

3rd System Operation European Stakeholder Committee (SO ESC) Meeting

Friday, 15 December 2017 from 10:00 to 13:30

ENTSO-E, Avenue de Cortenbergh 100, Brussels

Draft Minutes

Participants			
Uros	GABRIJEL	ACER	Chair
Jakub	FIJALKOWSKI	ACER/E-Control	Vice-Chair
Maria Eugenia	LEOZ-MARTIN-CASALLO	European Commission	
Tahir	KAPETANOVIC	ENTSO-E	Via phone
Jean-Philippe	PAUL	ENTSO-E	
Ramiro	FERNANDEZ-ALONSO	ENTSO-E	
Luca	Ortolano	ENTSO-E	Via phone
Sonya	TWOHIG	ENTSO-E	
Kristel	ROMEO	ENTSO-E	
Stela	NENOVA	ENTSO-E	Secretariat
Rafal	KUCZYNSKI	ENTSO-E	
Alexander	DUSOLT	ENTSO-E	
Marc	MALBRANCKE	CEDEC	
Florentien	BENEDICT	CEDEC	
Michael	WILCH	EDSO for Smart Grids	
Sébastien	GRENARD	EDSO for smart grids	
Luca	GUENZI	EUTurbines	
Ton	GERAERDS	VGB Powertech	
Klaus	OBERHAUSER	VGB Powertech	
Sanni	AUMALA	EURELECTRIC	
Pierre	CASTAGNE	EURELECTRIC	
Thomas	LESCARRET	EURELECTRIC	
Ellen	DISKIN	EURELECTRIC	
Eleni	DIAMANTOPOULOU	ClientEarth	Via webstreaming
Stein	ØVSTEBØ	IFIEC	
Christian	RAUNIG	GEODE	
Daniel	FRAILE	WindEurope	
Brittney	BECKER	EASE	
Christian	BAER	Europex	

1. Opening

1.1 Welcoming Address and Draft Agenda

SO ESC Chair Uros Gabor (ACER) welcomes the participants to the 3rd SO ESC meeting and after a brief tour de table of all participants, the draft agenda is approved. Items to be discussed under AOB include an update on inertia from the joint GC-SO ESC's session on 14 December, on joint topics of interest of both SO ESC and GC ESC as proposed by VGB and Eurelectric, and on updates on the recent adoption of NCs and GLs.

1.2. Review and approval of the minutes from previous meeting

The minutes of the 2nd SO ESC meeting are approved without further comments (available [here](#)).

1.3. Follow-up actions from previous meeting

The Chair notes that some of the follow-up actions are addressed under respective agenda items and some in the agenda item 3 on Issue Logger updates.

1.4. Review of ToR

The Chair and SO ESC members agree that there is no need to update the SO ESC ToR. It is noted that no proposals have been brought forward for updating the GC ESC ToRs either.

1.5. NC High-Level Implementation and Monitoring Group (NC IMG)

Sonya Twohig (ENTSO-E) provides an update on the work of the High-Level Implementation and Monitoring Group, chaired by the EC. The ToR of the group have been published and are available on the websites of the EC, ACER and the ENTSOs ([here](#)). The group is expected to provide high-level non-binding guidance on the NC implementation as well as on strategic matters where appropriate and can be used for escalation of specific matters as agreed with the Chair and the members of the relevant ESC. The last meeting of the NC IMG took place on 29 November 2017 and the conclusions are now available on the EC website and ENTSO-E website [here](#). The main topics discussed include amendment process including the particular amendment raised in respect of the RfG, the set-up of a data provision agreement between ACER and ENTSO-E, the ENTSO-E Transparency Platform roadmap for improvement, and the ENTSSOG functionality platform, among others. **Further updates from the group can be provided in the SO ESC meeting in March 2018, especially with regard to the data provision agreement.** The link between stakeholders and the NC IMG will be further ensured through the ESCs.

All information regarding the group's ToR, objectives, meetings and minutes is available on the websites of the [EC](#), ACER, [ENTSO-E](#), and ENTSSOG.

2. SOGL implementation

2.1. Updates on ongoing activities: KORRR

Ramiro Fernandez (ENTSO-E) provides an update on the status of the KORRR public consultation and the comments received (slides available [here](#)). The consultation ran between 31st October and 1st December 2017 and ENTSO-E received more than 300 comments from 26 various stakeholder entities. The articles with most comments include Art. 2 (definitions), Art. 3 general responsibilities on implementation of the KORRR, and Art. 18 on real-time data provided by SGUs with regard to providing information. ENTSO-E is currently assessing the comments received and preparing a final proposal and responses to consultation comments with the aim for an All-TSOs approval and submission of the methodology proposal to NRAs by 14 March 2018. ENTSO-E commented that it is open to meet stakeholders and understand individual comments as well as discuss how individual responses and comments are taken into account in the preparation of the final draft.

Michael Wilch (EDSO for Smart Grids) requests that another possibility for engagement with stakeholders such as the DSOs is provided before the final draft is submitted or at least to have the possibility to exchange with ENTSO-E as to the expected changes to the next draft of the text. The DSOs still have some concerns regarding the current draft. He proposes that ENTSO-E provides a view to stakeholders/ex. through a workshop or further consultation with stakeholders/once the initial draft has been amended based on the consultation results.

Sonya Twohig (ENTSO-E) invites stakeholders to contact ENTSO-E in case they want to have a follow-up conversation on this topic. If there are a lot of concerns in common, ENTSO-E will explore the possibility to organize another stakeholder engagement activity on the KORRR methodology, always taking into account the schedule to present the methodology. ENTSO-E is taking steps to address comments received with regard to inconsistencies from a legal point of view between the KORRR proposal and the SOGL, and is working on clarifying the text. **At the next SO ESC, ENTSO-E will provide an update regarding the final draft version of the KORRR methodology to be submitted to NRAs in March 2018.**

2.2. Updates on ongoing activities: CGMM

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) provides an update on the CGM methodology v3 process as required to be developed in accordance with the SOGL (slides available [here](#)). The deadline for submission of the all-TSOs' proposal for all-NRAs' approval is 14 March 2018. ENTSO-E has received 21 comments, which are currently being assessed. The CGMM v2 pursuant to FCA (Reg 2016/1719) is currently awaiting all-NRAs' decision by early 2018 while CGMM v1 pursuant to CACM has been approved already. Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) notes that remedial actions' coordination is covered by the CSA methodology and it is expected that CGM process deadlines will be revised to ensure consistency with scheduling deadlines in D-1, ID and CGMA requirements in Y-1. The frequency of ID updates is also an open question in the current version as the standards agreed between TSOs in Continental Europe appear to be challenging for some TSOs in other synchronous areas. Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) further clarifies that the three different versions of CGMM are approved separately by NRAs and they deal with different NCs. TSOs were asked to address only specific requirements per code in each separate version.

Daniel Fraile (WindEurope) invites ENTSO-E to share with SO ESC members further information on the respondents to this consultation (types of entities or names) as this will help some stakeholders understand better how and to what extent this consultation concerns various parties.

In response to stakeholder questions, ENTSO-E will provide further information on who has submitted comments to the consultation and if the input received is sufficient for the purpose. The Chair concludes that an email can be circulated to inform stakeholders about this point.

2.3. Updates on ongoing activities: CSA

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) provides an update on the CSA Methodology (CSAM), including its scope, main topics and links with other methodologies and the timeline for development of the proposal (slides available [here](#)). The CSA methodology covers Art. 75 (coordinating operational security analysis) and Art. 84 (assessing the relevance of assets for outage coordination). The two issues are dealt with together as they are very closely linked but two separate methodologies will be submitted. They will address influences (observability area, external contingencies, etc), common risk assessment (contingencies, accepted risks), uncertainties (effects on injections, forecasts), coordination between RSCs and the role of ENTSO-E with regard to data quality, monitoring and governance. The CSA methodology is further linked with the CGMM V3 (SOGL Art. 67 and 70) and with the organization of regional coordination of operational security analysis by RSCs at CCR level (SOGL Art. 76-77). **A formal stakeholder consultation will be launched in March 2018**, with the aim to deliver the proposals to NRAs in September 2018.

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) further clarifies that the list of contingencies includes ordinary versus exceptional contingencies to ensure the system remains safe even in N-1 conditions. Exceptional contingencies, where covered by the TSO, deal with the case of a unique event leading to the loss of several elements of the grid, whether the event is e.g. a fault on one element or other situations such as triggering of Special Protection Schemes. This is covered in the methodology by principles for harmonization to define and cover such contingencies.

Michael Wilch (EDSO for Smart Grids) welcomes ENTSO-E's intention to keep the methodologies apart on Art. 75 and 84 in view of helping stakeholders understand better the content. He recommends that to help stakeholders understand the interdependencies between the various methodologies, it would be good if ENTSO-E could elaborate more on that aspect in the document for the consultation.

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) clarifies that the computation method is common to the two methodologies and the main principles will be described in the supporting document but additional explanations on the interlinkages with other proposals required by SOGL or other regulations can be provided. ENTSO-E plans to provide further information on the upcoming CSAM processes.

Michael Wilch (EDSO for Smart Grids) would welcome if ENTSO-E could in addition allow more than 1 month time per consultation and to publish the consultation documents as soon as that would be possible for ENTSO-E in order to give stakeholders more time to analyse the documents and understand them better. As 2 methodologies will be consulted simultaneously, stakeholders might need more time to understand ENTSO-E's proposals and to provide quality comments. Sanni Aumala (EURELECTRIC) agrees with Michael Wilch (EDSO for Smart Grids) and encourages ENTSO-E to consult even before the official consultation launch through informal engagement channels, ex. workshops or other, in order to allow sufficient time for stakeholders to be able to provide good quality input.

Jean-Phillipe Paul (ENTSO-E) notes the ENTSO-E internal approval process and timelines might not allow for providing the draft methodology before it has been internally approved, but ENTSO-E will take on board the request for a longer consultation period and will look for possibilities for informal engagement with stakeholders on the deliverables, notably taking into account on the comments received during the stakeholder workshop or the consultation.

Florentien Benedict (CEDEC) comments that the previous informal workshop on the CSA has been very high-level and she would appreciate if ENTSO-E could provide a written response to the questions which she had posed to ENTSO-E as she was not sure if the answers were submitted and discussed at the WS. Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) notes clarifications were made during the workshop but a written response can be further provided.

The Chair encourages ENTSO-E to organize a more detailed workshop during the formal consultation period in order to explain to stakeholders how to understand the methodologies and clarify details, etc. ENTSO-E will explore possibilities for that.

Pierre Castagne (EURELECTRIC) reiterates a general request regarding stakeholder involvement also from the market stakeholders' perspective for a) prolonging the duration of consultations where possible and for b) the possibility to be involved at an early stage in the development of methodologies.

Pierre Castagne (EURELECTRIC) asks for a clarification if there is also a link with redispatching/countertrading and remedial actions in CACM. Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) explains that redispatching rules are required to be developed in CACM Art. 35 and SOGL Art. 76 at CCR level, while the pan-European CSA methodology will set more general principles, leaving flexibility to develop more precise rules and processes at CCR level according to Art. 76 of SOGL and Art. 35 of CACM.

Michael Wilch (EDSO for Smart Grids) encourages ENTSO-E to provide together with the consultation documents a supporting document, including explanations about why certain decisions were taken and an overview on the parameters which have been taken into account. This would be very much appreciated by stakeholder as it can help them get a better understanding of the matter. He supports the proposal for a stakeholder workshop during the consultation period.

2.4. Updates on ongoing activities: FCR minimum activation time

Luca Ortolano (ENTSO-E) provides an update on the current ENTSO-E work to fulfil requirements of SOGL Art. 156 on FCR provision requirements for Limited Energy Reservoirs (LERs) (slides available [here](#)). According to Art. 156 (10) and (11), the TSOs of CE and Nordic SAs should develop a proposal concerning the minimum activation period to be ensured by such FCR providers which shall consider the results of a CBA. The CBA should take into account a number of factors related to experiences with different timeframes and shares of emerging technologies, impacts of a defined time period on the total cost of FCR in the SA and on system stability risks, impacts on the system and FCR costs in case of increasing total volume of FCR, technological developments' impacts on costs of availability periods for FCR etc. According to SOGL timelines, ENTSO-E should provide the CBA for FCR provision by LERs to all NRAs by 14 March 2018. A public consultation and a workshop on the methodology is planned for January 2018.

Michael Wilch (EDSO for Smart Grids) welcomes the presentation and approach taken by ENTSO-E and notes that regarding the impacts of a defined time period on system stability risks through prolonged or repeated frequency events, if one looks at past events, it is possible that countermeasures were already developed for some severe events, so in the current framework it can be discussed also if there were countermeasures that minimize probability that similar events take place in the future, as an addition to the statistical analysis.

Luca Ortolano (ENTSO-E) clarifies that the idea is to have an approach that is not just linked to what happened in the past and derive conclusions for the future but also to have a pure technical approach as TSOs want to avoid the possible imbalances that can't be predicted in advance, so a CBA on only something known would not suffice. The N-1 is statistically considered, but there can be events or imbalances that happen in real time where the TSO does not know the origin but has to manage in real time. Regarding the clause of prolonged and repeated events in SOGL, ENTSO-E is looking at the past events that made some big and long frequency deviations to have an idea on what caused them, but causes cannot always be predicted, so a more general statistical approach is used for this analysis, and the models are still under development.

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) reminds that even if the system frequency has improved since the past, future challenges can be leading to stronger frequency deviations notably linked to RES development, and a potential increase of imbalance situations, so the future challenges may be different in cause, but with the same resulting impacts as in the past.

Thomas Lescarret (EURELECTRIC) notes that this will depend as well on the period considered as in the far future there can be up to 100% generation linked through power electronics but in case RES is not developing that fast, maybe we are requesting too much capabilities for the needs. TSOs have set some numerical targets on quality of frequency and these targets are almost in line with what has been observed in the past. To be consistent with the targets, maybe it will not be completely necessary to request new capabilities.

Jakub Fijalkowski (ACER) asks for a clarification on the interpretation of Art. 156.9-10, referring to a min activation period that should be ensured, and how the difference between normal and alert state is considered, given that the state can not be forecasted. With regard to Art. 156.11 and the CBA requirement for CE and Nordics, he questions if this refers to a common CBA or to a common harmonized value.

Luca Ortolano (ENTSO-E) explains that TSOs will perform a CBA at synchronous area (SA) level, however, there will be one CBA for both CE and Nordic Synchronous area. Regarding the question on the state of the system, the approach will be that as long as a frequency deviation is persisting, a normal state is considered if the frequency is still within the standard frequency range. If there is a deviation out of the standard frequency range (50mHz in CE SA, 100 mHz in Nordic SA), it is considered that some energy is used. ENTSO-E is looking at what is done now across different TSOs but normally energy use starts a little before alert state.

Pierre Castagne (EURELECTRIC) welcomes the presentation but notes that if the duration for FCR is to be extended, there will be parties that could provide less MWs because of exhaustion of limited energy reservoirs, and that could have a potential negative impact on market liquidity, as some parties would not be able to provide the same services as others. **He encourages ENTSO-E to organize a workshop as soon as possible** and reminds that as CE is a significantly large area, this should be taken into account.

Luca Ortolano (ENTSO-E) explains that the statistics for Nordic SA and CE SA will not be the same.

2.5 Forward planning for activities in 2018

Kristel Romeo (ENTSO-E) provides an overview on the upcoming deliverables, consultations and workshops planned for SOGL implementation at pan-European and regional level (slides available [here](#)).

The **pan-European deliverables** with deadlines in 2018 include the KORRR methodology (Art. 40.6 SOGL), CGMM for Y-1, D-1 and ID (Art. 67.1 and 70.1) to be submitted to NRAs by 14 March and CSAM (Art. 75.1) to be submitted to NRAs by 14 September. On CSAM, a public consultation will run between 6 March and 6 April 2018 and a stakeholder workshop will be organized by ENTSO-E on 21st March.

With regard to **regional activities at synchronous area level**, the main deliverables include an LFC blocks proposal (Art. 141.2) by 14 January 2018, a methodology for CBA for determining FCR minimum activation time (Art. 156.11) by 14 March 2018, a methodology for assessing the relevance of assets for outage coordination (Art. 84.1), and operational agreements (Art. 118.1) by 14 September 2018, and a methodology for the definition of minimum required inertia (Art. 39.3b) by 14 March 2020.

There are also **common methodologies that need to be prepared at each CCR level** according to Art. 76.1 regarding common provisions for regional operational security coordination with a deadline on 14 June 2019, following the approval of the methodology for coordinating operational security analysis.

Regarding the methodology for the definition of minimum required inertia, the Chair notes that the slide on the timeline should include a workshop which is planned for May 2018 as part of the ENTSO-E roadmap on developing inertia studies.

Thomas Lescarret (EURELECTRIC) notes that organizing a workshop one week before the end of the consultation period for the CBA methodology seems too late as it might not take appropriately into account the developments in stakeholder understanding and feedback on the topic.

Luca Ortolano (ENTSO-E) notes that the intention was to give stakeholders more time for reading through consultation documents and preparing and updating answers, but ENTSO-E will look for possibilities to move the workshop earlier.

The Chair invites ENTSO-E to assess the possibilities on whether the consultation deadline can be extended and/or if the workshop could be moved earlier and to inform the SO ESC of its decision on how to address the concern as well as update this information on the website.

3. Issue Logger Tool (Q&A logger) – follow-up on questions from previous meeting

Stela Nenova (ENTSO-E) provides an overview on the updates and functionalities of the [Q&A logger tool](#), which currently includes a number of questions raised at previous GC ESC meetings and 3 questions from the SO ESC as raised at the 1st SO ESC and discussed at the 2nd SO ESC meeting. The tool includes now [a guide](#) to help users understand and interpret better the information provided in it, as well as easy search and filtering options. The Q&A logger tool will be used to log and address questions from all three ESCs. Stakeholders are invited to share with ENTSO-E their feedback and any additional suggestions they would find useful to have in the tool.

As a follow-up of the 2nd SO ESC meeting, ENTSO-E was asked to provide an updated answer to two questions.

Regarding the first question on **whether a reference to Art.17 (GLDPM) in the FCA missing and only CACM and SOGL should be taken into account or else**, ENTSO-E's updated answer clarifies that the exchange of structural information in the KORRR has been developed considering timeframes of GLDPM, developed according to CACM. Timeframes of GLDPM updated according to FCA are not addressed in the KORRR.

Michael Wilch (EDSO for Smart Grids) notes that as there is only one methodology referenced in the SOGL, it appears that the agreement is that only this reference methodology is taken into account, and so the answer appears satisfactory.

Stakeholders agree that the new answer is acceptable (available [here](#) and in the [Q&A logger](#)). The status of the answer will appear green in the Q&A logger tool.

Regarding the updated ENTSO-E answer to the second question on **the definition and interpretation of "existing/new SGUs" and the requirements they should comply with across the CNCs and the SOGL** (available [here](#)), ENTSO-E clarifies that CNCs define the required technical capabilities of the facilities while the SOGL defines the use of those capabilities once they are connected to the network. The requirement is the facility to first declare the capabilities and then comply with the SOGL according to those technical capabilities. SOGL does not request additional technical capabilities to existing installations. In case real-time data exchange capability is required from existing installations that do not have the capability yet, then the existing facilities have to declare that they do not have the real-time capability in a justified way. In addition, a communication line is not a capability of a SGU, and therefore cannot be part of the justification.

Michael Wilch (EDSO for Smart Grids) notes that DSOs still have concerns as raised in the KORRR workshop on why such real-time exchange capabilities are needed when requirements are applied on existing installations. He would like to see a justification on this. He recommends that the process is kept as lean as possible as DSOs have otherwise difficulties with coping with the significant amount of generators connected to their grids.

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) notes that from a technical perspective, TSOs may need to request more information and different data than they used to do in the past as the system behaviour is changing with the growing share of new RES generation connected to system and DSR development.

Michael Wilch (EDSO for Smart Grids) notes that there is no problem of applying new requirements to new installations but if existing installations already exchange real-time data, they will continue to do so in the future. However, the ENTSO-E answer appears to imply that the installations have to declare their capabilities independent of what they do now, and that they might be required in the future to provide the capability. Furthermore, it would be problematic for a DSO if it has to judge if the justification provided is good or not.

Sonya Twohig (ENTSO-E) notes that this is still an open question from a legal point of view and recommends that this question be addressed by the EC. **Maria Eugenia Leoz-Martin-Cazallo (EC) confirms that the EC will be looking at the legal perspective to provide an answer.**

The Chair notes that the question will remain as open in the Q&A logger. Stakeholders are invited to submit further inputs in response to the question if they wish; the contributions received will be added to the Q&A logger.

Ellen Diskin (EURELECTRIC) raises a concern that a communication line as referred above seems to be a cost-driver and will demand additional attention. The exclusion of a communication line from the capabilities does not seem practical, even if legally required, and it further involves various costs and should not be excluded in this context.

Ramiro Fernandez (ENTSO-E) explains that the communication line is out of scope, as the implementation aspect and the decision on who should be providing that is left down to the national level. In addition, a communication line is not a capability of a power module.

Luca Ortolano (ENTSO-E) notes that regarding real-time data exchange, the capability cannot be defined on a purely black and white basis, for example regarding a communication line, sometimes users can define what they can do. In this context, communication refers to the possibility to communicate and the data that needs to be communicated.

4&5: Joint DSO contribution - feedback on ENTSO-E consultation process

Sanni Aumala (EURELECTRIC) provides some observations and recent experience with regard to some ENTSO-E stakeholder consultations and workshops on behalf of the DSO associations, and would welcome further updates and improvements in the ENTSO-E standards (slides available [here](#)). Some challenges encountered by stakeholders include a limited forward visibility on upcoming consultations, very short/insufficient consultation timeframes and notification periods. Stakeholders would appreciate it if the consultation hub can show the upcoming consultations in addition to the past and ongoing ones, and encourage ENTSO-E to strive for a longer consultation periods than 1 month where possible, especially when a number of complex consultations run in parallel. The KORRR experience has been challenging for the DSOs with regard to legal and cross-document consistency questions.

Sonya Twohig (ENTSO-E) thanks for the feedback and proposals provided by stakeholders and notes that ENTSO-E plans to update its stakeholder consultation process and the document as part of a new proactive stakeholder approach in early 2018 and will take the feedback already gathered into this update. ENTSO-E will notify stakeholders on how they can contribute further to this process in January 2018 and welcomes any additional suggestions for further improvements.

6. AOB:

The Chair invites VGB and EURELECTRIC to explain the joint GC-SO issues as identified during the last GC ESC meeting. The following topics require a discussion in the context of needs for the potential RfG amendment: classification of PGMs, measurements precisions, max. voltage on 400kV networks, and battery storage.

Klaus Oberhauser (VGB) explains that some inconsistencies and uncertainties have been identified between RfG and SOGL in several areas as mentioned above (slides available [here](#)). Regarding the classification of PGMs, the problem is that if a PGM falls under type D suddenly, then it is treated under SOGL under the same classification. This reasoning may fit well to big nuclear power plants but if it has to apply to a small PV module at an industrial site, as connected at/above 110kV, and this module needs to be is classified as type D, nobody would be able to install RES and cogeneration modules. A solution is needed.

Regarding measurement precision of frequency and frequency response insensitivity, there seems to be a conflict between the requirements for insensitivity and dead band as defined in NC RfG Art. 14 (table 4), which are defined at national level as non-exhaustive requirements, and between the SOGL Art. 154, which requires a max combined effect of inherent frequency response insensitivity of a specific value for CE (10mHz).

Regarding requirements for max voltage in 400kV grids, there appears to be a discrepancy between the requirements in RfG Art. 1 and values in table 6.2. and SOGL Art. 27 and Annex II, table 2 with regard to limits for the voltage of equipment to withstand in a normal state of the 400 kV grids.

Thomas Lescarret (EURELECTRIC) explains that battery storage devices are currently not subject to RfG but as new advances and technologies come along, battery storage can provide useful services to the networks in the future. However, SOGL is based on the classification of NC RfG, and he wonders whether SOGL provisions can be imposed on batteries if batteries are excluded from RfG. In addition, he notes that it might be useful to consider the development of common requirements for batteries at a European level. Ellen Diskin (EURELECTRIC) notes that the question on batteries may have wider implications for other codes beyond the RfG (ex. DCC etc).

The Chair concludes that the 4 questions as raised by VGB and EURELECTRIC will be recorded in the Q&A logger as cross-code issues for SO and GC and will be discussed jointly with the GC ESC and SO ESC in a session at the next meeting. Regarding the potential need for legislation on battery storage at European level, this can be further discussed at the ESC. From a regulatory perspective, one needs to consider the scope of the Framework Guideline on Electricity Grid Connection and ongoing discussions in the framework of the Clean Energy Package.

Jakub Fijalkowski (ACER) briefly recalls the feedback received from stakeholders during the joint GC-SO ESCs discussion on inertia on 14th December in the afternoon. Regarding the sequence of actions, Art. 39 should come first to determine inertia needs, then – if needed - a methodology for new inertia can be approved by NRAs, considering different options to address missing inertia. Issues related to TYNDP and system operation can be combined to reduce complexity. Stakeholders would like to be involved and to be able to provide feedback. The workshop scheduled in May 2018 is about the studies on inertia so it will be an opportunity for stakeholders to provide feedback and comments on the topic.

Daniel Fraile (WindEurope) recommends that regarding the definition of technical capabilities of system users, the thinking on that should be broader to include contributions from other network components, not just the system users.

7. AOB: Commission Update on the NCs

Maria Eugenia Leoz-Martin-Cazallo (EC) notes that NC ER and EBGL were adopted respectively on 24rd and 23th November and published in the OJEU on 28th November. They enter into force on 18th December 2017.

8. Next meeting dates - 2018:

The dates for the ESCs are confirmed as follows:

GC ESC	SO ESC	MESC
8 March, ENTSO-E	7 March, ENTSO-E	6 March, Eurelectric tbc Brussels
4 June, ACER	5 June, ACER	8 June, CEER, Brussels
14 September, ACER	13 September, ACER	4 th September, ENTSO-E, Brussels
13 December, ENTSO-E	14 December, ENTSO-E	5 th December, CEER, Brussels

9. Follow-up actions:

1. ENTSO-E will provide further updates from the NC IMG during the SO ESC meeting in March 2018, especially with regard to the data provision agreement.
2. KORRR: Stakeholders are invited to contact ENTSO-E in case they want to have a follow-up conversation on how their comments to the KORRR consultation are being considered by ENTSO-E. ENTSO-E will explore the possibility to organize another stakeholder engagement activity on the KORRR methodology in case it appears that there are still a lot of common concerns between various stakeholders.
3. At the next SO ESC, ENTSO-E will provide an update regarding the final draft version of the KORRR methodology before submission to NRAs in March 2018.
4. CGMMv3: ENTSO-E will provide information on who has submitted comments to the consultation and if the input received is sufficient for the purpose, through an email to be circulated to SO ESC members to inform them about this.
5. CSAM: ENTSO-E plans to provide further information on the upcoming CSAM processes, including the possibility to have a follow-up with stakeholders after the end of the formal consultation, if needed.
6. ENTSO-E will take on board the request for a longer consultation period for the CSAM and for a more detailed stakeholder workshop.
7. In particular, ENTSO-E should explore possibilities to organize a workshop during the formal consultation period for the CSAM in order to explain to stakeholders how to understand the proposals and clarify details etc.
8. ENTSO-E should follow-up with Florentien Benedict (CEDEC) with a written response regarding the questions raised for the CSA workshop.
9. ENTSO-E should provide a supporting document along with the consultation documents, including explanations about why certain decisions were taken and an overview on the parameters which have been taken into account.
10. Forward planning in 2018: The timeline for the inertia-related stakeholder activities should include a workshop which is planned for May 2018 as part of the ENTSO-E roadmap on developing inertia studies.
11. CBA FCR: ENTSO-E will assess the possibilities on whether the consultation deadline can be extended or if the workshop planned for 5 Feb 2018 could be moved earlier and to inform SO ESC members of its decision as soon as possible, and update the website.
12. Issue Logger tool (Q&A Logger): the updated response to the question on references to art. 17 GLDPM and CACM and SOGL is noted as acceptable and its status will be updated to green in the tool.
13. KORRR: EC will be looking at the legal perspective to provide a legal interpretation regarding the question on the definition and interpretation of “existing/new SGUs” and how they should comply with the respective requirements across the CNC and the SOGL. The question remains open in the Q&A logger (yellow status) and stakeholders are invited to submit further inputs, if they wish, in response to the question; the contributions received will be added to the Q&A logger.
14. ENTSO-E will take into account stakeholder feedback and proposals in the upcoming update on its stakeholder consultation process and the document in early 2018, and will notify stakeholders on how they can contribute further to this process.
15. The 4 questions as raised by VGB and EURELECTRIC will be recorded in the Q&A logger as cross-code issues for SO and GC and will be discussed jointly with the GC ESC and SO ESC in a session at the next meeting.