

1st System Operation European Stakeholder Committee (SO ESC)

Tuesday, 14 March 2016 from 9:00 to 12:15

ENTSO-E, Avenue de Cortenbergh 100, Brussels, Belgium

Draft Minutes

Participants			
Uros	GABRIJEL	ACER	Chair
Teelke	OLDERMANN	ACER/BNetzA	
Jakub	FIJALKOWSKI	ACER/E-Control	
Jeremy	VINCENT	ACER/CRE	
Matti	SUPPONEN	European Commission	
Tahir	KAPETANOVIC	ENTSO-E	
Jean-Philippe	PAUL	ENTSO-E	
Ramiro	FERNANDEZ-ALONSO	ENTSO-E	
Pilar	MUNOZ-ELENA	ENTSO-E	
Sonya	TWOHIG	ENTSO-E	
Kristel	ROMEO	ENTSO-E	
Stela	NENOVA	ENTSO-E	Secretariat
Rafal	KUCZYNSKI	ENTSO-E	
Alan	WHITAKER	ENTSO-E	
Marc	MALBRANCKE	CEDEC	
Michael	WILCH	EDSO for Smart Grids	
Sebastien	GRENARD	EDSO for Smart Grids	
Luca	GUENZI	EUTurbines	
Julie	FINKLER	ClientEarth	
Daniel	FRAILE	WindEurope	
Vandad	HAMIDI	WindEurope	
Ton	GERAERDS	VGB Powertech	
Klaus	OBERHAUSER	VGB Powertech	
Markus	WATSCHER	EURELECTRIC	
Garth	GRAHAM	EURELECTRIC	
Sanni	AUMALA	EURELECTRIC	
Thomas	LESCARRET	EURELECTRIC	
Toma	MIKALAUŠKAITE	Orgalime	
Stein	OVSTEBØ	IFIEC	
Christian	RAUNIG	GEODE	
Florentien	BENEDICT	CEDEC	
Goran	DROBNJAK	EASE	
Pavla	ERHARTOVA	Europex	

1. Opening

1.1 Welcoming Address and Draft Agenda

SO ESC Chair Uros Gabrijel (ACER) welcomed the participants to the 1st SO ESC meeting. The draft agenda was approved. One additional presentation by IFIEC was included under the item 5.

2. Functioning of the System Operation ESC

2.1. Approval of the Draft Terms of Reference (ToR) of the SO ESC

Uros Gabrijel (ACER) explained that the SO ESC ToRs are very similar to the existing GC ESC ToRs and that the ToRs are consistent between all the three ESCs.

Sanni Aumala (EURELECTRIC) noted that the Emergency Restoration (ER) code was not mentioned in the ToRs. The Chair agreed that this could be clarified. The ToRs were approved without further comments or change.

Sanni Aumala (EURELECTRIC) asked about the possibility for stakeholders to raise questions to the EC and to ask for a response or interpretation between the ESC meetings.

Matti Supponen (EC) noted that the EC is currently exploring an operational solution to this question. The EC recognizes the need to respond to stakeholders questions but is legally able to give guidance only on interpretation. The official legislative interpretation can only come from the Court of Justice of the EU. The EC is considering how to organize this process, and what platform to use to track stakeholder questions and comments and to respond. **There will be a conference in early May 2017 to celebrate the NCs completion and this might be a good occasion to disclose further ideas on how to proceed.** Some stakeholders have mentioned the existing gas functionality platform but Matti Supponen noted that it is not directly applicable to electricity and there is no one-to-one attempt to mimic this. ACER and ENTSO-E can discuss further possibilities regarding this issue.

2.2. Presentation of the ENTSO-E IT platform

Stela Nenova (ENTSO-E) presented the key features of the common IT platform for the European Stakeholder Committees (presentation [here](#)), which was developed by ENTSO-E to provide technical support to the work of the three ESCs. The platform is hosted on the ENTSO-E website and provides information on the composition and ToRs of the ESCs, as well as all relevant information for the ESC meetings (meeting materials, possibility to register for the meetings, to access public broadcasts of the ESC meetings, etc.). The IT platform aims to facilitate stakeholder access to NC implementation information, to allow stakeholders to follow and participate in the ESC discussions, and to ensure easy access of all interested parties to the documents relevant for NC implementation. To facilitate further the work of the SO ESC and timely information distribution, the same process will be followed as for the MESC and the GC ESC: stakeholders should submit their presentations and documents to ACER and ENTSO-E, and all meeting documents will be published on the IT Platform prior to each meeting for stakeholders' information and preparation. The IT platform is directly accessible [here](#).

3. Planning the adoption of the System Operation Network Codes

Matti Supponen (EC) informed members that the SOGL is now under scrutiny, which should take 3 months for the European Parliament to check the legal basis and approve. Subsequently, the SOGL might either be adopted before summer break (August 2017), or in case of further delays, shortly after summer break. ER is not yet in scrutiny but is expected to enter into scrutiny before summer break.

4. SO NCs' implementation status

4.1 Regional coordination: Common Grid Model (CGM) and OPDE

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) explained the current ENTSO-E framework and tools for regional coordination and operational planning activities according to CACM and SOGL under development: the Common Grid Model (CGM) and the Operational Planning Data Environment (OPDE) and how they function (presentation available [here](#)). TSOs are cooperating regionally to set up five key services (coordinated capacity calculation, coordinated security analysis, outage planning coordination, short and medium term adequacy, and the pan-European Common Grid Model, which merges individual TSO grid models) to be delivered by Regional Security Coordinators (RSCs). The CGM provides a full picture and common understanding of the power grid and the expected state of the system at different timeframes to describe correctly forecast situations and will be used as a basis for the key services. All data is shared between TSOs and RSCs in a common data environment (OPDE), which is the common architecture, using uniform format definition, to enable safe and secure operational planning coordination.

The CGM methodology will be approved by all NRAs and will serve both CACM and SOGL purposes. The service CGM Alignment (coordinated determination of the net positions in each bidding zone) will be necessary for the capacity calculation process and ensuring alignment between the different CCRs. All TSOs and RSCs will need to implement the requirements as per the CACM/SOGL, using a reliable and secure network ("All TSO network for non-real time Operational and Market-related data", or ATOM), and a common format (CGMES – Common Grid Model Exchange Standard - 2.4 which was adopted and published by ENTSO-E based on the international standard – Common Information Model, CIM) together with various applications and general services. The ATOM network is the pan-European private (fiber optic) communication network based on TSO-owned backbone infrastructure for non-real-time operational and market-operations related data. TSOs publish their IGMs and can subscribe some information; RSCs host the data environment layer, subscribe to all IGMs, and merge them into the CGM, and publish the CGM for all TSOs' use.

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) explained further the next steps for the CGM-OPDE program implementation. After the software development phase, ATOM network implementation, CGMES data format completion and the ATOM/OPDE contract, there is a transition phase until beginning of 2018 to ensure all TSOs are connected securely to the OPDE/ATOM. By mid-2018, the operational phase will be starting, and the CGM will be used for all pan-European operational services, data exchange through OPDE and implementation of coordination principles and services.

Vandad Hamidi (WindEurope) asked for further clarification on the link between the balancing platform currently in development and the CGM/OPDE platform and on the priority of these platforms for making decisions.

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) noted that in terms of implementation timelines, the CGM/OPDE is developed first and independently, there are requirements that are currently approved in the scope of EBGL, and some preliminary projects are working on this.

Tahir Kapetanovic (ENTSO-E) added that the CGM/OPDE platform has low-visibility to outside world as it is mainly about how TSOs exchange data for capacity calculation, load flows etc. while the balancing platform will be building upon this one. The two platforms are not excluding but rather complementing each other.

Michael Wilch (EDSO for Smart Grids) asked for clarification whether the use of this model will translate into higher demand by the TSO for data from a DSO to a TSO as he has recently observed higher demands for data in the national context. He also asked whether the DSOs will have access to this platform.

Tahir Kapetanovic (ENTSO-E) clarified that this is an internal communication network as required in the SOGL, including both hardware and software. DSOs are not intended to be connected to that platform – although parts of the data from DSOs' grids are required for modelling - as it deals with exchange of data between TSOs. The ATOM network with OPDE is a means to deal with the data but is not creating higher requirements for data (as defined in the SOGL), and it is linked to what the needs are for the TSOs to have an overview on the system.

A short movie on the functioning of the CGM is available [here](#).

4.2 Implementation activities

Tahir Kapetanovic (ENTSO-E) presented the key implementation activities in the system operation framework for both SOGL and the ER NC, and the preliminary timelines for the activities (presentation available [here](#) as of slide 9). He clarified that implementation refers to the implementation of methodologies with pan-European character. The ER, being a network code and hence no methodologies to develop and implement, follows a different implementation process from SOGL. For SOGL, there is a list of topics with provisions complemented with a specific methodology, and a large part of SO GL implementation is subject to NRAs approval. Moreover, a large part of this implementation takes place in the framework of the rollout of the 5 standard services by the RSCs (coordinated capacity calculation, coordinated security analysis, outage planning coordination, short and medium term adequacy, and the pan-European Common Grid Model). The SOGL, ER and CACM provide the legal framework for the coordination of TSOs and the implementation of these 5 services across Europe by the RSCs. Future enhancements are possible once the implementation has been completed.

Data exchange provisions (SO GL Art. 40) are the first and one of the key items to be developed immediately after the entry into force (EIF) of the SOGL. The timelines for the delivery of the data exchange provisions, roles and responsibilities for public consultation and NRA approval will be updated once the SOGL enters into force. TSOs will carry out technical studies per synchronous area for required minimum inertia to ensure that the system can withstand sudden stress in real time (SO GL Art. 39(3)(a)), to be delivered by mid-2019 based on the SOGL requirements. The short/medium term adequacy (SO GL Art. 81) is not a methodology per se but an assessment which helps keep the system secure and resilient and will be developed together with RSCs 18 months after SOGL's EIF.

Tahir Kapetanovic (ENTSO-E) noted that synchronous area agreements (SO GL Art. 118) might be more challenging to develop for Continental Europe and the Nordic synchronous areas, than for the GB and Irish synchronous areas (where the agreements should be simpler). The Baltic States are exempted because they are still connected to UPS/IPS. In terms of reporting provisions, based on the SOGL EIF timelines, the first reports will be due in 2019 to ensure coverage of the year 2018. Under SOGL, there are obligations to provide reports on Incident Classification cf. Art. 15, Load frequency control cf. Art. 16 and the regional coordination assessment cf. Art. 17. Regarding reporting under ER, the RSCs should report on TSOs' defence & restoration plans, cf. NC ER Art. 6(3) and ENTSO-E should report on market suspension consistency, cf. Art. 36, in 2019.

Vandad Hamidi (WindEurope) asked how ENTSO-E plans to engage with stakeholders to ensure TSOs receive on time the right information about plans, performance and capabilities of market participants to feed into these discussions.

Tahir Kapetanovic (ENTSO-E) noted that ENTSO-E is already working with DSOs on data exchange and will aim to involve stakeholders as early and transparently as possible in the upcoming consultation activities.

Uros Gabrijel (Chair, ACER) noted that from a practical perspective there was a question raised in the GC ESC, on the system studies for the specifications of frequency-related non-exhaustive requirements in connection network codes (CNCs). Those studies and their aim and scopes were presented last week in an ENTSO-E workshop. The Chair recommends a similar approach for the system study on minimum inertia issues as the one followed for the CNCs. The request from the GC ESC towards ENTSO-E was for a combined approach for both system operation and grid connection aspects. Inertia studies are one part of the specific requirements of the IGDs on frequency-related parameters, and inertia seems to be a cross-ESC issue. Stakeholders are invited to monitor and follow the work of the GC ESC as ENTSO-E has proposed a roadmap to deliver IGDs by end-2017. This will include a workshop in July 2017 on system studies, which may include inertia. When delivering on the regulation, ENTSO-E is encouraged to use all internal expertise to support the work on various cross-cutting topics.

Vandad Hamidi (WindEurope) underlined that in order to solve some of these challenges, there should be a good balance between the system operation requirements and the market provisions and it should be considered what products by generators are offered today which could already help TSOs. Generators are facing more requirements and they invest in upgrading and maintaining the software but he wondered if they have been called for by TSOs to help with inertia etc. and what could be done to engage them more (on products, remuneration etc.).

Tahir Kapetanovic (ENTSO-E) noted that ancillary services for inertia would ideally be provided using a market-based approach. In strongly meshed areas, it is possible that no such measures are needed, but in some remote areas, inertia might become useful.

Uros Gabrijel (Chair, ACER) concluded that if such cross-cutting issues are observed, they can be taken into a dedicated meeting. The GC ESC should be informed as well. System operation studies will inform what the minimum inertia that needs to be there at all times within a synchronous area is, then a methodology will follow on how to bring that inertia into the system in a cost-effective manner, decision on how that can be provided through market etc. The topic of inertia should be discussed further with ENTSO-E, but it might not merit a separate dedicated meeting. **The Chair suggests that a plan is devised on how the 3 ESCs will interact on the same issue; once the plan is devised, it can be presented to all committees. Stakeholders are welcome to raise other aspects in addition to inertia; they should inform ACER and ENTSO-E of such ideas so these can be taken into account in the design of a pragmatic approach.**

Goran Drobnjak (EASE) commented that inertia is an immediate response, linked to load frequency control, and recalled it would be necessary to consider how inertia would be ensured for the future in the context of increasing HVDC connections, as well as how to manage DC to respond to inertia effects. He noted that windfarms, storage etc. are among the different technologies that can be utilized for this purpose.

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) confirmed that whenever ENTSO-E foresees in more detail the minimum inertia study, there will be an overall comprehensive view on frequency management to take into account the dependency between this study and preliminary studies done for the connection codes' implementation.

5. Presentations from European Associations

5.1. Joint DSO presentation

Marc Malbrancke (CEDEC) presented the DSOs' view on data exchange, TSO-DSO cooperation, and interpretations of certain articles of the SOGL (presentation available [here](#)). DSOs would like further clarification on the principles regarding data exchange, the scope of TSO/DSO co-operation, and on proper interpretations of SOGL articles on existing/new power plants (Art. 2); observability area (Art. 75, 43, 44) and timing issues (Art. 40). DSOs have growing security concerns and face increased data exchange and observability needs themselves, and find it difficult to justify or pursue without justification provisions which exceed what is absolutely necessary for operational security in the context of data exchange requirements. DSOs would like to have further confirmation from the EC or ACER on principles regarding certain requirements on data exchange related to the justification of requests for additional or more onerous data exchange requirements and the management of data from distribution grids and their clients. The joint TSO-DSO [data management report](#) provides different choices but DSOs still believe that the respective DSO should manage the relevant data from its distribution grid and its clients.

Marc Malbrancke (CEDEC) noted that further clarification is necessary on the meaning and requirements for cooperation between TSOs and DSOs, as implied additionally by the NC ER. In addition, an agreement on basic rules of engagement with the TSOs, ex. giving an early warning etc. would be welcomed by the DSOs. DSOs would like further clarification on the question of how to interpret "existing SGUs," which have been defined in parallel in the CNCs and whether existing SGUs have to comply with the requirements of CNCs. DSOs' interpretation is that existing SGUs are involved in the GL SO only with their available capabilities, else this would mean retrospective application for the existing SGUs, for which a CBA would be needed. **This question has to be clarified by the EC.**

In addition, the main question for DSOs regarding observability is whether operator-specific issues can be out of the remit of the methodology for determining grid elements if the operator-specific issues have no impact on cross-border dimensions. DSOs would like to have a more meaningful role in determining how observability can be provided to meet the specific technical security requirements identified by the TSOs.

Florentien Benedict (CEDEC) would like further clarification with regard to the timing of Art. 40 on general requirements for data exchange, how to handle the various paragraphs and in which order (specifically if Art. 40(5) and Art. 40(7) should be handled after Art. 40(6)). The time schedule is not very clear with regard to Art. 40(5), which subsequently refers to Art. 44 and Art. 43, while there is no clarity on the observability. Based on the order of the relevant articles, it seems that only 6 months are left for Art. 43 and 44 to arrange the data exchange but this process is also left to the national level between the DSO and the TSO to address.

Michael Wilch (EDSO for Smart Grids) finds it problematic regarding the process with national implementation of GLDPM as the CACM request for data for regional security analysis is also related to observability area but this area is not defined yet.

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) clarified that the observability definition is for providing the information needed for TSOs for real-time data analysis of system and capability to analyse the real-time situation, but different from GLDPM and the methodology for capacity calculation in operational planning.

Tahir Kapetanovic (ENTSO-E) noted that some specific things are left out of Art. 40 due to different national needs and are not specified on a pan-European level if it is known that different solutions would be necessary at the national level.

Uros Gabrijel (Chair, ACER) concluded that ACER and ENTSO-E will cooperate to provide an answer to the question of interpretation of Article 40 regarding the order of handling the different paragraphs.

Florentien Benedict (CEDEC) noted that Art. 40(6) has a reference to the Generation and Load Data Provision Methodology (GLDPM) in GL CACM Art. 16, but no reference to Art. 17 (GLDPM) is provided in the GL FCA, and it is unclear if this reference is just missing and whether stakeholders should wait for Art. 17 or should go ahead with CACM and SOGL.

Tahir Kapetanovic (ENTSO-E) provided an ad-hoc answer that only CACM and SOGL should be considered, but **this will be double-checked and confirmed next time.**

Uros Gabrijel (Chair, ACER) noted that on data exchange proposals by the DSO, the majority of issues are in the articles, and TSOs are obliged to consult DSOs, take into account the system view etc. so all essential elements are in the legislation. Moreover, the national processes will provide for implementation of data exchange provisions. Where necessary, ACER will work with ENTSO-E on providing certain views on issues.

Ramiro Fernandez-Alonso (ENTSO-E) noted that ENTSO-E shares the DSOs' views on many points. Concerning system security, the data needed by both TSOs and DSOs are those required by SOGL. SOGL ensures system operators to receive information required to perform security analysis. ENTSO-E will take into account the DSOs' proposals as far as possible and will try to find a proposal on how to address the exchange of information between SGUs, DSOs, and TSOs in a flexible way. The same solution will not be the best for each country as costs of implementation will vary so flexible options are needed. SOGL provides the general framework (Art. 40(5), 40(7)), and the most cost-effective solution should be found when it comes to data exchange, including with regard to SGUs connected to the distribution grid.

Marc Malbrancke (CEDEC) pointed to the TSO-DSO report and the principle that if there is no exchange yet between TSOs and SGUs, DSOs should still be in the lead for data where it concerns SGUs connected to its grid, and only in specific cases if not able, there is a role for the TSOs.

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) clarified that the observability area is defined as the area for the TSO to assess sufficiently wide real-time information about the electrical state outside of its control area, in order to establish a good state estimation (external impact) and enable good security analysis. If the TSO lacks this information, this would be detrimental to all. The principle of the methodology to define the observability area is that if there is a given impact of external assets on the evaluation of the transmission system (adjacent TSO's or a DSO's system), this impact has to be considered, and this information is needed regardless of the connection to transmission or distribution.

Marc Malbrancke (CEDEC) noted that main question for DSOs to discuss is the way that TSOs gather the information rather than the observability area. If a TSO needs information about SGUs, which are connected to the DSO grid, TSOs should agree with the DSO that the DSO should deliver this information to the TSO.

Ramiro Fernandez-Alonso (ENTSO-E) noted that all necessary rules to guarantee security of the network, clarity on what information needs to be delivered to whom (including for SGUs connected to the DSOs), and how it is exchanged between the DSO and the TSO, will be in the data exchange methodology. The methodology should provide each operator with a flexible approach to implement the provisions in the different countries. Regarding the distinction between existing and new SGUs, Ramiro noted that ENTSO-E will take into account the DSO proposals and will look for an appropriate understanding. However, risks of not knowing what users are doing on the network should be avoided to preserve system security.

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) commented that, with consideration of growing impact of RES, if there is less visibility for the TSO, it might require increasing reliability margins, but on the other hand, a more precise vision of the grid is needed to allow the TSO respond better to market expectations of maximizing capacity.

Markus Watscher (EURELECTRIC) noted that a model that works for everyone and avoids sending the same data twice is needed.

Marc Malbrancke (CEDEC) noted that the DSOs refer to CNCs where lots of requirements are put for new PGMs, but not for existing ones (unless some retroactive action decided by Member States or by CBA or in case of substantial modification of existing PGMs). However, there seems to be a legal problem in the texts as it appears all SGUs have to comply with provisions mentioned in the SOGL, while it is not clear if the CNC requirements are valid for both new and existing PGMs. In the current landscape with existing PGMs' capabilities, if the ultimate objective is to exchange information, significant investments would be needed to improve capabilities.

Ton Geraerds (VGB Powertech) noted that as Requirements for Generators (RfG) says the requirements are not applicable to existing PGMs, SOGL is secondary and so stakeholders will refer to the RfG.

Uros Gabrijel (Chair, ACER) concluded that this question should be discussed further trilaterally with EC to see what the specific issues are, and an answer will be provided in the next meeting.

Michael Wilch (EDSO for Smart Grids) noted that higher data demands at the national level seem to be justified by the need for regional security calculation from CACM. He asked where he could find more information on regional security analysis as defined in the CACM and how it relates to the SOGL's coordinated security analysis concept, and how to find out which calculations are used.

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) clarified that, as it is written in the CACM on exchange of interconnected systems, some aspects of operational security analysis are used for capacity calculation as per the capacity calculation methodology used in each CCR. In the coming months, all TSOs of each CCR will publish this methodology. The national regulators will approve the methodology for the coordinated security analysis according to the regulation.

The Chair confirmed that the CACM interpretation regarding security analysis is the same for SOGL.

5.2. ClientEarth presentation

Julie Finkler presented shortly ClientEarth, an NGO providing legal expertise on various topics and interested in ensuring the IEM framework is robust and efficient. ClientEarth aims to represent civil society in the SO ESC among the other stakeholders who are mostly industry and institutions. ClientEarth is mainly interested in the duties and responsibilities given to different stakeholders (DSOs, TSOs, RSCs), and in ensuring that they are appropriately overseen and that the future framework is suitable for the IEM. ClientEarth is happy to provide legal advice, help with interpretation of provisions etc., share best practices with others, and on how to develop certain methodologies. Julie asked if there is a platform to find out if certain TSOs did not implement RSC guidance for various reasons.

Tahir Kapetanovic (ENTSO-E) noted that this will be part of the reporting obligations under Art. 17, which foresees that RSCs should provide reports on remedial actions for the previous year, and ENTSO-E has to publish those by September of the given year. The MLA TSO agreement is a private agreement for early action before entry into force of the SOGL, but based on the SOGL deadlines after entry into force of the SOGL, the first report will be issued in 2019 for the full year of 2018. Further information about current operation practices can be found on the individual RSC websites themselves.

5.3. IFIEC presentation

Stein Øvstebø (IFIEC) presented some principles from the perspective of industrial energy consumers regarding the system operation framework (presentation available [here](#)). IFIEC members face increasing competition and potential challenging power cost increases going forward. SOGL provisions are very complex, influence industrial operations, so the objective of system operation should be efficient market price setting and minimizing total system operation costs. Security of supply should be in the focus as any outages or blackouts will significantly disturb industrial operation. IFIEC would like to see demand side response (DSR) developed across Europe to handle future challenges in an efficient way, and the power intensive industry's potential as contributor is significant with an appropriate market and remuneration design. The data exchange and requirement discussion is very important for IFIEC and a proper justification of any new requirements is crucial due to potential corresponding cost implications for grid customers including the industry. IFIEC encourages ENTSO-E, Acer, national regulators and TSOs to ensure appropriate arena and transparency for participants in the implementation process.

6. AOB including discussion on key implementation topics raised in Associations' presentations

Thomas Lescarret (Eurelectric) made a general comment from the GC ESC experience that ENTSO-E is working on tools and methodologies to make studies, and that the objectives of these is not to provide common rules in every country. Eurelectric wants to preserve the possibility for each country to decide rules on its own but expects that the ESC will provide some recommendations (ex. the SOGL article referring to minimum standards common across in a synchronous area). Eurelectric hopes that these minimum standards can be provided in the committee framework, and that the ESC reflects on what would happen if countries do not respect min standards.

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) noted that in SOGL there are a number of explicit requirements for harmonization, with the general scheme: the methodology is first approved by all NRAs in all countries and then it becomes the binding rule for all. Some requirements are left to be specified at the national level (e.g. on data exchange) and will be covered by an all-TSO methodology, but there are not so many possibilities where coordination is left open.

Tahir Kapetanovic (ENTSO-E) noted that the methodology will be used and will be part of the national legislation in Member States; the Energy Community in Vienna is established to ensure among others also Acquis Communautaire implementation in the non-EU states, and will also be relying on the methodology.

Thomas Lescarret should provide for the next ESC meeting a list of requirements and articles, which EURELECTRIC deems are left open and fall in between mandatory methodologies approved by NRAs and the exhaustive articles. He would like to see some recommendations from the ESC in the future on topics related to DSO-TSO cooperation.

Uros noted that the operational parameters reference might fall into such a category - it is mostly in the grid connection requirements.

7. Next meetings for 2017

The chair noted that the December meeting date (5th December) needs to be changed as it coincides with the ENTSO-E Annual Conference. Tentatively, the SO ESC can be rescheduled for 12 or 13 December 2017. **The December meeting date will be confirmed at the June meeting as the GC ESC and MESC dates will need to be revised as well.**

Stakeholders suggested that if there are no big developments in between March and September, the September SO ESC meeting could be done remotely through a web-conference call.

Marc Malbrancke (CEDEC) would like to see more communication between SO ESC meetings to enable stakeholders to receive answers to their questions if those are available earlier instead of waiting for the next meeting to receive those answers. He inquired if stakeholders can ask questions between meetings to ENTSO-E.

Uros Gabrijel (ACER) reminded that the EC plans to reveal ideas for new procedures to address stakeholder questions between the ESCs in May at the event on NCs. The question about a physical meeting in September also affects the members in the GC ESC meeting, so they will be informed accordingly. **ACER will discuss together with ENTSO-E the final plan on these procedures and will consider the comments received. Answers to the stakeholder questions from this SO ESC will be provided in June at the meeting in Ljubljana.**

Next meeting dates: 6th June (ACER, Ljubljana); 7th September (ACER, Ljubljana (tbc if a physical meeting needed)); 5th December (ENTSO-E, Brussels (date tbc in June))

8. Follow-up actions

- ✓ ACER and ENTSO-E should discuss together and design a plan on how the 3 ESCs will interact on issues of cross-cutting nature (such as inertia), and present the plan to all committees once developed. Stakeholders should inform ACER and ENTSO-E of any other topics of such nature which should be taken into account.
- ✓ ACER and ENTSO-E should provide an answer to the question of interpretation of SOGL Article 40 regarding the order of handling the different paragraphs.
- ✓ The EC, ACER and ENTSO-E should discuss the definition and interpretation of “existing/new SGUs” and the requirements they should comply with across the CNC and the SOGL, and provide an answer at the next SO ESC.
- ✓ ENTSO-E should explore and confirm at the next SO ESC if the reference to Art. 17 (GLDPM) in the FCA is missing and only CACM and SOGL should be taken into account.
- ✓ Thomas Lescarret will provide for the next ESC meeting a list of requirements and articles, which are left open and fall in between mandatory methodologies approved by NRAs and the exhaustive articles.
- ✓ ACER will discuss with ENTSO-E the possibility of specific procedures for responding to any stakeholders' questions addressed to them in between the ESC meetings.