14th Grid Connection European Stakeholder Committee (GC ESC)

Wednesday, 5 June 2019 from 09:00-15:00

Draft Minutes

Participants			
Uros	GABRIJEL	ACER	Chair
Vincenzo	TROVATO	ACER	GC & SO ESC
Alesa	SLEMENIK	ACER	GC & SO ESC
Marie	WOITHE	ACER	SO ESC
Elaine	O'CONNELL	European Commission	GC & SO ESC/via phone
Marco Savino	PASQUADIBISCEGLIE	ARERA	GC & SO ESC
Thomas	HOELZER	BNetzA	GC & SO ESC
Knud	JOHANSEN	ENTSO-E	SO & GC ESC
Alexander	DUSOLT	ENTSO-E	GC & SO ESC
Ioannis	THEOLOGITIS	ENTSO-E	GC & SO ESC
Pilar	MUNOZ-ELENA	ENTSO-E	SO & GC ESC
Stela	NENOVA	ENTSO-E	GC & SO ESC
Ralph	PFEIFFER	ENTSO-E	GC & SO ESC
Rafal	KUCZYNSKI	ENTSO-E	SO ESC/via phone
Luca	ORTOLANO	ENTSO-E	SO ESC/via phone
Knut	EGGENBERGER	ENTSO-E (CGM Program)	SO ESC/via phone
Jean-Philippe	PAUL	ENTSO-E	SO ESC
Robert	WILSON	ENTSO-E	GC ESC/via phone
Emilie	MILIN	ENTSO-E	GC ESC/via phone
Jean-Christophe	GAULT	Enedis/EDSO for Smart Grids	GC & SO ESC
Marc	MALBRANCKE	CEDEC	GC & SO ESC
Alberto	BRIDI	CEDEC	GC & SO ESC
Thorsten	BUELO	SMA	GC & SO ESC
Adolpho	LOPEZ	EURELECTRIC	SO ESC
Florentien	BENEDICT	CEDEC	GC & SO ESC
Luca	GUENZI	EUTurbines	GC & SO ESC
Ton	GERAERDS	VGB Powertech	GC & SO ESC
Eric	DEKINDEREN	VGB Powertech	GC & SO ESC
Garth	GRAHAM	EURELECTRIC	GC & SO ESC
Pierre	CASTAGNE	EURELECTRIC	GC & SO ESC
Pavla	ERHARTOVA	Europex	GC & SO ESC
Mike	KAY	GEODE	GC & SO ESC/via phone
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

1. Opening

1.1. Review of Agenda

The Chair welcomes the participants to the 14th GC SC session. The agenda is approved with an AOB by Eurelectric on the possibility to use the EG reports to prepare phase one for the future amendment process.

1.2. Review and approval of minutes from previous meeting

The minutes of the 13th GC ESC are approved (available here).

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

Action 1: Issue-logger: ENTSO-E will look into possibility to extract issues pending acknowledgement, circulate with all ESC members via email the table. ESC members have 2 months to send any reservations with the answers provided or remain silent. The June ESC meeting will discuss the issues for follow-up which are kept open; the other issues will be acknowledged by default. The topic is addressed under agenda item 2.
Action 2: National choices on the definition of existing plants as applicable as of 27 April: ACER will share with ENTSO-E for publication on the website the results of the inquiry with NRAs and links to the national decisions. Answer: ENTSO-E has been working on a short survey, in an attempt to clarify which member states have applied the default date of 17/05/2018 and which have defined own deadlines. In collaboration with ACER, the survey results have been complemented and results are shown in the Issue Logger under the title: "2019-03-21GCESC - Existing vs New PGMs - What is/are the date/conditions chosen at a national level for defining existing/new installations?" The survey shows the classification and state of play on national decisions or pending approvals, as per the latest information received by either ENTSO-E and/or ACER. The action is deemed resolved, but the file will be updated whenever new information becomes available.

Action 3: ACER update on implementation monitoring: ACER and ENTSO-E will cross-check the implementation monitoring file and ensure consistency across the findings. ACER and ENTSO-E will merge the information and will show a merged results file for information. Information will then be sent to ENTSO-E to be published in the monitoring file. The topic is addressed under agenda item 3 of the 14th GC ESC meeting. Both ENTSO-E and ACER contributed to the collection of information. Information has been incorporated in the monitoring excel file (e.g. links to national documentation and dates of approval) on the Active Library site here. A separate excel file is also available in the documents of the 14th GC ESC meeting, which covers more the submission dates and approval dates of the national proposals. The action is deemed resolved, but the collection of information remains a regular task under the implementation monitoring obligations of ACER and ENTSO-E.

Action 4: Topics for next EGs: ENTSO-E has circulated the survey regarding future EG topics under the ESC and results are available for further review and discussion under agenda item 7.

2. Review of the Issue Logger

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) provides an overview of the consolidated file including all Issue Logger questions as well as the responses received by ESC members, the state of play on the answers (whether they have been acknowledged or not), and the suggested actions after the meeting (list available here). Some of the questions are outdated as implementation processes have provided replies to them but they will remain in the Issue Logger for wider stakeholder information. On some questions there are various positions on as reflected. **The status in the issue logger will be changed as suggested in the excel after the GC ESC meeting on 5 June.**

Marc Malbrancke (CEDEC) notes it will be beneficial to consider the existing answer in the Issue Logger on the issue of substantial modernization by the EG on the matter (not yet established).

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) explains that the question on substantial modernisation is a general one and was answered by the EC broadly. The EG work can bring more clarity on this topic or replies to some of the questions even if a question is closed. **The mapping will be kept updated to facilitate checking and tracking. The two questions without replies will be checked by ENTSO-E and a reply will be suggested as relevant.**

Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) suggests that for the open question on whether standards could or should be developed with respect to more stringent requirements, a future EG could be tasked to explore the question.

3. Connection Network Codes implementation:

3.1. Update from Technical Group High Penetration

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) provides an update on the state of play of the TG High Penetration (HP) which is developing a report on grid forming capabilities and relevant requirements in future grid/network codes (slides here). The report will be shared with the GC ESC and other interested stakeholders by July 31 for feedback by end August. It will be refined after taking into account the comments received and ENTSO-E approval by end of December. The TG HP work will be presented at the Wind Integration Workshop 2019 in Dublin (16th-18th October).

3.2. Active Library / Monitoring Excel File

3.3. RfG implementation monitoring / Consolidated results from ACER and ENTSO-E

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) provides an update on the monitoring of non-exhaustive requirements and the state of play in various countries as of May (slides here). For the RfG, a number of proposals were submitted for approval and for some, the approval of non-exhaustive parameters is still pending. For the DCC and HVDC, the approval of the final values is advancing with deadlines in September as to the application of these codes. Most up to date and detailed information is available in the excel monitoring file, including the different threshold proposals. The monitoring excel file for tracking the national proposals for the non-exhaustive requirements will have a new layout to make it more user-friendly, including better possibilities to filter information for each country and links to more detailed information from national websites and documentation, as well as approval dates. It is developed in collaboration with ACER and ENTSO-E and will be updated on a regular basis. Stakeholder feedback and suggestions are welcome.

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) provides a summary of the outcomes of the EG's work. The report of the EG on PSH requires still needs to be complemented with variable speed technologies. Specific expert inputs are needed and will be incorporated in the coming weeks. The final report of the EG on storage is almost ready pending fine tuning and finalization of the table of requirements. The final report of the EG on MCS is ready. If there are no further comments during the discussions later in the meeting, ENTSO-E with the help of the EGs will finalize the reports and make them publicly available. The status of the EGs according to the current ToRs can be assumed close to "finalized" and would not hinder the initiation of new EGs.

Luca Guenzi (EUTurbines) inquires if additional information on non-exhaustive requirements could be made available regarding the values as he had difficulties in collecting information for some countries.

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) explains that it is challenging to receive complete information on different countries and the summary of the state of play is important. Further information will be made available in the future regarding non-exhaustive requirements and derogations as it becomes available and as soon as it has been cross-checked. Support of stakeholders for completing the data would be appreciated.

Luca Guenzi (EUTurbines) notes that it would help if the NRAs helped the TSOs provide proper information on time. It would also be helpful if the links in the Active Library would contain website information.

The chair thanks for the proposal to involve NRAs in checking the monitoring file and will raise it with them. Regarding derogations, ACER has established the platform which collected already a number of derogation criteria and is designed to collate derogation decisions in all MSs. The platform allows for filtering but there is not enough practical experience yet. Stakeholders are invited to provide any feedback on whether/how the tool can be improved further.

The Chair inquires if it is the national grid code or national legislation which contains the exhaustive requirements as defined. The prime objective is to receive the information from TSOs and the links on what should be transparent provisions for the implementation. He invites ENTSO-E to encourage the TSOs to provide the information regarding the requirements.

Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) explains that in GB, two national code modifications on RfG and DCC were raised to require all TSOs and DSOs when they specify balance and site-specific requirements to be made available. If there are more than 4 sites, then the information should be publicly available to ensure manufacturers can see it. If stakeholders are not aware of the values agreed, they are unaware of what is being discussed. There should be transparency on that information.

- **Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) invites the ESC members to support this work and provide ENTSO-E with any relevant links and information they wish with respect to the different requirements (site-specific and general application). ENTSO-E will consolidate all information to provide transparency.**

The chair notes that there hasn't been clear delineation of the requirements in the RfG which are site-specific and which are of general application, which is a fundamental question before requiring transparency on that.

Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) explains that in GB, the general and the specific application requirements were identified and there is transparency about those. The requirements of general application need to be approved by the NRA. The site-specific requirements in GB are related to national requirements to publish in the national code so everyone can see the site-specific values.

Ralph Pfeiffer (ENTSO-E) reminds that with respect to the question of which requirements are of general application and which of specific application, ENTSO-E had published an IGD on this (parameters of non-exhaustive requirements). From a DE perspective, on making publicly available the national implementations, it was chosen in Germany the approach by national standards. The link on where to get the standards can be made available. The site-specific requirements are typically agreed bilaterally with plant operators and can't be easily published.

Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) notes that a contractual agreement on site specific requirements is of interest and should be publicly available as information. The publication can be done in an anonymized way to ensure stakeholders are aware of the requirements and make case if they wish to. Art. 7.4 requires that the relevant TSOs submit a proposal by 2 years after EIF. General application items should have been submitted and approved already, while the site-specific ones possibly following later. The values of general application should be published.

The chair clarifies that the referred IGD arguably lacks clarity as one of the NRAs approached ACER upon the concerned TSO disputed the delineation of general and site-specific requirements. **The chair invites ENTSO-E to look at the wording of the IGD on the parameters of non-exhaustive requirements and clear out inconsistencies, especially as related to the general and site-specific applications.**

Stein Ovstebo (IFIEC) welcomes all work done by the EGs, and notes that on MCS it is needed to remove the criteria.

Freddy Alcazar (EUGINE) inquires if the summary tables can include not only the links but also a guideline on what code applies in the countries (as some have various codes). It would be beneficial to have a place with not only what is in the codes but also something further connecting the sites.

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) explains there are different cases and recommendations available in separate files and a list. ENTSO-E can make publicly available further information on the Active Library as received from TSOs and NRAs whenever possible. Stakeholders are invited to support this effort by providing further information if they are aware.

3.3. ACER report on RfG

Vincenzo Trovato (ACER) provides an update on the ACER findings regarding the RfG implementation monitoring (slides here). A questionnaire regarding certification and verification programs was shared with all NRAs in January 2019. Twenty one MSs responded and some additional clarifications were needed on the application of rules applying to new PGMs and derogations, on authorised certifiers issuing equipment certificates (and possible alternatives), and on certification and validation programs. ACER invited EFAC representative Bernhard Schowe-von der Brelie (EFAC) to a meeting with NRAs to provide more insights concerning the verification and certification programs (6th June). In addition, some potential risks were identified and mitigation actions need to be proposed with respect to the PGMs connecting after the RfG EIF, most notably regarding issues raised by stakeholders in their letter to the EC and ACER of 14 March 2019 and at previous GC ESC meeting regarding the the lack or late approval of non-exhausting requirements and of verification and certification programs, among others. Therefore, ACER prepared a note recommending NRAs to look into the RfG implementation issues and to adopt relevant mitigation actions. More specifically, each NRA is suggested to act, as per Article 4(2) of the RfG, within given powers concerning the determination of *existing* vs *new* PGMs, and explore, as per Art. 60 of the RfG, the possibility of granting PGF owners and/or relevant SOs time-limited or indefinite derogations from one or more provisions listed in the RfG. In particular, ACER recommends NRAs to communicate the identified issues via the ACER Task Force, coordinate at this level the mitigation actions, e.g. aiming at harmonised solutions when evaluating the types and duration of derogation.

Elaine O'Connell (European Commission) explains that the EC has received the letter with stakeholder concerns regarding national RfG implementation and recognizes the timing gap in the legislation which had been discussed by Member States before they voted in comitology (slides here). ACER worked with Regulators last year on mitigation actions. As a result, the majority adopted a common approach whereby PGMs connected before 27th April 2019 are subject to old requirements. It should be recognized that not all MS NRAs are the ones responsible as there are different processes in different MS. The stakeholder letter requested that the EC amends the RfG. The EC view is that this would not be a practical approach to solve the issues as legislative measures take time to be proposed, consulted on, voted on and enter into force. The EC recommendation is that ACER's proactive actions will provide the fastest possibility to address the issues. The EC will support ACER where possible. There is an annual priority list for the NCs and amendments and nothing is foreseen on this issue any time soon. The ESCs offer a forum to follow-up on this work and the next steps.

- **The chair concludes that ACER continues to engage on the topic with NRAs. EFAC has been invited to elaborate on the issues at stake to the ACER Task Force and to raise awareness.** He reminds that not all NRAs are the bodies approving the non-exhaustive requirements at the MS level.

Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) notes that for CNC the equipment certificates are important: once they are available, there is no need for compliance testing. NRAs should be mindful if one MS has or does the compliance, as then this becomes applicable across the EU if issued by one MS. This is very useful and would save money for stakeholders as they don't have to test again the aspects they have already tested.

Luca Guenzi (EUTurbines) agrees that it is important to know the compliance procedures across MS to achieve harmonization of certificates and inquires if more information could be shared on the outcomes of the meeting with the ACER TF on the topic.

- **The chair notes that stakeholders will be made aware either by the respective NRAs or national stakeholders, and ACER will follow up on the outcomes of the ACER Task Force meeting in the next GC ESC meeting.**

4. Report from the GC ESC Expert Groups
- Presentation of final results from PSH and STORAGE; Acknowledgement and publication

Ralph Pfeiffer (ENTSO-E) presents the final results of the work of the EG PSH and the recommendations of the final report developed by the EG (slides here). The EG worked with a table of RfG requirements that was created to assess better the capabilities of the different technologies. This table is part of the deliverables of the EG. The EG analyzed different technologies, including fixed speed pump turbine, single shaft ternary, variable speed pump turbine (doubly-fed induction machine); variable speed pump turbine (full converter), and assessed all the technologies in 3 operating modes (generation mode, pump mode, and synchronous compensation mode). The requirements that all technologies in all operating modes were assessed against include frequency, voltage, system restoration & system robustness requirements, and instrumentation and protection. The objective of the EG PSH report is to document clearly the specific characteristics or constraints of PSH power generating modules for each operating mode and the consequences on connection requirements. The report further explains in more detail the table of requirements and provides some recommendations as well as observations that are considered to be relevant for amending NC RfG when it comes to capabilities and limitations of the PSH technologies when applying the current NC.

The ESC welcomes the work done by the EG PSH and the report and the chair thanks all the experts for the work.

Emilie Milin (ENTSO-E) explains the outcomes of the work of the EG on storage and the final report produced with recommendations on storage (slides available here). The report covers the status regarding RfG requirements and other relevant requirements, details how co-located sites are treated (with examples), some experiences from Member States, references to applicable standards, compliance and to the work of the EG on mixed customer sites. The report does not provide a recommendation on whether storage devices should be covered by amending the existing codes or drafting a dedicated new code.

The ESC welcomes the work done by the EG Storage and the report and the chair thanks all the experts for the work delivered.

5. Report from the GC ESC Expert Groups
- Presentation of final results from MCS; Acknowledgement and publication

Robert Wilson (ENTSO-E) presents the outcomes of the work of the EG MCS (slides here) and the report prepared by the EG. A number of different options have been considered and evaluated regarding their advantages and disadvantages, including defining an additional 'interface point' to determine all connection requirements (except fault ride through); defining an additional 'interface point' just to determine the connection voltage and therefore type, increasing voltage criteria to be >220kV; removing voltage criteria from type A generators (so determined by capacity only); removing voltage criteria from type A & B generators; removing voltage criteria completely so for all of types A-B-C; Removing voltage criteria from type A, partial removal of increased RfG requirements for type B generators (on capacity) where defaulted up to type D on connection voltage. An open question remains the exclusion of CHP in the RfG.

Several preferred solutions have been identified and proposed, taking into account the different views and red lines of various parties with respect to preferences: i.e. removal of voltage criteria (for all of types A-C), removal of voltage criteria for A & B, or an interface point. The different solutions however require further specific considerations in code drafting with different implications, should they be considered as a way forward.

The ESC welcomes the work of the EG MCS. The Chair thanks all for delivering the results and will bring these results to the upcoming NRA TF meeting as well.

6. Survey and preparation for new Expert Groups

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) explains the outcomes of the survey on topics for EGs as carried out in 2018, and notes that more topics may still emerge (see excel list here and slides). Some of the key topics so far include type A PGM baseline; criteria for significant modernization; simultaneous voltage & frequency deviations (topic also listed in the Issue Logger). ESC members had time to review the topics and provided feedback on the proposals. Further time was requested until September's GC ESC meeting to propose possible new topics. The DSOs provided additional specific feedback on the topics.

Regarding the EG items, Elaine O'Connell (European Commission) thanks for the hard work and notes it is a very good basis on reflections on potential future amendments. She recommends that it is important to consider for future EG work the longer-term perspective and impact. The distribution level will be key with respect to large quantities of renewables by 2030. It would beneficial to have further reflections on the long-term incentives and impacts on the existing installations when developing proposals for future amendments.

The chair thanks for emphasizing the importance of input on potential impact assessment which is fundamental to preparatory phase I. This is helpful in terms of showing how the various options are taken and considered.

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) notes that the example of the MCS, in the report it is more obvious that there is a qualitative impact assessment as it shows also for which items the impact is and gives some good indications.

Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) notes that if there were to be criteria for significant modernization for DCC, they would have to apply to existing facilities.

Eric Dekinderen (VGB Powertech) inquires why the DSOs need to be further involved in criteria for significant modernization if in the RfG the significant modification is only for C and D, and those are connected to the TSO system, and harmonization is not the purpose of the EU NCs.

Marc Malbrancke (CEDEC) explains that there are lots of DSOs who have type C generators connected to their grid. The DSO/TSO interface and significant modification link is that there are lots of MS agreements on DSO/TSO on how they will work on this and defining what significant modification is at the connection point but not to be treated in the same way as a generator connecting to the grid/installation. There are lots of questions open also regarding the definitions.

Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) notes that in the area of substantial significant modernization, the same for all codes so criteria that apply should be covered by all that use this process. If a piece of equipment is changed, then the criteria would have to be applied if a DSO replaces something at their site. Attention should be paid to retain the level playing field between generators and load connected to the grid.

Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) explains that Article 4.1 of the DCC requires existing DSOs and TSOs be treated in the same way and the NRA is to define and approve that. If significant modification criteria are looked at, the NRA will decide which parts will apply to the connection, and it is not sure if a different arrangement can be applied depending on what is modified. If a transformer is replaced by an HVDC operator, that transformer wouldn't go through or need to be compliant but the generator that does this would have to go through the HVDC procedure and the NRA for approval. Questions like these would be useful to explore.

The chair notes that ACER has been bringing to the NRAs attention questions regarding significant modification criteria and NRA approval (example of DCC art. 4.1).

Gath reminds to be mindful of the 2030 targets and upcoming ECBC meetings. It could be good if EGs could identify possible changes to the codes, see if any items can be brought forward to the ECBC.

IFIEC supports the idea for September for EG topics' decision and highlights the importance of the topic on significant modifications.

Eric Dekinderen (VGB Powertech) notes that for type B generators, this is not defined in the code and it could be useful to have a look at type B baseline.

Marco Savino Pasquadibisceglie (ARERA) inquires about the scope of modernization – for RfG this is related to a CBA and solved at national level. What is in this item – general criteria to provide modernization?

The chair clarifies that this refers to a case where a type B generator wanting to increase its capacity without going through a CBA.

Ralph Pfeiffer (ENTSO-E) supports the proposal to decide in September on topics for next EGs and supports what the idea to be mindful on which EGs will be established in light of the updates from the EC, as the EG work can feed into the amendments but the possibility for amendments will not open very frequently. Given energy policy objectives and targets, a conscious decision and consideration is necessary whether the EGs work would be relevant for possible amendments, for example the type A baseline would be relevant in this context, whereas an EGs on simultaneous voltage and frequency deviations would not address an issue of possible amendments.

- The chair concludes that the ESC has to reassess and adjust the original aim of the existing EGs in order to use efficiently the input to that amendment process. Some additional tasks depending on the EGs results need to be conducted. For example, the existing EGs shall additionally be tasked to fill in the missing information and necessary details to prepare for amendment proposals according to the process provided by the EC presentation so as to feed into the preparatory phase I in line with the timeline of the EC.

Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) supports the idea of keeping EGs working and making use of their expertise as relevant.

Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) notes there is a process where we would be encouraged to go to phase I; now we need to develop understanding on the details.

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) notes that in September, there will be better understanding also on ENTSO-E side as to the resources needed for the EGs.

As to the scope for the new EGs, the chair notes that there should be a discussion on what is missing, and stakeholders can already start thinking of the deliverables and their own contributions as well as resources that can be dedicated. Priorities for the new EGs will be decided upon considering the poll results.

The chair explains some lessons and experiences from the NC development process – the EC, when laying out new legislative proposals or amendments, needs to prepare an impact assessment, which is a document that has a prescribed scope based on an EC guideline on how to draft an impact assessment. This type of impact assessment document was submitted to MSs for the existing NCs. The aim here is to address incremental changes (revisions or add-ons, not full legislative proposals). Any proposals for amendments need be justified, but if extensive, may also need to comply with the format as prescribed in this guideline, e.g. baseline (do nothing); assessment of different policy options depending on proportionality & other principles (if the issue can be solved nationally or at European level) and effects of a policy, assess pros/cons; and finally decision on a preferred policy option.

The Chair concludes that all three existing EGs will have to assess the stage of their current work and necessity for a compliance with the impact assessment guidelines and in turn provide the necessary information. Unless the EC takes its own initiative on these topics, the amendment procedure is initiated through ACER that might to choose to bundle the proposals; ACER shall perform a public consultation, assess stakeholders' input and propose the amendments to the EC. The EC can take the amendment proposals or can further change and put on the table their own amendment proposals.

The chair advises against putting the task of drafting the impact assessment (IA) into a general ToR of all EGs as some of them may be tasked with mere justifications or clarifications of certain aspects.

Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) notes there are two stages: first is do the work, then give the instruction for the 2nd stage. EGs can identify different ways of addressing a topic.

Emilie Milin (ENTSO-E) notes that the EG work on storage focused only on grid connection aspects and regarding the impact assessment of proposing an amendment, there is no overall view of other codes and European regulations, so it is not sure the EG will be able to prepare a global IA on this topic.

Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) notes that there might be a need for a new set of skills and members of EGs depending on the topic, so the second part of the EG life would be different, and they should be adaptable.

Ralph Pfeiffer (ENTSO-E) notes that regarding the proposal for adding tasks of IA to the existing EGs, the outcomes may not proceed further for some of them. The IA comes at a later stage of the process – grouping amendments to ensure proper assessment of proposals' impact on the whole guideline and to be able to assess the entire set of amendments as opposed to the perspective of a single requirement. The Agency will assess the impact of the proposed amendments in the end.

Due to the complex nature of the CNCs, the chair notes that in case of underdeveloped proposals ACER will eventually be required to request the EG to elaborate the impact of proposed amendments.

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) notes that current EGs don't have the expertise needed to cover the cross-code impacts and some other potential aspects unless other ESCs would be mobilized.

Treatment of EGs and existing expertise: the chair notes that once the EG work has fulfilled the respective ToRs objectives, possibly new EGs can be developed with same title but different scope. Some time may be granted for chairs and members to decide on whether to continue their work under the new scope of the EG. ToRs shall be revised to formalize the new scope.

- The chair concludes that the ToRs of the existing EGs will be updated, and also a call for renewal of membership to the existing EGs shall be issued. A timeline for this will be established before the next meeting, and an electronic procedure for comments will be used.
- ACER, ENTSO-E and EC will sit together and put the necessary elements that are needed when revising the existing ToRs. The proposals will be circulated for comments to the ESC preferably before next meeting so that work of the EGs can be started as soon as possible.
- In parallel, ENTSO-E will collect proposals for new topics and in turn run a new poll (during August) on the priorities for new EGs. To this end, ESC members should send their proposals till end of July for new EG topics. The results of the poll will be discussed in the next GC ESC meeting.
- ACER will bring the EG reports to the NRA attention and discuss in the TF meeting as to what extent and when NRAs would want to be involved in any relevant work for the inputs to the preparatory phase I for amendments. In order to have a preparatory phase I delivered to best possible maturity, it would be useful to have NRA input at hand.

7. AOB

The September ESCs ACER and EC will try to merge SO and GC meetings in one day if the number of topics allows for this. An agenda will be proposed by end July to confirm if the 2 days foreseen for the meetings (Sept 11 and 12) will be used both.

8. Follow-up actions:

1. Action from 13th GC ESC: National choices on the definition of existing plants as applicable as of 27 April: In collaboration with ACER, the survey results have been complemented and results are shown in the Issue Logger under the title: "2019-03-21GCESC - Existing vs New PGMs - What is/are the date/conditions chosen at a national level for defining existing/new installations?" The action is deemed resolved but the file will be updated whenever new information becomes available.
2. Issue logger: The status in the issue logger will be changed as suggested in the excel after the GC ESC meeting on 5 June. The two questions without replies will be checked by ENTSO-E and a reply will be suggested as relevant.
3. RfG implementation: The chair will involve NRAs in checking the monitoring file and will raise it with them. Stakeholders are invited to provide any feedback on whether/how the ACER tool for derogations can be improved further.
4. ENTSO-E is encouraged to invite the TSOs to provide the information/links related to the requirements (site-specific and of general application). ESC members can support this work and provide to ENTSO-E any relevant links and information they might wish to with respect to the different requirements. ENTSO-E will consolidate all information to provide transparency.
5. ENTSO-E is invited to look at the wording of the IGD on the parameters of non-exhaustive requirements and clear out inconsistencies, especially as related to the general and site-specific applications.
6. RfG monitoring: ACER will continue to engage on the topic with NRAs and will follow-up on the outcomes of the ACER Task Force meeting in the next GC ESC meeting.
7. The ToRs of the existing EGs will be updated, and also a call for renewal of membership to the existing EGs shall be issued. A timeline for this will be established before the next meeting, and an electronic procedure for comments will be used. ACER, ENTSO-E and EC will sit together and put the necessary elements that are needed when revising the existing ToRs. The proposals will be circulated for comments to the ESC preferably before next meeting so that work of the EGs can be started as soon as possible.
8. ENTSO-E will collect proposals for new topics and in turn run a new poll (during August) on the priorities for new EGs. ESC members should send their proposals till end of July for new EG topics. The results of the poll will be discussed in the next GC ESC meeting.
9. ACER will bring the EG reports to the NRA attention and discuss in the TF meeting as to what extent and when NRAs would want to be involved in any relevant work for the inputs to the preparatory phase I for amendments.
10. For the September ESCs, ACER and ENTSO-E will try to merge SO and GC meetings in one day if the number of topics allows for this.