joint feedback from EUTurbines and EUGINE

Luca Guenzi (EUTurbines) presents the slides (available [here](#)).

Luca Guenzi (EUTurbines) highlights the lack of harmonization in the national implementation processes which complicates the transparency and collection of information. Active Library and all available ENTSO-E tools are very useful, and the work is appreciated, but the quality of information is different for each country, hence the need for an improvement in that area. A challenging fact is that the documentation is available in most cases in national languages only. EUTurbines assessed the available information and sent 21 requests for information during the summer to the TSO contacts from the Active Library. Only 5 of them answered and only 2 of those 5 provided the information requested. Further information regarding compliance processes can be considered.

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) thanks EUTurbines for the feedback and asks EUTurbines to send the survey and the assessment on the tools made available on ENTSO-E website to consider for the future improvements. ENTSO-E will also proceed with its own assessment of the Active Library and EUTurbines' survey results can be useful. Of course, not all points and concerns can be addressed since they deviate from and may reach beyond the mandate of ENTSO-E and TSOs in general. Processes, implementation, communication, national websites, etc., are matters that are treated differently in the MS and for which different actors i.e. NRAs, Ministries, ... can be responsible.

Concerning the use of English language by all TSOs, this has been recommended by ENTSO-E, but it is not a mandatory requirement and therefore cannot be enforced. It is a challenge, but language should not be a deterrent factor if one is interested in what is happening in one specific country. This was already the case before the RfG era. Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) mentions that ENTSO-E - via the Active Library and other tools - strives for a useful pan-EU overview in English to allow any stakeholder to get a sufficient level of information regarding connection codes. This is a rather challenging task, but ENTSO-E tries to coordinate as much as possible and make transparent what can be useful.

As far as the stakeholder involvement to the drafting and implementation is concerned, Ralph Pfeiffer (ENTSO-E) adds that, with the implementation of CEP, stakeholders shall be involved at the early stage of implementation. Concerning the issues related to harmonization of compliance and certification, he stated the lack of support and involvement of CENELEC to GC ESC meetings on the matter. There has been no update or reporting for one year and it is difficult to keep track of the progress. Luca Guenzi (EUTurbines) as a member of TC8X WG3 of CENELEC states that people from the relevant working group have other work to do in parallel and the resources currently available are not sufficient to stay updated as per the needs of GS ESC. However, an internal meeting will be held within the next ten days where these issues will be discussed.

Ralph Pfeiffer (ENTSO-E) also mentioned that ENTSO-E will seek to formalize the collaboration with IEC RE which will address the issues of a harmonized certification scheme.

Garth Graham (Eurelectric) states that in GB the requirements for generators connected at distribution levels are not shown by the TSO (on their website) and the monitoring excel file, while they should be visible. Mike Kay (GEODE) supports that.

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) understands the request but mentions that the current status of the monitoring excel file has been the result of a great effort which has been made over the last two years in reply to stakeholder requests and acknowledging that such level of transparency is useful for all parties and the basis for future ENTSO-E monitoring

activities. Therefore, for any additional improvements the support of the relevant stakeholder groups is necessary for efficient and timely updates. For this particular request, DSOs can support by providing at least links to existing and approved documentation.

The Chair (ACER) concludes by asking ENTSO-E to update the Active Library/monitoring file with the websites and link to GC documents. Moreover, the same invitation is extended to DSOs. Michael Wilch (EDSO) says that it could be difficult to reach all European DSOs. Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) asks if there is a need to do so.

5. Revisions to the Terms of Reference of GC ESC Expert Groups

The Chair (ACER) presents the updates on the revised ToR (available [here](#))

Eric Dekinderen (VGB) asks what the procedure would be in case the EG leaves an open option concerning a subject. The Chair (ACER) clarifies that ESC shall guide the EGs as to their deliverables considering the inputs coming from the EGs.

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) added that there is a degree of freedom to define how the justifications could look like, e.g. proposal for an amended text or further assessment of some policy options and the impact.

If future EG results impact past results from another (closed) EG, then there is the option to re-open the specific point and to re-assess it. A clarification on that will be introduced to the ToR in reply to Michaël Van Bossuyt (IFIEC) point.

6. Workplan of the existing GC ESC Expert Groups - Revised EG membership, timeline and new objectives

Ralph Pfeiffer (ENTSO-E), Emilie Milin (ENTSO-E) and Robert Wilson (ENTSO-E), chairs of the existing EGs, present the respective slides (available [here](#)).

Ralph Pfeiffer (ENTSO-E) presents the updates on the phase two of the EG PSH and the related objectives

The new membership has been presented which is a result of a call. It is proposed to continue with the existing chairmanship.

The Chair (ACER) asks when the updated ToRs will be made available, given the fact that they should be agreed by the ESC (e.g. via an electronic procedure).

It was agreed that if there are no objections on the points presented on this day, ENTSO-E can draft the ToRs, circulate them in advance of December's meeting and the ToRs can be approved officially in the next ESC GC. Anyhow, this should not delay the start of the work by each EG. In all ToRs the preferred policy options should be mentioned clearly.

Emilie (ENTSO-E) presents the part related to the EG STORAGE.

The Chair (ACER) highlights that, concerning the first policy option, Annex 3 of the report is not including any references. Emilie confirms that the annex of the report should contain the requested information and it should not be empty. The tables of the requirements exist and will be made available.

Michael Wilch (EDSO for smart grids) notes that in slide 5 it is indicated that EG MCS is responsible for the task. Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) confirms that it is a typo and that EG STORAGE should be indicated as responsible for the task. The update version of the presentation shall be uploaded.

The new membership has been presented which is a result of a call. It is proposed to continue with the existing chairmanship.

Robert Wilson (ENTSO-E) presents the part related to the EG MCS

The new membership has been presented which is a result of a call. It is proposed to continue with the existing chairmanship.

All current reports and supporting material will be made available on the EGs site and anything new coming from phase two will be added later.

7. Survey results for new Expert Groups

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) presents the results of the survey and the related comments from the members (comment slides available [here](#)).

Michael Wilch (EDSO for smart grids) notes that regarding the baseline for Type A PGMs topic and the point of harmonization of requirements and alignment with standards, the free trade of goods is important, but it is not the aim of the network codes. However, they should not add barriers either. The Chair (ACER) replies that the codes aim at achieving cost efficiencies. This should be considered when drafting legal text proposals.

Bernhard Schowe-Von Der Brelie (EFAC) asks for including EV in the EG STORAGE during phase two. There are interesting issues to be addressed at DSO level interaction of charging points.

Eric Dekinderen (VGB) suggest including Type B PGM in the title for "Baseline for Type A PGMs" topic, given the fact that a B unit in France can be an A unit in Denmark. Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) mentioned that this is a valid point and is considered in the objectives in the assessment of A/B threshold.

On the same topic, Eric Dekinderen (VGB) mentioned that the certification should be designed for the most stringent testing e.g. for FRT case considering tclear of 150ms vs 200ms. The reply was that there are a number of requirements that can be different from country to country and therefore we need to see if such Equipment Certificates can be useful and to which extent.

The Chair (ACER) remarks, concerning the second priority topic (interaction studies), the risk that some devices could be left out from the interaction studies. For example, synchronous condensers and power electronics at the DSO level that can interact with each other and across different voltage levels. Moreover, he agrees on inclusion of the EV topic under the EG STORAGE. ENTSO-E notes both points and will consider them at the EG level.

Garth Graham (Eurelectric) concludes by saying that in December 2019 or in March 2020 even the possibility of creating new groups should be evaluated. The Chair (ACER) says that the establishment of new groups shall follow after the finishing of the current work of the existing EGs with respect to the ToR and the available resources. This will be further discussed in the next meeting in December.

8. AOB

ENTSO-E to prepare a proposal for 2020 meeting dates, similar to what has been done for 2019 in terms of trying to combine SO & GC ESC with MESC.

9. Follow-up actions:

1. ENTSO-E, with the support of the DSOs, to update the monitoring file including links for DSO requirements.
2. IGD Parameters of Non-exhaustive requirements to be reviewed especially concerning the difference between general and site-specific requirements.
3. EUTurbines to send ENTSO-E the results of the survey run on the active library.
4. CENELEC to be contacted and send updates in the upcoming meeting – especially regarding the work on 50549-10.
5. ENTSO-E with the EGs to prepare all ToRs Annexes of phase 2 to be submitted for approval at the next GC ESC meeting
6. ENTSO-E to publish the current reports and supporting material of the EGs online.
7. ENTSO-E to prepare for the next meeting a schedule for 2020 with meeting dates similar to the one proposed for 2019.