

33rd Grid Connection European Stakeholder Committee (GC ESC)

Tuesday, 12th March 2024, 09:30 – 14:00 **HYBRID**

(BRUSSELS & REMOTE)

Minutes of the meeting

Participants		
Addala	Srinivasa Raju	EUGINE
Alcazar	Freddy	EUGINE
Antonopoulos	Georgios	ACER
Augusto	Catarina	SolarPower Europe
Auvray	Mélanie	European Heat Pump Association (EHPA)
Barboni	Juliane	European Partnership for Energy and the Environment (EPEE)
Barroso Gomes	Maria	ACER
Beckstedde	Ellen	Florence School of Regulation
Benedict	Florentien	EU DSO Entity
Biellmann	Herve	EU Turbines
Bertle	Roman	VGBE
Bolat	Serdar	EU DSO Entity
Buelo	Thorsten	SolarPower Europe
Carbone	Tommaso	EU DSO Entity
Cerretti	Alberto	CENELEC
Chambers	Keith	Europgen
Dekinderen	Eric	VGBE
Dembi	Vidushi	WindEurope

Fijalkowski	Jakub	DG ENER
Gabrijel	Uros	ACER / Chair of GC ESC
Guenzi	Luca	EUTurbine - Solar Turbine
Hearne	Tony	EURELECTRIC
Adeline	Houtart	European Heat Pump Association (EHPA)
Kay	Mike	GEODE
Klonari	Vasiliki	WindEurope
Kuhn	Rose	BNetzA
Malbrancke	Marc	CEDEC
Martinez Villanueva	Sergio	ENTSO-E
Ndreko	Mario	ENTSO-E
Oberhauser	Klaus	VGBE
O'Connell	Elaine	DG ENER
Pasqua di Bisceglie	Marco	ARERA
Sadighi	Nawid	BNetzA
Schaefer	Nils	CENELEC
Schaupp	Thomas	CENELEC
Schowe-von der Brelie	Bernhard	EFAC
Stoessl	Martin	Orgalime
Tudoroiu-Lakavičė	Alexandra	COGEN
Van Bossuyt	Michaël	IFIEC Europe
Vasilaki	Evangelia	ACER
Vinas	Thierry	EURELECTRIC
Zaccaria	Marco	ENTSO-E
Zastavnetchi	Dmitri	ENTSO-E

1. Opening

1. Review of Agenda

The Chair welcomes the participants to the 33rd GC ESC meeting. The Chair has invited to the today's meeting two experts: Juliane Barboni from the European Partnership for Energy and the Environment as an observer, and Nils Schaefer from the Fraunhofer Institute for CENELEC.

The Chair asks for any additional topics to be covered under the AOB. Florentien Benedict (EU DSO Entity) asks to discuss the possibility to identify a location for the GC ESC meeting in December, so far planned as a remote meeting.

The agenda is presented and approved (available [here](#)).

2. Approval of the last meeting minutes

The minutes of the last meeting are presented and approved (available [here](#)).

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

Dmitri Zastavnetchi (ENTSO-E) presents the follow-up actions and their status from the previous meeting:

- i. To publish the EG CROS phase II report approved by the GC ESC. The report has been uploaded in the ENTSOE website ([here](#)), the action point is considered closed.
- ii. To publish the SO and the GC ESC updated ToR approved by the GC ESC. The updated ToR have been uploaded in the ENTSO-E website ([here](#)), the action point is considered closed.

2. ACER GC NCs amendments: NC RfG/DC amendments main changes from PC draft proposals and NC HVDC indicative timeline

Georgios Antonopoulos (ACER) presents the slides (available [here](#)).

Georgios Antonopoulos (ACER) reports on the expected timeline for the NC HVDC amendment process, based on the evidences of the EG CROS phase II report ([link](#)): the public consultation on ACER's proposal is foreseen in July/August 2024; a public webinar is expected in early July 2024; based on the evaluation of the responses from stakeholders, the finalization of the amendments is planned in early Q4 2024 followed by the drafting of the recommendation; in December 2024 the internal process involving the Board of Regulators is expected, followed by the submission of the final recommendation to the European Commission in the same month in case of a favourable opinion (i.e., December 2024). Thierry Vinas (EURELECTRIC) asks how long will last the public consultation. The Chair replies that the public consultation is expected to last 10 weeks, allowing stakeholders to engage also bilaterally with ACER in case of specific issues.

Regarding the update of the size threshold for RoCoF immunity (i.e., updated for type D SPGMs from 400 MW stated in the public consultation proposal to 140 MW stated in the ACER recommendation to the European Commission), Michael Van Bossuyt (IFIEC Europe) asks for clarification on how the threshold has been defined by ACER. Georgios Antonopoulos (ACER) replies that, in absence of other studies, ACER considered the study carried out by KEMA

(available [here](#)) as a reference, where the evidence of a 140 MW capacity unit which is not able to withstand a 2 Hz/s RoCoF is presented.

Michael Van Bossuyt (IFIEC Europe) asks European Commission about the expected timeline for the entry into force of the NC RfG and NC DC updated regulation. Elaine O’Connell (DG ENER) replies that the European Commission is examining the ACER recommendation published in December 2023, underlining the impressive quality of the proposal which have been discussed extensively between the system operators and the stakeholders. Before proposing the final version of the European Commission regulation, a limited number of issues will be further examined. For this reason, few changes in the final legal texts are expected. Regarding the next steps, the European Commission expects to discuss the proposal of the regulation text with Member States experts before the summer; the text will also be published on the European Commission website ‘Have your say’ for feedback. Expecting to finalise the regulation text over the summer, the European Commission assumes to submit the regulation text to the European Parliament and to the Council before the end of 2024. Elaine O’Connell (DG ENER) specifies that before the entry into force of the new regulation, the text needs to be evaluated by the European Parliament and by the Council for two months. In case of any update of the aforementioned timeline and as soon as the proposed regulation is published on the European Commission website, the European Commission will inform the GC ESC stakeholders. Luca Guenzi (EUTurbine) asks for clarification regarding any need of stakeholder engagement foreseen by the European Commission, to actively support within this process. Elaine O’Connell (DG ENER) replies that, since significant consultation has already been carried out, the main consultation expected for the next stages will involve Member State experts (e.g., in case of specific national issues to be considered). Additionally, the possibility to give feedback on the Commission proposal would be possible through the “Have your say” consultation platform on the European Commission website. The European Commission encourages stakeholders to share any particular concerns or proposals. Mario Ndreko (ENTSOE) asks if the “Have your say” consultation will be open only to Member States experts or also to the stakeholders. Elaine O’Connell (DG ENER) replies that, procedurally, the discussion with Member States experts would be required from the European Commission. However, the European Commission is interested to receive feedback from stakeholders within an open process. For this reason, the regulation text proposal will be published for one month on the said consultation platform for feedback, and anybody interested could react.

Martin Stoessl (Orgalime), commenting the ACER’s highlight on the inclusion of high-voltage ride through provisions for power to gas demand units, asks if further considerations for power-to-gas demand units have been considered by ACER. Georgios Antonopoulos (ACER) replies that the high-voltage ride through provisions have been included in addition to some provisions that were already included in the publicly consulted proposal.

3. ENTSO-E

3a. IGDs planning

Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) presents the slides (available [here](#)).

Vidushi Dembi (WindEurope) asks for clarification about the expected timeline of the drafting of the planned IGDs and about the collaborative work streams with the stakeholders within the IGD development. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) replies that the official public consultation on the drafted IGDs will start after the entry into force of the new regulation; the first IGD to be publicly consulted is hence expected during summer 2025. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) highlights that, according to the regulation (Article 58 in NC RfG and Article 56 in NC DC), ENTSO-E has the legal mandate to draft the IGDs to guide TSOs for the network code implementation at national level, and stakeholders can provide feedback during the relevant public consultation. For the new IGD topics, ENTSO-E can work bilaterally with the relevant stakeholders to get information and to jointly develop any preliminary joint document; inputs from stakeholders will be considered and integrated in the following IGD drafts, as already carried out in the past. The exchange with the stakeholders can be hence carried out through technical groups promoted by ENTSO-E.

Vidushi Dembi (WindEurope) asks about the creation of a technical group on grid forming requirements. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) replies that this group will commence in 2024, not in the form of a drafting group, but as a technical group

under ENTSO-E to deliver a consolidated view of the European stakeholders (such as the technical group on high penetration, where ENTSO-E, WindEurope, Solar Power Europe, and EU DSO Entity developed the first steps on understanding the grid forming capability). Following this approach, ENTSO-E is planning to create technical groups on grid forming (starting from April) and on forced oscillations to develop consolidated reports with the stakeholders. The reports carried out during this preparation phase will be used as input for the relative IGD drafting phase, under ENTSO-E responsibility. Luca Guenzi (EUTurbines) asks ENTSO-E if any plan to revise the IGD process to be more inclusive for stakeholders is considered within the GC ESC framework (in addition to the public consultation). Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) states that ENTSO-E has the legal mandate to draft the IGDs and takes into account the stakeholders' inputs during the public consultation and the possible discussions carried out via the technical groups. Moreover, IGDs are non-binding documents that should remain in the responsibility of ENTSO-E since they are linked to the guidance of the TSOs of the Member States, and to the system needs of the TSOs. Luca Guenzi (EUTurbines) comments that, unlike the IGDs, CENELEC standards are usually based on 27 technical committees where ENTSO-E is invited to participate, and participation is open to anyone. Srinivasa Raju Addala (EUGINE) asks about the procedure for the stakeholders to approach ENTSO-E and ACER on IGD drafting process. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) remarks that the discussion on the IGDs is part of the GC ESC framework.

Srinivasa Raju Addala (EUGINE) asks ENTSO-E about the list of the expected IGDs topics to be developed and for any opportunity for the stakeholders to request specific IGDs drafting. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) replies that ENTSO-E has prepared a list of existing IGDs to be updated. ENTSO-E is open to write common technical reports with the stakeholders before drafting the relative IGD. Since the IGDs represent non-binding guidance for the national implementation, it is remarked that the authorities leading the national implementation process could decide to consult the technical requirements and the parameters at national level, leading to some changes to meet local needs.

Freddy Alcazar (EUGINE) asks about the possibility to develop an IGD on certification, based on the EG HCF report. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) replies that the IGD on certification is included in the other topics under analysis by ENTSOE that could be developed in 2025, to be drafted after the entry into force of the amended NC RfG; the EG HCF report will be then used as a basis for drafting the IGD. Freddy Alcazar (EUGINE) asks if ENTSO-E foresees the creation of a technical group to develop the certification topic. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) replies that ENTSO-E does not see a clear reason to create a technical group for the topics where an Expert Group has already provided relevant material.

Mike Kay (GEODE) commenting the scope of an IGD on EVs and V2G, believes that several technical issues expected from EVs and V2G are well defined in RfG 2.0 as extensions of PGMs requirements from the existing RfG; on the other hand, some technical issues on connection and management of EVs impacting DSO networks exist, leading to a further discussion on how an IGD could tackle these issues. More generally, it would be considered more appropriate to have an open governance document via an Expert Group under the GC ESC, instead of a technical group promoted by ENTSO-E, in particular for taking forward the EG HCF work on the compliance processes.

Thierry Vinas (EURELECTRIC) asks if the topics of sub-synchronous oscillations and harmonic pollution are included in the framework of the IGD on forced oscillations to be developed. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) replies that only wind turbine tower vibration issue will be considered for compliance and requirements clarification, for the national implementation.

The Chair asks ENTSO-E to provide its planning concerning the forthcoming IGDs in terms of scope, priorities and expected timeline at the next GC ESC meeting in June.

ACTION: ENTSO-E to provide the IGDs planning in terms of scope, priorities and expected timeline at the next GC ESC meeting in June.

3b. Discussion points on NCs

Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) presents the slides (available [here](#)).

Michael Van Bossuyt (IFIEC Europe) asks for clarification about the perimeter considered for the new loads of significant capacity for NC DC and for the significant size DSO-connected demand facilities. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) specifies that ENTSO-E, fully supporting the ACER's recommendation about NC DC, would like to raise awareness (i) on new active loads having significant capacity in the GW scale, as for instance industrial scale Power-to-Gas; (ii) that some TSOs consider important the cascading of LFDD from transmission level towards distribution systems. Michael

Van Bossuyt (IFIEC Europe) comments that LFDD topic should lead to a much broader discussion in the three-year implementation period since it is linked to the revision of SO GL and even of emergency and restoration.

The Chair asks if ENTSO-E has already defined a plan and a timeline to address the discussion points highlighted in the presentation to the European platform of the ESC discussions. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) replies that ENTSO-E will draft a short letter to the European Commission to highlight these key considerations for the awareness of the Commission and for the discussion with the Member States. The letter, addressing considerations with a European point of view, is estimated to be developed in April, and later uploaded as part of the upcoming consultation (i.e., the “Have your say” platform).

The Chair asks European Commission if the inputs collected from the stakeholders on the “Have your say” platform will be transparent. Elaine O’Connell (DG ENER) replies that, in case, any stakeholder can indicate if the feedback shall be considered anonymous.

Luca Guenzi (EUTurbines) asks ENTSO-E to clarify about any foreseen discussion with the stakeholders on the RoCoF topic. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) clarifies that the letter to the European Commission will reflect ENTSO-E perspective points (not discussion points) and will propose minor inputs for slight modifications, for instance on RoCoF via a small modification legal text proposal. Jakub Fijalkowski (DG ENER) points out that the European Commission is not an expert on RoCoF and expects to follow broader discussions than the ENTSO-E point of view on this topic. Herve Biellmann (EU Turbines) asks ENTSO-E to better clarify whether how RoCoF should represent an issue. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) highlights that the current exemption foreseen above 140 MW could be acceptable for ENTSO-E only in case of technical limitation to be discussed between the plant owner and the TSO in advance, nevertheless with the aim to not set any asset protection behaving with an intentional exemption (i.e., if a machine can withstand higher RoCoF for a specific operating point, the protection shall not intervene).

Alberto Cerretti (CENELEC), disagreeing on ENTSO-E positioning about standards which shall follow the regulation, states that laws should promote principles, leaving to standards the relative implementation to practical cases.

4. EU DSO Entity

4a. Follow-up on NCs implication for DSOs: (i) GFC; (ii) EVs; (iii) Certification

Florentien Benedict (EU DSO Entity) and Tony Hearne (EURELECTRIC) present the slides (available [here](#)).

Luca Guenzi (EUTurbines) asks DSO Entity regarding grid forming capabilities if the outcome of the island detection activities (to map technologies and methods are currently used) will be publicly available. Tony Hearne (EURELECTRIC) replies that the outcome will not probably be published in detail, nevertheless DSO Entity will share the underlying guidance and any relevant useful material.

4b. Anticipation for future ESC work

Mike Kay (GEODE) presents the slides (available [here](#)).

The Chair comments that the creation of new EGs on certification (focused on EV and charging systems) and on aggregation at this time and in parallel to the EC ongoing process on the adoption of amendments could generate issues with the final regulations. Elaine O’Connell (DG ENER) replies that the European Commission would be in favour of the creation of these EGs, aiming at leading to more harmonisation and improved exchange of best practices among the stakeholders. However, confirming that potential changes in the regulation proposal could be introduced in the upcoming months, the expected fast timeline to finalize the amended regulation should be taken into account (e.g., to not introduce artificial barriers to delay the regulation). Mike Kay (GEODE), reacting to timing issues, comments that DSO Entity considers beneficial to continue developing certifications for EVs and heat pumps even without a legal requirement. The Chair adds that the EGs inputs could highlight possible optimal implementation solutions to the industry via the related IGDs aiming at facilitating the implementation processes. Luca Guenzi (EUTurbines), commenting on the IGDs governance, suggests including the EG reports at the same level of IGDs in the Article 7 of the

amended NC RfG, leveraging on the good consensus achieved among the stakeholders within the EGs. Elaine O'Connell (DG ENER) asks the GC ESC experts about the interaction with the ongoing standards for the EVs and charging systems. Aiming at assessing whether there is a need to establish a new EG on this topic, the Chair asks CENELEC as to where how far is the work on creating standards for EVs and associated charging infrastructure. Alberto Cerretti (CENELEC) suggesting continuing to develop these topics within CENELEC rather than via an EG, replies that standardization bodies where all the stakeholders may be present to foster discussion, consensus, and technical neutrality are already in place (inside CENELEC). Mike Kay (GEODE) supports the dialogue with CENELEC to take forward certification. Vidushi Dembi (WindEurope), commenting the non-binding characteristics of IGDs, remarks the importance of drafting legal text instead, to avoid any misinterpretation. The Chair clarifies that ACER's recommendation to the European Commission includes non-exhaustive requirements and room for national implementation for the purpose of subsidiarity and accounting for local specificities. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) reports that ENTSO-E would not support the creation of an EG on certification under the GC ESC; moreover, ENTSO-E fully supports that the technical regulation remains above technical standards considering technology availability. Catarina Augusto (Solar Power Europe) reports that even supporting the creation of an EG on certification, Solar Power Europe expresses concerns regarding the relative timeline. Keith Chambers (EUROPGEN) comments that EUROPGEN supports efforts to provide clarity on compliance. There is room for both efforts (i) on the standards to provide a reference that manufacturers can certify products to, and (ii) an Expert Group that is providing guidance on how TSOs and DSOs should define their compliance schemes. Keith requests that the scope is expanded to include all technologies (i.e., not just EVs). Bernhard Schowe-von der Brellie (EFAC), supporting the development of the work on certification within CENELEC, asks for clarification whether the certification scheme could be handled in the standards. Alberto Cerretti (CENELEC) confirms that the certification scheme is not included in the standards. Bernhard Schowe-von der Brellie (EFAC) remarks that an EG on the certification scheme could address this issue. Depending on this information, the discussion whether and how any further step should be carried out on this topic is postponed to the next GC ESC meeting. Mike Kay (GEODE) suggested that it would help discussions at the next GC ESC meeting if there was a draft Terms of Reference for such an EG and volunteered to work with some members of the closed EG Harmonisation of Certification and Family Grouping to create a draft ahead of the next meeting.

The GC ESC asks CENELEC for an update regarding the current state of work, the plan on the delivering of the standards, in particular related to EVs and charging stations. Alberto Cerretti (CENELEC) replies that CENELEC can update on the testing of grid forming and on some preliminary illustration of the proposal work on dispatchable load; nevertheless, CENELEC is not working specifically on EVs at the moment, and no plans have been already defined. Nawid Sadighi (BnetzA) adds that an overview of the current status of the non-European international standards in the field of e-mobility (on EVs and charging systems) is in his disposal, to be shared no later than the next June GC ESC meeting among the GC ESC according to GC ESC request.

The Chair summarises the discussion regarding the certification schemes and highlights that further work would be considered beneficial under an Expert Group, nevertheless this is not considered urgent.

With regards to Whereas 11 in the NC RfG, Vidushi Dembi (WindEurope) asks ACER for clearer recommendation; Mike Kay (GEODE), remarking that the creation of the Expert Group should be considered as possible future work, suggests circulating among the GC ESC members the uncertainty identified by the DSO Entity in the current drafting of the RfG on aggregation. Keith Chambers (EUROPGEN) asks ACER to clarify how SPGM units should be considered. The ongoing issue of aggregation versus individual units to form a SPGM is considered a concern for manufacturers, due to possible inconsistency of implementation across Member States. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) remarks ENTSO-E position to address this topic at national level and asks for clarification on the expected outcome of the work of the related potential EG under discussion. The Chair argues against hastily establishing of the expert group on Whereas 11, since ACER could provide its intent (reading) during the next GC ESC meeting. Mike Kay (GEODE) suggests that it might be helpful to circulate a few diagrams explaining the interpretation challenges that DSOs foresee.

ACTION: CENELEC to update regarding the current state of work on the standards at the next GC ESC meeting in June.

ACTION: Nawid Sadighi (BNetzA) to share with GC ESC members the overview of the current status of the international standardisation in the field of e-mobility in IEC and CENELEC, no later than the next June GC ESC meeting.

ACTION: Mike Kay (GEODE) and EU DSO Entity will produce a first draft of possible ToRs for a new EG on certification of EVs and heat pumps.

ACTION: Mike Kay (GEODE) and EU DSO Entity will circulate their thoughts on aggregation interpretation.

ACTION: ACER to provide guidance on Whereas 11 about aggregation at the next GC ESC meeting in June.

5. SolarPower Europe: The Requirements for Generators NC

Catarina Augusto (SolarPower Europe) and Thorsten Buelo (SolarPower Europe) present the slides (available [here](#)).

Mike Kay (GEODE) asks for clarification regarding the mentioned timeline for type A SPGMs, whether it is referred to a technology roadmap or to the roadmap reported in the draft Article Y to adapt networks to accommodate grid forming, which is believed by DSO Entity to be referred to Type A, B, and C. Catarina Augusto (SolarPower Europe) replies that, as interpreted by SolarPower Europe, the draft Article Y refers only to Type A, and the roadmap is intended for grid operators to comply with the requirements. Georgios Antonopoulos (ACER) clarifies that the draft Article Y does not refer only to Type A, as long as it is referenced within other articles for other types.

Regarding grid forming, Thierry Vinas (EURELECTRIC), commenting the cost-benefit analysis of the available technologies and their capabilities suggested by SolarPower Europe, highlights that hydro, nuclear, and thermal power plants already provide inertia for free, asking if any remuneration is foreseen for this service. Catarina Augusto (SolarPower Europe) replies that from the storage side, it is not clear how to implement this service, and more in general, further discussion would be needed to design any market service. Georgios Antonopoulos (ACER) clarifies that the directive refers to market-based procurement not to the capabilities; hence, the grid connection code does not exclude market-based procurement, e.g., market-based procured balancing reserve is specified in the NC RfG. Nawid Sadighi (BNetzA) remarks that, from a regulatory perspective, if in the European Union the synthetic inertia will be defined to be mandatory procured, the possibility for lawmaker to determine mandatory requirements within the grid connection codes will not be excluded.

Regarding the use case utility-scale solar+storage or wind+storage projects, SolarPower Europe highlights that the ACER proposal of the NC RfG 2.0 does not appear enough clear on the rules for the determination of the significance of connecting non-synchronous PGMs of different underlying technologies. The Chair remarks that the presented use case will be investigated by ACER and further discussed in the next GC ESC meeting as a part of the action point above.

6. COGEN Europe: Reaction to ACER Recommendation regarding the NC RfG

Alexandra Tudoroiu-Lakavičė (COGEN), Nils Schaefer (CENELEC), and Luca Guenzi (EUTurbines) present the slides (available [here](#)).

No relevant comments emerge from stakeholders.

7. WindEurope: The Requirements for Generators NC

Vidushi Dembi (WindEurope) presents the slides (available [here](#)).

Concerning the maximum grid export capacity for the determination of significance, the Chair asks WindEurope if its proposal implies that when the maximum export capacity is zero, no technical capabilities are required from the underlying generation assets. Vidushi Dembi (WindEurope) clarifies that to define the requirements for the particular

asset, the export capacity will follow what has been agreed in the contract between the system operator and the asset owner.

Regarding the mentioned cost-benefit analysis (CBA) on grid forming, Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) remarks that the CBA is planned to be carried out by the European Commission in order to promote neutrality and to take into account alternative scenarios.

8. AOB

GC ESC meetings in 2024

Florentien Benedict (EU DSO Entity) suggests organizing the GC ESC meeting on 9 December physically (currently planned as remote). The Chair does not object and, stating that ACER's premises will not be available then, suggests discussing further this topic during the next GC ESC meeting in June, leaving to ENTSO-E and to DSO Entity to potentially host this meeting. The possibility to organize a physical meeting will be assessed in the next meetings depending on the number of topics to be discussed.

9. Follow-up actions:

1. ENTSO-E to report on the IGDs planning in terms of scope, priorities and expected timeline at the next GC ESC meeting in June.
 2. CENELEC to update regarding the current state of work on the standards at the next GC ESC meeting in June.
 3. Mike Kay (GEODE) and EU DSO Entity will produce a first draft of possible ToRs for a new EG on certification of EVs and heat pumps.
 4. Mike Kay (GEODE) and EU DSO Entity will circulate their thoughts on aggregation interpretation.
 5. Nawid Sadighi (BNetzA) to share with GC ESC members the overview of the current status of standardisation in the field of e-mobility in IEC and CENELEC, no later than the next June GC ESC meeting.
 6. ACER to provide further guidance on Whereas 11 about aggregation at the next GC ESC meeting in June.
-