ACER
Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators

1st Demand Response European Stakeholder Group (DRESG)

Monday 3 November from 11:30 to 17:15

Location: ENTSO-E's premises

Participants		
Athina Tellidou	ACER	Chairperson
Markus Amundsen	ACER	Representative
Mana Farrokhseresht	ACER	Substitute
Marijn Maenhoudt	CREG	Representative
Patrick Albrecht	ENTSO-E	Representative
Stine Haugland	ENTSO-E	Representative
Shane Kelly	ENTSO-E	Representative
Isabel Bohn	ENTSO-E	Substitute
Robert Kielak	ENTSO-E	Substitute
Sultan Aliyev	ENTSO-E	Secretariat
Torsten Knop	DSO Entity	Representative
Yvonne Ruwaida	DSO Entity	Representative
Paul De Wit	DSO Entity	Representative
Geir Magne Abusdal	DSO Entity	Substitute
Georg Hartner	DSO Entity	Substitute
Valeria Battista	DSO Entity	Secretariat
Mehtap Alper	DSO Entity	Secretariat
Paul Troughton	Smarten – Smart Energy Europe	Representative
Fabrizio Carboni	All NEMO Committee	Representative
Joren Schepers	ChargeUp Europe	Substitute
Łukasz Grabasz	COGEN Europe	Representative

Thomas König	Energy Traders Europe	Representative
Carlos Emanuele	Euroheat & Power	Representative
Thomas Kawam	European Commission	Representative
Kora Töpfer	Europex	Representative
Michael van Bossuyt	IFIEC	Representative
Giao Do	ENTSO-E	Ad-hoc Representative
Mariia Andreeva	T&D Europe	Representative
Jarmila Bogdanoff	T&D Europe	Substitute
Laurent Schmitt	SolarPower Europe	Substitute
Vidushi Dembi	WindEurope	Representative
Zoe Ledwith	REScoop.eu	
Tomas Llobet	Smart Energy Solution Providers	

Draft Minutes

1. Opening

1.1 Welcoming address and Approval of draft Agenda

The Chair (Athina Tellidou) presents the draft agenda of the meeting and asks for comments. The agenda is approved without comments.

1.2 Tour de table

As this is the first DRESG meeting, Athina Tellidou (Chair) proposes to reserve some time for a tour de table of the participants. Each participant intervenes to share briefly its name and background.

2. Demand Response Network Code

2.1 Update from the European Commission

Thomas Kawam (EC) provides an oral update from the European Commission.

The EC received the ACER's recommendation on the NC DR in March 2025. Following the ACER's recommendation, the EC conducted a targeted consultation and received 87 answers from stakeholders. The non-confidential answers will be published soon. In parallel, the EC is working on the NC DR draft to consider the inputs received into the text. As next steps, the NC DR draft will be submitted to Member States (MSs) and the Comitology process among the MSs and the EC is expected to start in Q1 2026; no fixed duration for this process is foreseen. The EC mentions that it is also expecting

to publish a non-official NC DR draft next year and open the opportunity for feedback with the aim to ensure transparency in this phase.

Torsten Knop (DSO Entity) remarks that the NC DR process has benefited from the stakeholders' interactions and these contributed to the process in a constructive way, mentioning as example the stakeholder meeting held in Ljubljana with ACER in November 2024. Torsten acknowledges the legal framework of the Comitology process, but he encourages to keep direct interactions and dialogue with stakeholders as this is crucial for major amendments. It would be very welcomed if relevant stakeholders can be consulted for specific questions while keeping confidentiality and without causing delays to the Comitology process.

Thomas Kawam (EC) confirms that the EC is ready to engage with stakeholders and will not hesitate to interact with specific stakeholders when needed. However, he emphasizes that the Comitology is a specific legal process and only critical and the most relevant interaction will be integrated.

Kora Toepfer (Europex) asks for clarification regarding the outcome of the recent EC targeted consultation. She asks if the EC could provide details on the content of the feedback received and the focus areas for the EC on the current draft.

Thomas Kawam (EC) replies that the EC currently cannot provide an overview and share insights. He remarks that the EC is working in parallel on the NC DR and the consultation. As part of the documentation, they will share with MSs a summary document on the responses.

3. DRESG terms of reference (ToR) approval

3.1 Objectives and tasks

Athina Tellidou (Chair) presents the formal establishment of DRESG with a session dedicated to the Terms of Reference (ToR). She remarks that the objective of this session is to go into the details of the ToR. Any concerns and questions from stakeholders are welcome to revise the ToR where needed.

The Chair highlights that, as per the ACER recommendation on the NC DR, stakeholder involvement is expected pursuant to Article 7, in close cooperation with ENTSO-E and DSO Entity. The DRESG is established as a regular meeting with the aim of identifying problems, proposing improvements, and discussing concerns during the implementation phase. Additionally, cooperation with other European groups, e.g. on topics such as data exchange may be relevant. Regarding its setup, the DRESG is a subgroup of the Market Stakeholder Committee (MESC), and it will formally report to the MESC. As the demand response topic is not only related to market topics but also to system operation, such as coordination of SOs and grid connection, the DRESG will also report to the System Operation Stakeholder Committee (SOESC) and the Grid Connection Stakeholder Committee (GCESC).

Laurent Schmitt (Solar Power Europe) asks a clarification question on how the topic of data standardisation could be covered and how to consider its link with the Data for Energy (D4E) subgroup of the EC. He advises to make a link to the group though a formal liaison or by scheduling regular exchange between the groups, as there is also ongoing discussion with use cases.

Athina Tellidou (Chair) specifies that the topic of standardisation of data exchange is explicitly mentioned in the NC DR but for the moment there is no dialogue between the D4E and DRESG. She adds that this point can be further checked.

Thomas Kawam (EC) would like to know how this link between D4E and DRESG could be implemented and if this would imply to have a representative of the D4E in the DRESG.

Laurent Schmitt (Solar Power Europe) adds that topics such as the SPU and SPG are already discussed within the D4E and he suggests the link to the DRESG. If a regular exchange between the topic would be expected, it is suggested to clarify which topics should be discussed among the two groups.

Sultan Aliyev (ENTSO-E) adds that in the D4E, there is a discussion on the Implementing Regulation on Demand Response. This first meeting of DRESG is dedicated to aggregation models and most likely also the second meeting would be focusing on this topic. However, it can be checked if the standardisation topic can be integrated.

Athina Tellidou (Chair) remarks that it is challenging to clarify this until the final text of NC DR is available. She suggests clarifying this point after the NC DR is published.

Vidushi Dembi (WindEurope) asks if there in this meeting or in the future meetings will be provided an exact list of topics to be covered in the DRESG. She adds that certain topics such as Flexible Connection Agreements (FCAs) are discussed in the MESC, but some dimensions of such topics could fall within the scope of DRESG.

Athina Tellidou (Chair) confirms that some topics certainly will overlap. However, after publication of the NC DR, a clearer distinction on where a topic is discussed and where the reporting occurs will be agreed. The Chair adds that moving forward after we have the final NC DR text, there will be more clarity on a list of topics, although it is excluded to have a final closed list of topics to be covered.

The Chair continues the presentation highlighting the three main objectives of the DRESG:

- To monitor the implementation of NC DR and check the efficiency of established processes and arrangements, in line with the requirements.
- To serve as a platform to share general views on the NC DR implementation with stakeholders.
- To contribute to a more informed decision-making process for the methodologies and rules to be developed under the code.

Torsten Knop (DSO Entity) asks if, as part of these objectives, the DRESG will focus every year on a specific topic. He suggests consulting the DRESG and get its feedback on the decision regarding the topic for the second and further years.

Athina Tellidou (Chair) clarifies that the focus on specific topics is only relevant for the ACER monitoring exercise (and this point will be discussed later), but DRESG discussion should be broader than that and cover other demand response related topics. She also confirms that stakeholders will be able to provide feedback on this. The Chair continues the ACER presentation outlining DRESG representation principles, its contribution for the different associations and the role and responsibilities of its members.

On the representation principles, some stakeholders express concerns that the current set up does not address the necessary expertise around the table. Michael Van Boyssut (IFIEC) expresses his concern that demand representatives has only one seat and asks for more expertise on demand as this is the main topic to be tackled. He adds that also sectoral organisations ask to be involved. The main concern is not the number of representatives, but the variety of expertise needed. Laurent Schmitt (SolarPower Europe) has a similar remark; SPE would appreciate having more representation and explains that one seat per organization limits the contribution that can be made to the group. This is because within the organization they split the topics with different experts and as there are many topics, it would be appreciated to allow a larger involvement. Paul Troughton (SmartEn) also intervenes for a similar remark.

Athina Tellidou (Chair) explains that currently ACER has not filled all the 25 available positions because, as it is the first set up of this type of group discussing demand response, it aims at observing if the current representation fits the purpose. ACER sees demand response from the point of view in participation of wholesale market, and this explains the selected representation. However, ACER highlights that it is open to observing the dynamics in the group and making a check on whether all demand stakeholders are represented. She also reminds that DRESG welcome experts from relevant associations to present specific topics with the idea of maintaining one permanent voice per association. Following the points raised by stakeholders, the Chair concludes that the topic will be reassessed and that ACER is open to making changes where appropriate.

Tomas Llobet (Esmig) would like to have more clarity on how the meetings will be organized, for example if a slot will be provided for stakeholders to prepare their presentation. He also remarks that this should be prepared well in advance.

Athina Tellidou (Chair) specifies that the draft agenda and relevant materials will be circulated largely in advance and stakeholders can propose to add topics. Stakeholders can request to add topics also before receiving the draft agenda. She also clarifies that stakeholders can share any reaction and questions they may have regarding agenda topics with ACER, DSO Entity and ENTSO-E. The organizers will facilitate the inclusions of slots for relevant questions.

Some stakeholders suggest sharing the agenda in advance, for example by one month prior to the DRESG meeting. Paul Troughton (SmartEn) also remarks that as a representative of an association with over 100 members, it can require few weeks to gather members' views on a specific topic. Therefore, he suggests being very concrete when requesting feedback from stakeholders and to do so as much in advance as possible.

Athina Tellidou (Chair) clarifies that the draft agenda will be shared in advance to ensure reactions can be made and the final agenda no later than one week before the DRESG meeting, as per ToR. Also email exchanges will be used to inform on materials and gather feedback from stakeholders.

Fabrizio Carboni (All NEMO Committee) comments on the importance to use the DRESG as a forum to share results from existing projects, as this could help to combine the top-down approach of the implementation of NC DR with the bottom-up approach typical of ongoing pilot projects. He adds that this is an opportunity to share important lessons and outcomes on several issues such as aggregation, data exchange interoperability etc. that were experienced on these projects.

Athina Tellidou (Chair) notes that this is a very important topic especially in the context of demand response. The targets in other network codes were clearer but in demand response there are different options for the implementation and there is great benefit in learning from the shared experience.

Torsten Knop (DSO Entity) on behalf of DSO Entity remarks appreciation for the current format of DRESG. Of course, improvements will be made through the exchanges with stakeholders.

Athina Tellidou (Chair) introduces the core principles on working together in DRESG. She clarifies that the work in DRESG is different by scope and kind of interaction from the previous Drafting Committee. However, the goal remains the same: to enable demand response participation in wholesale electricity markets. She adds that the key core values that will continue to characterise the exchange are trust through openness, mutual respect, and clear communication.

Torsten Knop (DSO Entity) supports that one of the objectives is to enable demand response through participation in wholesale markets. However, from DSO Entity perspective it is also important to enable participation where appropriate in local service markets, and through other mechanisms to mobilise demand response and allocate it where is more valuable.

Athina Tellidou (Chair) clarifies that "wholesale markets" as it is referred to, also include balancing and local services. Athina adds that when using the wording "wholesale markets", it is meant everything in the scope of the NC DR and this was also clarified by REMIT, at least for balancing and congestion management. She agrees that local markets are within wholesale and can also go beyond in other market-based processes.

Laurent Schmitt (Solar Power Europe) asks for clarification in relation to reactive and voltage control power. He explains that, during the first phase of NCDR, the reactive power topic had a limited space in discussion. He asks if ACER plans to integrate voltage control markets and reactive power in wholesale market and therefore demand response participation as part of REMIT perspective.

The presentation from ACER on agenda item 3.1 are accessible here.

3.2 Working together

Athina Tellidou (Chair) opens the dialogue on the topic of "Working Together" for inputs from stakeholders and collect their expectations. Therefore, stakeholders are invited to write their suggestions on post its based on two main questions:

1. What do you expect from DRESG?
2. What would you need to participate fully and make the meetings successful, pleasant and meaningful?

After the lunch break, stakeholders reconvenes and the Chair opens the discussion summarising the content from the written inputs organising the discussion in two main categories: DRESG process-based input and DRESG content-based inputs.

On DRESG process-based input:

- Some stakeholders ask for clarification on the location for DRESG meetings. Athina Tellidou (Chair) mentions that the assumption is that all meetings are held in Brussels but welcomes the possibility to have meetings in Ljubljana. Some stakeholders consider the travelling to Ljubljana more complicated compared to Brussels.
- Some stakeholders remark that it is important to ensure that all associations are involved and being heard, also the smaller ones. Athina Tellidou (Chair) confirms that the aim of DRESG is to have a balanced approach and give every member the same opportunity to bring their views.
- Some stakeholders remark again the need to bring more expertise around the table and to reconsider the representation principle in DRESG.
- Torsten Knop (DSO Entity) highlights the proposal to organise breakout sessions and deep dive into specific topics. This would allow greater interaction, ensuring a constructive and interactive approach. Paul de Wit (DSO Entity) remarks that, during the drafting phase of NC DR, some workshops on specific topics were also organised. Yvonne Ruwaida (DSO Entity) adds that DRESG could be a good space to increase he common knowledge, sharing good practices and technical details among experts. Athina Tellidou (Chair) comments that the suggestions will be considered.
- Some stakeholders highlight the importance to receive insights and clear information of the process as early as possible such as on deadlines for feedback and inputs and establishing clear deliverables for each DRESG meeting. Also, with reference to the previous discussion, stakeholders remind that they need enough time to consult their members and gather different opinions. Athina Tellidou (Chair) comments that these are good points that ACER will make sure that they are reflected in the processes.
- Athina Tellidou (Chair) highlights that ACER is committed to provide a balanced agenda for the meetings and inputs on the topics can be sent in advance. Also, if needed, ACER can provide more clarity on how the process works on ACER and SO associations sides and clarifying the working structure for stakeholders.

On DRESG process-based input:

- Some stakeholders provide suggestions on the topics to be covered in DRESG.
- Fabrizio Carboni (All NEMO Committee) suggests having an integrated approach among the different topics. For example, interoperability should be more detailed in the discussion as well as the topic on dynamic tariffs. For now, it seems the focus is more on explicit demand response, but the issues related to the integration of interoperability are also linked with implicit demand response. Athina Tellidou (Chair) remarks that implicit demand response is out of the scope from the DRESG discussions and the focus is on market participation, not the response to price signals, but the active participation in the market.
- Stakeholders suggest going more in depth on the discussions regarding the baseline topic. Looking at Member States, it seems there is a more flexible approach because new type of devices and EV connected, the methodologies need to adapt to new assets. This suggests that the decision making should be more flexible.

Athina Tellidou (Chair) confirms to keep this point for discussion and suggests that the workshop approach could fit this purpose.

- Laurent Schmitt (Solar Power Europe) alongside the topics discussed, would like to raise the standardisation of data exchange, focusing on how to avoid that there are different models for data exchange for the same products across Europe. From a customer perspective, it is an issue that DSOs don't share the data from the meter, and it was discussed that data access to DSO meters could be tackled from a regulatory perspective. This discussion should be linked with EBGL but as now the flexibility product topic is split among two groups, from balancing and local flexibility perspective, Laurent adds the importance to bring these together. SPE also suggest continuing the open discussion on DMDs and how DMDs are used to collect data in different cases, underlining the importance for further harmonisation. Athina Tellidou (Chair) clarifies that although the topic is split into two groups, coordination will be ensured. As part of the monitoring exercise, ACER wants to explore how the data from DMD are used. It is unclear which level of detail will be reached in this group regarding DMDs. Athina concludes that the level of depth on this topic will also depend on the NC DR final text and for now it is noted that the discussion is under development.
- Paul Troughton (SmartEn) adds that the discussion will depend on the final NC DR text. However, he points out that extensive discussion on the DMDs could be beneficial as currently we could have national implementation where DMDs are not permitted. He hopes that the monitoring exercise will include this extensively. Athina Tellidou (Chair) confirms that the intention is to monitor how DMD are used and to what extent. Depending on the final text on NC DR, more recommendations can be made later in the process.

4. Aggregation models monitoring exercises

4.1 Aggregation models monitoring exercise

ACER presents the aggregation model monitoring exercise. It is clarified that the monitoring is what is already implemented in different MSs and not a monitoring of NC DR, as it is not adopted. The aim is to better understand what has been implemented and identify best practices to be better prepared for when the EU Methodologies needs to be developed.

Markus Amundsen (ACER) explains that ACER has chosen aggregation models as topic as they know this is already implemented in MSs. Thus, there is already knowledge and experience on the topic, but at the same time there is a lot of MSs that are still building knowledge and have the implementation of aggregation pending. Slide 3 shows the topics that are planned to be covered in the upcoming years and will be consulted with the DRESG. The 3 main topics ACER wants to focus on is aggregation models, market-based congestion management and prequalification.

Torsten Knop (DSO Entity) adds that this is the ACER market monitoring but understands ACER are flexible with the inputs from this group.

ACER confirms that this is the case. ACER expects inputs on these topics already now if the members of the group would like to provide so, but this will also be discussed at a later point in time, when the exercise for next year is set.

Patrick Albrecht (ENTSO-E) comments that the timeline for topics on congestion management and prequalification is overlapping with implementation. What is then the expectation?

Athina Tellidou (Chair) confirms that it will be based mainly on the final text of NC DR, as all these aspects are partly implemented by some MSs and some not, and the NC DR will add additional requirements. In general, through the monitoring exercise, ACER will monitor requirements that are in force, but the main interest is in what has been implemented so far and what will be implemented in the near future (also on pilots or projects that are being discussed for implementation).

Slide 5 shows how the monitoring exercise is structured. The focus topics will be structured around subtopics, high level questions, and specific questions. ACER welcomes input from stakeholders on the subtopics.

After presenting the general level, Markus Amundsen (ACER) presents the aggregation models monitoring exercise more precisely. Starting from the timeline, ACER has already started discussions with NRAs on the subtopics. ACER will submit the survey to NRAs in January. NRAs will reply in February. The goal is to have some draft recommendations before the next DRESG and receive stakeholder input on this. The report will be finalised in the summer 2026.

Markus highlights that the monitoring exercise on aggregation models has been divided in 5 main subtopics: aggregation models, financial transfer and compensation, baselining methods, allocated volumes and cross cutting topics.

Paul Troughton (SmartEn) raises questions on the effect of financial compensation on price signals and on whether compensation has a predictable impact on demand response behaviour.

Michael van Bossuyt (IFIEC) emphasises that the rebound effect must not be treated as given, as it does not exist in all cases; it should be assessed separately for cases with and without financial compensation. Rebound effects should be explicitly linked to compensation design.

ACER confirms that financial compensation and imbalance corrections are distinct and plans to investigate the identification of rebound effects in the upcoming survey.

On Imbalance correction vs financial compensation:

Paul de Wit (DSO Entity) on financial transfer and financial compensation suggests considering how the metering point administrator is involved, considering that the process is complex.

Paul also asks whether imbalance corrections are always considered a given, and whether compensation should be viewed on top of imbalance corrections or as separate processes.

ACER confirms they view imbalance correction as separate from financial compensation.

Baselining, Data Exchange & Standardisation:

Yvonne suggested including in the monitoring report whether standardized data exchange formats exist and in case they do whether these are international or national standards.

Laurent Schmitt (SPE) asks if there is a reason for looking only at baseline methods that are system user specific. He notes data exchange is part of standardization, as aggregators must exchange data with administrators. He added that data exchange is essential for aggregation, thus should be covered under aggregation/baselining monitoring.

ACER Responds that data exchange occurs across many processes and in this exercise, the focus is on aggregation models and baselining. Broader standardisation of data exchange will be addressed when monitoring product-level data exchange (e.g., for congestion management services), as standardisation is linked to product attributes. Data exchange for actors outside aggregation scope is not included here.

Measurements and Allocated Volumes:

Markus Amundsen (ACER) highlights the reliance on:

- Measurements
- Smart meters
- Dynamic metering data (DMDs)
- Important for determining allocated volumes.

Giao Do (ENTSO-E) asks about evolving definition of financial transfer in NC DR and raises concerns about survey alignment given potential definition changes.

ACER Responds acknowledges the uncertainty around the final definition, as it is dependent on the final text of the NC DR. Regardless of the terminology ("financial transfer" or "settlement"), monitoring of such mechanisms remain a relevant topic for the monitoring exercise.

Baselining:

Confirms intention to assess how all components operate together, not separately.

4.2 Specific topics on aggregation and baselines

1. Purpose of the Exercise

- ACER is conducting a monitoring exercise on aggregation models and baselining, supported by an NRA survey.
- Goal: Describe existing practices, identify best practices, and support Member States with implementation guidance.
- Stakeholders invited to submit examples and best practices via email.

2. Imbalance Settlement & Market Participant Responsibilities

ACER Overview

- All market participants must ensure that market positions match physical injections/withdrawals (allocated volumes).
- Deviations due to system operator activations are corrected through imbalance adjustments, which apply only when an SO activates a service.
- Imbalance adjustment is only linked to the activation for a service provision and is independent of aggregation model.

Stakeholder Points

- In Sweden, for local services/tenders, imbalance rules are not always defined; BRPs may face unaddressed imbalances.
- SmartEn & IFIEC: Correction is needed when services are exchanged between market parties, even without SO involvement.
- ACER clarified this would require corrections to the allocated volume or the final position but is not labelled as imbalance adjustment.
- Discussion on intraday nominations: ACER confirmed these must be reflected in final positions and will be captured in the survey.

3. Aggregation Model Categorisation

ACER's proposed classification for the aggregation models categorised by:

- Number of BRPs per connection point, and
- Number of metering points, and
- Presence/absence of settlement between parties.

Focus areas for monitoring: models with multiple BRPs in one metering point, as they pose most implementation challenges.

Stakeholder Feedback

- SmartEn: Include assessment of impacts and incentives, not just categorisation.
- SPE: Ensure independent aggregation is visible, including potential barriers.
- General: Need clarity on terminology around metering point, submeter, DMD, regulated meter.

ACER confirmed that it will refine the definitions and re-check the categories with NRAs and SOs.

4. Rebound Effect

- ACER intends to analyse identification process, time windows, and interactions with compensation and financial transfer.
- Stakeholders stressed the rebound effect depends heavily on the aggregation model design and financial transfer mechanism.
- ACER acknowledged and will integrate these considerations.

5. Financial Transfer (Energy Transfer Settlement)

ACER informed that the monitoring would focus on the following elements:

- Mapping of calculation methods across markets and products.
- Assessment processes at national level.
- Roles and responsibilities in settlement.
- Parameters and formulas used (where applicable).

The main comments raised by the stakeholders were on the following topics:

- Distinguish between financial transfer and financial compensation (ACER confirms they are separate).
- Definition in ACER's draft (flow "between BRPs") may be too narrow—real-world settlements may involve supplier, customer or supplier &aggregator.
- ACER will clarify definitions in the questionnaire.
- Some urged simplifying terminology: ACER will maintain separation of concepts but ensure clarity.

6. Baselining Methods

ACER Mapping Plan is identifying baselining methods and group them into archetypes, identify what the most common BMs/archetypes per market/product and technology, better understand what the key parameters are for some baselining methods, assess the approval process, the validation of baselining methods, implementation, and monitoring processes.

Stakeholder Input

- Add hybrid methods (e.g., historical + weather regression).
- Highlight baselining links with DMDs, which reduce noise and improve accuracy.
- Include DMDS explicitly in the questionnaire.
- PV, storage, EV require improved baselining, historical profiles often insufficient.

7. Technology Classification Challenge

- ACER seeks a way to categorise technologies meaningfully for baselining.
- Stakeholders agreed product characteristics (duration, notice time) are primary drivers, with technology as a secondary factor.
- ACER to refine approach.

5. AOB

In the AOB, the dates for the next DRESG meeting are discussed.

Athina Tellidou (Chair) anticipates that the dates for the next two meetings will potentially be around mid-April and after summer. ACER, DSO Entity and ENTSO-E will coordinate to provide fixed dates for these meetings by the end of November to allow the stakeholders to organize for the travel to Brussels.

The Chair adds that some conclusions of the aggregation model questions could be ready by April before the second DRESG meeting. In the meantime, ACER will continue the dialogue with stakeholders to collect inputs.

Annex: Action Tracker

1. EC to evaluate the potential link between DE4D and DRESG.
2. ACER to reassess the representation principle.
3. ACER to clarify with REMIT colleagues on the intention to include voltage control and reactive power in wholesale market perspective. ACER to follow up on this with Laurent Schmitt (Solar Power Europe).
4. Action: DRESG members to revert to us, shall there be more baseline methods that are presented on slide 14 or any other inputs on the questionnaire by 19 November.
5. Action: The next meeting dates to be shared by end of November. (22 April and 6 October 2026)