

9th System Operation European Stakeholder Committee (SO ESC) and Joint SO-GC ESC

Tuesday, 4 June 2019 from 13:00-16:00
ACER, Ljubljana

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

9th System Operation ESC meeting (SO ESC)

4 June from 13:00-15:00

ACER, Trg Republike 3, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

1. Opening

1.1. Review of the agenda

The Chair, Uros Gabrijel (ACER), welcomes the participants to the 9th SO ESC meeting. The draft agenda is approved.

1.2. Review and approval of minutes from previous meeting

The minutes of the previous 8th SO ESC meeting are approved (available [here](#)).

1.3. Follow-up actions from previous meeting (available [here](#))

1. Action 1: The answers to the questions raised by VGB at the 4th SO ESC meeting regarding interpretation of certain articles in the SO GLs and NCs will be made available on the ENTSO-E website once finalized. Answer: Further explanations were provided in a physical meeting on 16 May 2019; further discussed in point 4 of the agenda.

Action 2: SOGL: ENTSO-E is invited to provide visibility regarding the numbers and the approaches taken regarding the implementation of the LFC block operational agreements and reserve sizing, for example regarding the probabilistic approaches applied in different areas and how those compare to each other. Answer: ENTSO-E will endeavour to collect the data during 2019, after the approval of LFC block operational agreements and upon clarifying the exact scope of the request with ACER.

Action 3: ER: ENTSO-E will consider if there is a possibility to organize a workshop for further discussion on aspects to allow NEMOs and other stakeholders to inform the discussions on the ENTSO-E guidance and the development of the rules for suspension and restoration of market activities. Answer: a stakeholder workshop on NC ER implementation took place on 7 May in ENTSO-E premises, and many stakeholders were represented. Further information under agenda item 3. All the information for the workshop can be found on [ENTSO-E website](#).

Action 4: ENTSO-E should collect information regarding SOGL and NC ER implementation and ensure transparency through the Active Library and the monitoring file. Answer: Active library will be extended to allow TSOs to cover also the implementation of SO GL and NC ER, ENTSO-E will further report on this in the second half of 2019. The focus is now on pan-European and regional implementation as national requirements in SO GL in many cases represent the status quo. Relevant TCMs regarding defence and restoration providers as per the ER NC can be made available through the ENTSO-E website, once the NRA decisions have been issued, provided that there are no confidentiality issues. ENTSO-E further is invited to assist the TSOs to provide this information to help visibility vis-à-vis the ESCs. Stakeholders would like to have the opportunity to look at the TCMs and raise any points they consider important.

Action 5: Regional coordination proposals (per CCR): ENTSO-E will look into the feasibility for organizing a stakeholder workshop on the regional coordination topic. Answer: CCR believe discussion with NRAs of the different CCRs will be valuable to share views on expected approaches in the different CCRs. A workshop with the TSOs and NRAs will be organized, and the output will be considered where relevant in the proposal elaborated by each CCR for public consultation.

Action 6: ENTSO-E to confirm which data will be required from stakeholders for the purpose of the CBA (the question will be recorded in the Issue Logger and the list of data will be provided there when available). The answer is provided under agenda topic 3.

2. SOGL:

2.1. Status of SO GL deliverables and planning for 2019

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) provides an update on the state of play of SOGL implementation (slides [here](#)). The KORRR has been approved. ACER is expected to provide a final version of the CSAM by mid-June. Preparations are ongoing with respect to ensuring publication of relevant information according to SO GL articles 183-190.

The Chair clarifies that ACER plans to send on 4 June all relevant documents to the Board of Regulators opinion for both methodologies (CSAM and RAOCM). Assuming a favourable opinion, the decisions will be published (published 21 June [here](#)) and sent to TSOs by the deadline of 21 June. The changes expected go mainly along the lines of the issues which were consulted with stakeholders. A key change is on the harmonization of treatment of remedial actions: changes to the CSAM make no distinction between impacting remedial actions and cross-border remedial actions so taken as same in the optimization function and ensuring the efficiency as required by the SOGL.

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) reminds that on the outage planning coordination methodology, the TSOs made a unique pan-EU proposal. ACER was given the final decision for consistency with CSAM so they will publish the final version with minor changes (published on 21 June [here](#)).

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) explains the state of play on regional deliverables. The SAOA between TSOs are undergoing NRA approvals between April and August 2019. 1 month after the approval the agreements will be signed and entry into force is 3 months after the approval. The CE SAOA has been approved.

On minimum inertia, the required studies per synchronous area are to be provided in September 2019. Between October 2019 and March 2020, methodologies for definition of minimum inertia will be developed where relevant.

A stakeholder workshop was organized on 15 May 2019 on the topic. All the information is available on [ENTSO-E website](#).

CBA LER: the CBA results suggesting the minimum activation period for FCR are expected in April 2020, based on the approval of the CBA methodology in March 2019.

Regional coordination proposals (per CCR) are due 3 months after approval of CSAM. Due to the handling of changes introduced by ACER, 3 months of extension has been agreed informally with the EC for the submission of proposals to NRAs (by December 2019), and ENTSO-E will send a letter to EC to formalize it.

2.2. FCR provision by LERs

Luca Ortolano (ENTSO-E) provides an overview on the state of play of the requirements for FCR provision by limited energy reservoirs (LERs) and the methodology for cost-benefit analysis for minimum FCR activation period (slides [here](#)).

The CE and Nordic NRAs have approved the amended methodology. ENTSO-E already started the implementation process. Data will be collected from the TSOs and all inputs will be then shared with the ESC in a dedicated session. A project timeline will be shared with the ESC once defined. The results are expected by April 2020.

As to the project timeline, the chair emphasizes the importance of ensuring enough opportunities for stakeholders to provide necessary feedback/input.

Pierre Castagne (EURELECTRIC) thanks for the opportunity to contribute.

2.3. CGM-related methodologies/Feedback System Operation Coordination Group

On behalf of the Convenor of the drafting team, César Clause, Knut Eggenberger (ENTSO-E) explains that the original plan to seek formal approval of the consolidated versions of the CGM-related methodologies (i.e. CGMM and GLDPM) during the year 2019 has been revised upon a suggestion from the NRAs (slides [here](#)). The NRAs have suggested that the regulatory approval of the consolidated CGM-related methodologies be put on hold until the CGM process comes closer to becoming operational. With respect to the week-ahead time frame, NRAs have indicated that they prefer to check that this material is not subject to regulatory approval.

The drafting team has accepted the suggestion and postponed the request for regulatory approval but continues to work on consolidating the CGM-related methodologies, including the extension to the week-ahead timeframe, with a view to reducing uncertainties and risks related to the regulatory approval process. Informal discussions with NRAs will help resolve any outstanding open issues to ensure that the contents of the methodologies - as currently approved - are not modified and that questions related to the methodologies are resolved before formal procedures start. Stakeholders will be kept up to date through the ESCs. The agenda for the next SO ESC in September 2019 meeting can foresee a more substantive presentation on the consolidated CGM-related methodologies.

2.4. Dynamic stability assessment and minimum inertia studies – Stakeholder Workshop feedback 15th May

Knud Johansen (ENTSO-E) provides an overview on the state of play of the dynamic stability monitoring, assessment and management obligations as per SOGL Articles 38 and 39 and relevant ENTSO-E activities (slides [here](#)). A third stakeholder workshop took place on 15 May and presented the coordination activities on DSA (as per Article 38(2)) in each synchronous area (SA). SO ESC stakeholders will be kept informed of the progress of the activities. The responses to some pending questions from the Dynamic Stability Assessment (DSA) workshops with stakeholders, will be shared through the SO ESC the coming meetings and the ENTSO-E website as relevant. In addition, monitoring of the inertia in each Synchronous Area (SA) will be reported to the SO ESC where possible. It was evident from the discussions and presentations at the 3rd DSA stakeholder workshop that a single number for inertia is not representative for the stability of the grid in the SA as observation of angle stability and small signal stability has a significant influence on grid stability as well.

As per Article 39.3 of the SOGL, all TSOs of a synchronous area shall conduct a common study to identify whether a minimum required inertia needs to be established, taking into account costs and benefits and potential alternatives. If this study determines that a minimum inertia requirement is needed, the TSOs shall develop a methodology on how to determine a minimum required inertia. For RG CE and RG Nordic, the system inertia challenge is only relevant in case of a system split, which is addressed in the NC ER (during emergency and system restoration system states). It is not in the scope to follow how the minimum inertia changes. Current studies show that defining a minimum inertia level is not required for normal and alert operation in either RG CE or RG Nordic. In the RG Nordic, the Nordic Operation Information System includes functionality to monitor inertia in real time. For minimum inertia (MI) as per Article 39(3)(a), all ENTSO-E Regional Groups are working to deliver the outcomes of their studies and projects (RG CE and RG Nordic) to be compliant with the requirements in SO GL. SA RG GB and RG IE/NI are already compliant with the SO GL requirements. The results for RG Nordic and RG CE are planned to be available September 2019.

Knud Johansen (ENTSO-E) explains the RG CE, Nordic, IE/NI & GB approaches on DSA (as per Article 38.2 SOGL). In RG CE, 32 TSO in 28 countries each develop an individual DSA concept for their control area and involve neighbouring TSOs if necessary. System design settings are based on a single-bus model, which allows for an analysis of multiple scenarios. The TSOs are working on improving the nodal dynamic model with more details on generating technologies and other key aspects.

For the RG Nordics, the DSA is already a part of the transmission capacity calculation and operational planning and off-line studies are implemented. A coordinated methodology will gradually be introduced and included in Nordic Synchronous Area Operational Agreement and in the future, a close to real-time DSA will be implemented, based on the CGM dynamic models.

Ireland/Northern Ireland RG already have their DSA and a Wind Dynamic Security Assessment Tool (WSAT) performs dynamic stability assessments on an all-Island basis. The requirements for performing studies and TSO co-ordination have been fulfilled and NRAs have been. RG GB uses a number of programs for offline studies from long term to day ahead and online studies to determine post-fault transient and dynamic stability issues in real time. The GB TSO does not currently coordinate DSA studies with other TSOs.

The chair notes that regarding the RG CE study on minimum inertia, requirements on minimum inertia have to be discussed as part of the system defence plan according to the requirements in the NC ER. The RSCs will have to produce a technical report on consistency of the measures concerning defence and restoration plans. He wonders how the coordination with the RSCs will take place.

Rafal Kuczynski (ENTSO-E) explains that this point is not yet taken into account but the analysis will be made as a next step in the future when the RSCs are established.

The chair notes that Article 6.3 of NC ER obligation is a one-off task. If studies are yet to give hints on what needs to be done next, then he wonders whether the RSCs should not be asked in addition to do reports on the minimum inertia and islanding. Regarding the 10-20 years ahead timeframe, the chair wonders if it could be expected to have a roadmap on how to come to this point regarding overall inertia need in RG CE in a consistent manner, considering existing legislation at hand and looking forward regarding future legislative changes. As security of supply is a key principle – even without concrete articles – it can be expected from TSOs to prepare a roadmap for a discussion in this forum. He asks if ENTSO-E is preparing such a plan or if it could provide a feedback at the next SO ESC meeting.

Knud Johansen (ENTSO-E) explains that ENTSO-E is working on this issue and looking into developing a coherent view with both long-term TYNDP scenarios up to real-time system operation.

The chair notes that it would be of most interest to understand better the dynamic stability aspects after a system split. If it is not known what can happen after a system split, especially if the system consists of lots of small islands with different generators, and if there are some islands in RG CE at this same moment, additional services like fast frequency reserves could be needed (like in UK and IRE). This has to be looked at from RG CE perspective but currently arguments regarding this are not available.

The SO ESC looks forward to the outcome of the studies.

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) explains that the normal state of operation of Ireland is not the same as in the case of emergency state in CE. The loss of generation can happen and damage the stability of the island. A direct comparison between CE and IRE would be misleading.

Eric Dekinderen (VGB Powertech) inquires if for example Spain and Portugal get disconnected from Europe, is the time constant large enough to allow the large frequency containment reserves to get the system back to 50Hz?

Ralph Pfeiffer (ENTSO-E) explains that ENTSO-E will try to get more clarity on this as part of the work with respect to getting possible system splits and types of situations to which the system could be exposed, and to get the understanding of what is manageable and what not.

3. Update on NC ER implementation

3.1 Feedback on Stakeholder workshop on 7 May 2019 (1)

Rafal Kuczynski (ENTSO-E) provides an update on the stakeholder workshop which took place on 7 May (slides [here](#)). More than 40 participants joined and the feedback has been positive regarding technical aspects. Market-related topics of the NC ER will be dealt with under the MESC. Key topics presented during workshop include the Telecommunication Guidance and guidance on Critical Tools and Facilities, the Active Library for NC ER implementation, which will also include the NRA approvals, RSC activities for NC ER, triggers (Article 36(4)) and suspended activities, and settlement in case of suspension of market activities. All presentations from the workshop are available on the [ENTSO-E website](#). The RSCs are not yet formally established as per Article 77 of SOGL but EU TSOs are expected to provide the information to support this process. By the end of the year, each (future formal) RSC will provide this report. The proposals regarding the settlement in case of suspension of market activities are as an example –collected for an overview. Based on these, it will be checked if there is further room for improvement or possibilities to find a common position.

Marco Savino Pasquadibisceglie (ARERA) explains that the criteria to trigger market suspension are a national proposal. Each TSO is to provide this proposal for each MS at national level where the relevant decision authority approves the proposals in each MS. For this kind of activities, in most of the cases, the decision authority is the same as the NRA but in some cases the decision is directly delegated to the MS. In MESC, the idea is to find a common understanding on how the market can be suspended in case of emergency and restoration activities, and how settlement is delivered to avoid free-riding and make restoration as quick as possible.

Stein Ovstebo (IFIEC) underlines that it is important to develop rules regarding this aspect and to coordinate the rules and plans with neighbouring MS.

4. VGB and ENTSO-E Follow up on VGB questions

Eric Dekinderen (VGB Powertech) explains that VGB raised many questions back in December 2018, and a dedicated meeting with ENTSO-E and ACER took place on 16 May to discuss the open questions (slides [here](#)).

Jean-Philippe Paul (ENTSO-E) explains ENTSO-E is working on finalizing the formulation of some remaining answers after some further cross-check of the content and the answers will be made available through the appropriate means.

- **The Chair explains that, as agreed at the previous SO ESC meeting, the answers will be separated and if some are of wider benefit, they will be published in whatever form agreed and a follow-up discussion can take place in the September SO ESC meeting.**

5. AOB & meeting dates in 2019

Concerning the publications on the existing ESC platform, the Chair encourages,

- **ENTSO-E to foster TSOs to submit the relevant TCMs (publicly available information) in accordance with Article 4(2) of the NC ER to the ESC platform (Active Library or Issue Logger), if possible ahead of the next SO ESC meeting.**

Marco Savino Pasquadibisceglie (ARERA) explains that there are some confidential issues in the defence and restoration plans and their publication may be limited to the public parts only. The language of the documents is the national language as there is no obligation to provide this information in English. Analysis of inconsistencies between the plans is one of the tasks for the RSCs. RSCs will be formally established as per the proposal for Article 76, due by December 2019. Currently only coordination between TSOs is under progress, without the formal RSC umbrella.

Meeting dates in 2019

The dates for 2019 are approved as suggested.

GC ESC	SO ESC
12 September, ACER*	11 September, ACER*

12 December, Brussels	13 December, Brussels
-----------------------	-----------------------

6. Follow-up actions:

1. NC ER: Relevant TCMs regarding defence and restoration providers as per the ER NC can be made available through the ENTSO-E website, once the NRA decisions have been issued, provided that there are no confidentiality issues. ENTSO-E further is invited to encourage the TSOs to provide this information for publication to the ESC platform (through Active Library or the Issue Logger) to help visibility vis-à-vis the ESCs, if possible ahead of the next SO ESC meeting. Stakeholders would like to have the opportunity to look at the TCMs and raise any points they consider important for the next SO ESC.
2. The agenda for the next SO ESC in September 2019 meeting will foresee a more substantive presentation on the consolidated CGM-related methodologies.
3. The ENTSO-E answers to the VGB questions, which are of wider benefit, will be published in the appropriate platform and a follow-up discussion can be done if needed in the September SO ESC meeting.

Joint SO-GC ESC session

4 June 2019, 15:00-16:15

1. Opening

1.1. Review of the agenda

The Chair welcomes the participants to the Joint SO-GC ESC session. The agenda is approved with a short AOB on ENTSO-E updates.

1.2. Review and approval of minutes from previous meeting

The minutes of the previous joint SO-GC ESC session of December 2018 are approved (available [here](#)).

1.3. Follow-up actions from previous meeting (slides [here](#))

1. Action 1: All stakeholders who wish to provide preliminary feedback for the update of the Consultation policy document are invited to submit suggestions through the ENTSO-E annual stakeholder survey in January 2019, or to send directly their proposals to ENTSO-E. Any stakeholder suggestions received through the survey will be taken into account in the upcoming update of the document.
2. Action 2: ENTSO-E will look into the possibility to link the different languages of the NCs/GLs in the app as well as into further possibilities for enhancing the functionalities of the app to reflect the proposals received where feasible. ENTSO-E is looking into possible enhancements.
3. Action 3: The topic of the update on the defence and restoration plans by ENTSO-E will be considered for the joint SO-GC ESC session in March. March ESC, that can be a joint topic for discussion. The action is ongoing.
4. Action 4: ENTSO-E will take the suggestion to collect historical data of inertia where possible already from 2018 and will report in the December ESC the feasibility. Answer: The issue has been discussed and answered in the last DSA stakeholder workshop on 15 May. More information is available [here](#) (slide 17).
5. Action 5: ENTSO-E will look into gathering the information regarding countermeasures considered by TSOs in the system defence plans. Follow-up: The exercise will start in the new year following submission of the defence plans once it is clear what is required.

2. NC High-Level Implementation Group - Informal guidance for the preparatory phases of the network code and guidelines amendment process

Elaine O'Connell (European Commission) explains the key principles in the informal guidance for the preparatory phases of NC and GL amendment process which should provide a consistent view ahead (slides [here](#)). It builds upon the ACER 2013 guidance document. The process proposed respects roles and responsibilities of the parties as set out in the legislation in order to ensure legitimacy and accountability. The amendment process should not necessarily replicate the formal development process but transparency and public consultations will be ensured as relevant throughout the steps. To the appropriate extent, the preparatory stages should apply to both NCs and GLs. The process should be as simple as possible to avoid unnecessary delays. Priority and urgency can be reviewed at any stage by the EC. Regular reporting will be done in the NC IMG to track progress and avoid bottlenecks.

The preparatory phase foresees a discussion on NCs/GLs implementation and possible amendment proposals at various fora (ex. ESCs for electricity or FUNC for gas). Information exchange between the EC, ACER and the ENTSOs as well as NC IMG will be ensured. In a second phase, ACER at its own initiative or any interested persons as a result of phase 1 can submit to ACER proposals for amendments, or the EC at its own initiative can propose amendments. Transparency is ensured either through registering the amendments through ACER register or the EC will consult and as appropriate and if deemed justified, ask ACER for an assessment and to register the proposals. In a next step, ACER consults publicly on the proposals and assesses the amendments and provides potential reasoned proposals to the EC. The EC then ensures the formal amendment process and adoption through Comitology. The EC may still ask technical support and expertise of ACER and the ENTSOs but formally it is the only responsible party to present a proposal and launch a process for an amendment which then goes through ECBC. The formal legislative stage might be different for different types of proposals in the future (depending on where they are delegated acts or implementing acts).

ACER will review proposals on a flexible basis. It is expected that amendments will be grouped where useful and appropriate. The guidance can be found on the ENTSO-E and EC websites here.

As the CEP has concluded, the EC is looking into what changes might be needed to make NCs/GLs consistent between regulations and with the CEP. The priority will be amending CACM (with respect to capacity calculation thresholds) and SOGL (with respect to RCCs) to reflect the new requirements. The EC will be looking at limited and targeted changes only or if there are essential elements to mirror the CEP outcomes.

Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) notes that it would be helpful to consider what the ESC has already looked at with the EGs on storage and the recommendations that the EGs are working on. It would be good to understand if this work could feed into the EC work on future amendments and if yes, in what part of the process as presented by the EC would this work fit into.

Elaine O'Connell (European Commission) explains that the ESCs are key to provide input to the work. Regarding the storage topic, many things have changed since 2011. Depending on the EG output, and on whether the EGs have considered changes with respect to achieving the objectives of the RfG, some of the work can provide input. If there are proposals to make amendments, it is best to get them grouped as it is difficult to get the ECBC together. The next ECBC, whenever it is to take place, will need to focus as a priority on CACM/SOGL to ensure mirroring of the Electricity Regulation, so possibly there will not be time for other amendment topics.

The chair notes that it would be useful to know when and what type of input the EC would welcome on the two priorities by the ESCs. Elaine O'Connell (European Commission) will get back to the ESC with further information on this topic. She clarifies that each amendment presented will be considered on its own merit, even if all are presented to MS in a group. The discussions are article by article and a case by case.

The chair notes that the current EC priorities are limited to ensuring the necessary compliance with the recast Electricity Regulation but it would also be useful to learn of any additional priorities for comitology that the EC may look into by the end of summer so that the ESC could contribute to the process efficiently.

Elaine O'Connell (European Commission) explains that there is no comitology meeting foreseen in 2019, and no meeting regarding NCs/GLs in the course of 2019. An informal meeting of the ECBC for initial ideas might take place but there is no anticipation to vote on amendments before end 2019. The EC will be proposing amendments based on the priorities once the time comes. The HL NC IMG is there to help prioritize together. It meets roughly every 3 months and will have a look at more strategic issues. If ACER or ENTSO-E see urgent issues, then some issues can be reprioritized and raised. Elaine O'Connell (European Commission) notes that the priority list on NCs does not foresee any work on NC amendments this year and formally no process is expected to be started. The NC IMG is an informal group but taken very seriously and can have significant influence on the EC thinking on these topics. In order for an amendment proposal to get to phase II, there needs to be an assessment by ACER. It would be useful to have a look at the criteria for assessment in the paper to provide a view on the proposals, when it comes to the output of the EGs' work so far.

Ioannis Theologitis (ENTSO-E) notes that the different EGs are at different stages of assessing the topics and potential solutions.

Garth Graham (EURELECTRIC) suggests it would be useful to consider some procedural aspects for the EGs' work – the EGs' reports can be taken to the ESC which can collectively decide if the outputs can be taken further as the view of the group with a view to preparation for phase 1 of the process or to recommend to the respective EG to continue the work further.

Ralph Pfeiffer (ENTSO-E) reminds that there are numerous interlinkages between NCs/GLs which are more complex between SOGL and the CNCs. The discussions about the amendments should consider the interlinkages and the impact on other NCs/GLs as well.

The chair agrees and thanks the EC for the presentation.

The chair notes that depending on the agenda, the SO and GC ESC in September may fit in a one-day meeting.

3. AOB

Stela Nenova (ENTSO-E) informs the ESCs that ENTSO-E will consult on its Annual Work Program for 2020 for 2 months during the second half of summer. Stakeholders are invited to provide contributions and suggestions through the ENTSO-E consultation tool or can send recommendations per email. ENTSO-E will further work in the coming months on updating its consultation policy document with respect to the new CEP requirements and mandates. A public consultation on the document will also provide a possibility for stakeholders to suggest improvements to the policy. The ESCs will be informed as to the next steps and how to contribute to the process.

4. Follow-up actions:

1. ESCs will be informed by the EC by end summer with respect to additional priorities for amendments of existing NCs/GLs and comitology processes/timelines so they can contribute further to the process.
2. (from Joint SO-GC ESC, December 2018): The topic of the update on the defence and restoration plans by ENTSO-E will be considered for the joint SO-GC ESC session in March. March ESC, that can be a joint topic for discussion. The action is ongoing.
3. (from Joint SO-GC ESC, December 2018): ENTSO-E will look into gathering the information regarding countermeasures considered by TSOs in the system defence plans. Follow-up: The exercise will start in the new year following submission of the defence plans once it is clear what is required.