

34th Grid Connection European Stakeholder Committee (GC ESC)

27th June 2024, 09:00-16:00

Hosted by DSO Entity - (EU Thon Hotel, Brussels) and Online

Draft Minutes

Participants		
Uros Gabrijel	ACER	Chairperson
Leonhard Bartsch	ACEA	Guest
Georgios Antonopoulos	ACER	Observer
Adriana Pop	ACEA	Guest
Vilas Alvaro	APPLiA	Member
Marco Pasquadibisceglie	ARERA	Observer
Rose Kuhn	BNetzA	Observer
Sadighi Nawid	BNetzA	Observer
Alberto Cerretti	CENELEC	Member
Julian Treichel	CharIN	Member
Alexandra Tudoroiu	COGEN	Member Substitute
Florentien Benedict	DSO Entity	Member
Tony Hearne	DSO Entity	Member
Joost Kuppen	DSO Entity	Guest Member
Tony Kim Yet	EASE	Member
Bernhard Schowe	EFAC	Member
Veerle Beelaerts	EHI	Member
Adeline Houtart	EHPA	Member
Lazaros Exizidis	ENTSO-E	Member - Secretariat
Marco Zaccaria	ENTSO-E	Member - Secretariat
Gamze Dogan	ENTSO-E	Member - Joint Session ESC SO-GC
Sergio Martinez Villanueva	ENTSO-E	Member
Janek Massmann	ENTSO-E	Guest for presentation

Rene Suchantke	ENTSO-E	Guest for presentation
Hanna Ljungberg	ENTSO-E	Member - Joint Session ESC SO-GC
Serdar Bolat	EU DSO Entity	Member - Secretariat
Carbone Tommaso	EU DSO Entity	Member - Secretariat
Luca Guenzi	EU Turbines	Member
Freddy Alcazar	EUGINE	Member
Assiet Arene	EUGINE	Member Substitute
Thierry Vinas	Eurelectric	Member
O'Connell Elaine	European Commission	Observer
Keith Chambers	Europgen	Member
Emma Menegatti	FSR	Member
Mike Kay	GEODE	Member
Léa Malfrait	Hydrogen Europe	Member Substitute
Michaël Van Bossuyt	IFIEC Europe	Member
Loffredo Jaume	Smarten	Member Substitute
Mireia Spadaler	SPE	Member Substitute
René Suchantke	TUB	Observer
Klaus Oberhauser	VGBE	Member
Roman Bertle	VGBE	Member Substitute
Vidushi Dembi	WindEurope	Member

1. Opening

The Chair (Uros Gabrijel—ACER) welcomes the participants to the 34th GC ESC meeting and reviews the participants list to ensure that only Members of the Committee or alternates who have informed the Chair are present or connected.

The Chair introduced two new permanent members, EHPA and Hydrogen Europe, and mentioned that ACEA was also invited to the meeting as a guest.

The minutes of the previous meeting are approved.

The follow-up actions from the previous meeting are presented (available [here](#)) and considered all closed.

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

The Chair asks for any additional topics to be covered under AOB. No additional requests from members are made.

2. EU DSO Entity presentations

A. Grid Forming – updates from DSOs (Tony Hearne)

Tony Hearne presents the slides, which are available [here](#).

Tony Herne explains where the DSO Entity stands with regard to the grid-forming topic. DSO Entity intends, as indicated in previous presentations to this forum, to produce a guidance document on the matter. As part of that work, its Expert Group on Existing Network Codes launched an internal survey on some technical aspects of the topic, including topics such as the various neutral considerations employed by the member DSOs. Tony presented some of these findings as part of this presentation.

The DSO Entity also advanced internally on the construction of a risk mitigation matrix which will be part of the paper. For the draft structure of the paper, refer to slide 3 of the presentation.

Michaël Van Bossuyt (IFIEC) asks whether DSO Entity expects closed distribution system operators with embedded generation to be involved in this topic; Tony Hearne responds that they will be taken into consideration; Uros stresses that ACER would like to know whether the collaboration between DSO Entity and IFIEC will take place.

Freddy Alcazar (EUGINE), on slide 9 of the presentation (ratio of synchronous to power park modules), asks whether synchronous condensers will be included for voltage control, short circuit, or inertia; Tony Hearne responds that this topic is not tackled yet but will be considered.

Vidushi Dembi (WindEurope) asks about the expected roadmap for the rollout of grid forming, referring to NC RfG Article Y (5); Tony Hearne responds that roadmaps will be required, with some uniformity in approach.

The Chair asks how frequently the DSO Entity intends to update the roadmaps; Tony Hearne responds by pointing out that there is a difference between the guidance documents and the roadmaps themselves, as the former is intended to provide “guidance” to NRAs and all relevant stakeholders before the roadmap is drafted; The Chair adds that the guidance document should not be at least ignorant of other inputs that might pop up in due course. Tony Hearne notes this.

Florentien Benedict (DSO Entity) stresses that we must avoid mixing up the roadmap referred to in Article Y (5) with the document that the DSO Entity is producing internally (guidance document). Therefore, the guidance document will principally advise DSOs on how to create the roadmap, although generic aspects for adoption by member states are intended to be included.

As part of the Q&A, Tony Hearne also clarified that the intent remains that the document will provide guidance to those who will, in due course, be charged with producing the DSO contribution to the Grid Forming Roadmap. He re-asserted that the aim is that the authors of the roadmap will not start with a blank page, and, whilst the outcomes may vary depending on the circumstances prevailing in the Member State, there will be a degree of uniformity in the methodologies used.

It was further clarified that this guidance document is distinct from the Implementation Guidance Document (IGD) that ENTSO-E will produce on exhaustive grid forming technical detailed functional descriptions and connection requirements for Power Park Modules (PPMs), which will be informed by the So-Called “phase 2” Technical Group.

ACTION – DSO Entity to discuss grid forming implications with IFIEC in advance of the next ESC GC.

B. Certification of EVs/ Heat Pumps – Terms of Reference (Mike Kay)

Mike Kay presented the slides, which are available [here](#).

During the last GC ESC meeting, experts supported the proposition that an expert group (EG) working on certification would likely be needed; DSO Entity has already circulated the draft terms of reference (ToR) for this new expert group (available [here](#)).

The Chair, referring to slide 7 outlining the deliverables of this potential new expert group, asks for some specifications regarding point 2, where it is said that the EG will outline additional technical requirements (additional to those mentioned in NC RfG 2.0); Mike Kay responds that NC RfG 2.0 is most likely exhaustive but the EG will investigate if some aspects have been disregarded. Mike Kay also points out that DSOs have requirements, principally anti-islanding protection, which are not included in the EN 50549 standard at the necessary level of detail. Although not strictly necessary for NC RfG compliance, it will probably be helpful for manufacturers, developers, and DSOs if the certification process can also include DSOs’ requirements.

Laurent Schmit (Smarten) notes that it would make sense to streamline the certification process to avoid sending a device to different certification bodies; Mike Kay responds by saying that this would be useful to be considered in the ToR. In addition, Mike Kay asks Laurent Schmit to share these comments in writing with him.

The Chair asks about the expected timeline; Mike Kay responds that 1-2 more months will be needed to finalize the ToR, and in parallel, the right experts will need to fill the EG. The first meeting of the new EG should ideally take place 2-3 weeks before the next GC ESC meeting.

Nawid Sadighi (BNetzA - German Energy Regulator) asks whether experts from CENELEC will be involved in this new EG; Mike Kay responds that experts coming from existing standardization bodies will be certainly needed; Alberto Ceretti (CENELEC) reiterates that experts with the right expertise are needed.

The Chair considers it premature to initiate expert group meetings this summer, given that the RfG 2.0 is unlikely to be published before the end of 2024. He suggests that it might be appropriate to wait a little longer. Mike Kay acknowledged this was reasonable and noted that it also gives CENELEC and other standards bodies more time to advance the development of the relevant standards. The additional time can be used to refine the terms of reference and for ESC members to research which stakeholders should be sought as members of the expert group.

Elaine O’Connell (European Commission) notes, with reference to the expected timeline for the NC RfG 2.0 and the NC DC, that the EC is still targeting to send the revised proposal to the EU Parliament and the Council in early 2025. Therefore, the EC’s legal text proposal should be finalised by 2024.

ACTION – All ESC members are to consider the draft ToR and make any further comments to Mike Kay by Friday, 23 August.

ACTION – All ESC members are to consider relevant experts to join a future expert group on certification and suggest names to Mike Kay by Friday, 23 August

ACTION – Laurent Schmitt is to send his comments on streamlining to Mike Kay by Friday, 23 August.

C. Aggregation – Florentien Benedict

Florentien Benedict presents the slides which are available [here](#).

As mentioned in the agenda proposal, a deep-dive discussion was held after ACER's presentation on item 6 below.

3. *EUROPGEN: views on SPGM definition*

Keith Chambers presents the slides, which are available [here](#).

The core of the presentation is on the issues faced by SPGM manufacturers in those countries that continue to interpret the compounding rules for SPGMs (*Whereas (11)* in particular) as not treating individual independent synchronous generating units as SPGMs.

The Chair says that aggregation topics will be tackled in ACER's presentation later on (item 6 below).

Mike Kay (GEODE) suggests that based on discussions with stakeholders it would be advantageous to choose, another word than "aggregation" for the consideration of multiple generating units. The ESC accepted that this is a good alternative, and it is possible suggested that the Commission will could replace the few occurrences of "aggregation" in the recitals and legal text with "compounding" or "accumulation"

4. *CharIN: Follow-up on NCs implication for EV and EVSE*

Julian Treichel presents the slides, which are available [here](#).

The core of the presentation is on technical issues contained in the NC RfG and NC DC drafting; to wrap up the conversation, Julian Treichel asks the EC how to take part in the "have your say" feedback;

Elaine O'Connell (EC) responds by saying that the amended legal text proposal will be published online, not before the next GC ESC meeting in September. Elaine O'Connell (EC) will make sure to circulate the link to get access to the legal text proposal with the members of the GC ESC. The "have your say" survey will be available for one month. In the meantime, the stakeholders are encouraged to share feedback or comments on ACER's recommendation to the EC.

The Chair notes that when drafting the code amendment proposal, ACER notes that the system operators could operate the grids with a very small number of migrating cars, which are not compliant per se in that country. Therefore, as soon as vehicles are homologated to be sold in the EU, then they would be able to freely migrate and be charged and discharged, wherever this may be. It was a conscious decision aiming at decreasing the costs for the manufacturers.

5. *ENTSO-E: A. IGDs planning, B. Grid Forming, C. Power to Gas*

A. Mario Ndreko presents the slides on IGDs planning which are available [here](#).

Following up on the presentation, ACER addressed several Q&As.

The Chair asks ENTSO-E if the content in slide 4 is a reference to the implementation monitoring platform ([link](#)), non-exhaustive parameters as implemented in different member States. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) responds that the mentioned IGD refers to the guidance on some parameters selection that should be updated considering

NC 2.0 new requirements that shall be met, providing recommendations, for example, given ranges, etc. The issue is, hence, not linked to monitoring activities.

The Chair asks if ENTSO-E plans on working in parallel on more than three IGDs. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) responds that new IGDs need to be parallel with the new IGDs. There are some experiences already; ENTSO-E is planning to work in parallel, prioritizing the delivery of a reasonable number of IGDs according to the available resources.

ACTION The Chair asks ENTSO-E to keep the stakeholders close for the IGD drafting and consulting. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) responds that ENTSO-E initiated technical groups, such as on Grid Forming involving stakeholders to promote discussions and collect relevant inputs before drafting all relative IGDs. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) remarks that each IGD will undergo a one-month public consultation process.

Comments from the ESC members – in chronological order by bullet points:

- Michael Van Bossuyt (IFIEC) asks for clarity for on IGDs detailed scope (e.g. LFDD).
- Thierry (Eurelectric) – Comment - it is important that IGD development has a strong involvement of stakeholders. For this purpose, it is important to share more details on the expected scope of planned IGD.
- Laurent Schmit (Smarten) on IGDs – Comment - remarks the importance of focusing on EVs bidirectional use case - charging.
- Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) replies that a dedicated IGD on EVs is covered in the development plan even if it is not marked as a top priority, since most of the NC 2.0 requirements for EVs are exhaustive. This IGD will be drafted during the 3 years implementation period.
- Vidushi Dembi (Wind Europe)- Question on IGD on Automatic connection/reconnection and admissible active power ramp – asks for updates on the timeline.
- Response from Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E)- the timeline is still under discussion
- Vidushi Dembi (Wind Europe)- remarks that ENTSO-E and WindEurope are working in the abovementioned Technical Group on Oscillations (FO), asks ENTSO-E the reason why the relative IGD is not mentioned in the presented plan on the coming IGDs. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) replies that ENTSO-E is available to discuss an anticipated release of the IGD on FO, according to the availability of resources.
- Bernhard Schowe (EFAC)- comments on certification (slide 4 presented), remarking that the topic is not reported in the list of the most urgent IGDs to be drafted. Moreover, the EG HCF report is mentioned as basis for supporting the drafting phase under ENTSO-E responsibility. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) replies that ENTSO-E is available to discuss an anticipated release of the IGD on certification, according to the availability of resources.
- Luca Guenzi (EU Turbines)- comments on IGD on EVs and P2G demand unit
- Freddy Alcazar (EUGINE) – comments on how IGDs will be implemented - towards ENTSO-E

ACTION: ENTSO-E to present the IGDs development plan, which provides more structure/planning/scope, at the GC ESC September meeting.

B. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) presents the slides on Grid Forming, which are available [here](#).

Comments from the ESC members:

- Michael Van Bossuyt (IFIEC) stresses and comments on the need for stakeholder involvement.
- Luca Guenzi (EU Turbines) comments that CENELEC is very active and asks that their work be considered. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) replies that CENELEC is part of the technical group.

- Laurent Schmit (Smarten) – comments on solar vs. wind technologies inclusion in the group scope. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) responds that depends it on PGM types, as per the NC RfG 2.0 draft.

C. Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) presents the slides on the Urgency of core technical requirements for power-to-gas demand facilities (link [here](#)).

Comments from the ESC members:

- Michael Van Bossuyt (IFIEC) mentions that there is a need to define the scope better and make a distinction of existing electrolyze technologies from the power to gas.

ACTION The Chair states that the points mentioned in the presentation will be brought to NRAs' attention.

6. ACER: A. Grid Connection NC HVDC Amendments, B. ACER views on aggregation of PGMs – NC RfG 2.0

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

Comments from the ESC members during ACER's presentations of NC RfG 1.0 examples:

- Keith Chambers (Europgen) – general comments on ACER on aggregation examples
- Tony Hearne (DSO Entity) – further comments on the aggregation as examples for new emerging use cases
- Freddy Alcaraz (EUGINE) – asks for clarity of the legal text so that the risk of different interpretations is reduced.

Comments and replies from the ESC members after/during ACER - RfG 2.0 slides presentation – in chronological order by bullet points:

- Mike Kay (GEODE)- comment on “installation” wording (slide22) – in English “installation” is a synonym for “facility”, so it would be better to use a construction like “piece of equipment” or “a grouping” in this context.
- Mike Kay (GEODE) – comments on ownership/ assets of Grid Connections and asked if it was possible for there to be more than one party holding a connection agreement with the RSO.
- Nawid Sadighi (BNetzA) - comments on ownership/ assets of Grid Connections. “Owner” vs. “Operator” clarification needed.
- Marco Pasquadibisceglie (ARERA) –explanations on Italian example- could be 2 owners (facility owner) and PV plant (owner).
- Freddy Alcaraz (EUGINE) makes further comments, restating the legal text's need for clarity of the aggregation rules.
- Tony Hearne (DSO Entity)- further comments - the facility owner has the contract with DSOs and shall be responsible.
- Keith Chambers (Europgen) –comments- there is room for clarification. He asks that the EC improve the clarity in the legal text.
- Elaine O'Connell (EC) and Uros Gabrijel (as ESC Chair) respond – in case of any comments, EC and ACER welcome the inputs.
- Mike Kay (GEODE) – comment on ACER examples - different underlying technologies- ACER is talking about different technologies in a different way because, actually, storage and PV are different, yet because coupled at DC, ACER says they are not different. Whereas an inverter for PV and the converter

in an ESM can look identical from the network - there's a lot of scope for uncertainty in how these rules will be applied in practice.

- Mike Kay (GEODE) comments on ACER—on slide 32, misleading if you don't show the demand on the site—on limiting Pmax. The concern is the confusion of Pmax with PGMs on the site and the export capacity from the site, which is a commercial, rather than technical, consideration.
- Georgios Antonopoulos (ACER)- reacted to the questions by mentioning there is room for different interpretations, even under the current connection codes. Therefore, the agreement between the system operator and the facility owner is key, which, to our understanding, is any case implied in the current RG because of the economic unit, which is an investor decision.
- Nawid Sadighi (BNetzA) comments on aggregation examples (slides 30-32 from ACER), highlighting the legal aspects and outcomes and enforcing questions on the treatment of aggregation/accumulation of different technologies before the connection point.
- The Chair reacted: Regarding Pmax, the owner presumed is subject to the connection agreement and the information submitted to the DSO in its own deliberations on the connection request.
- Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) –Question (to ACER) on storage and power to gas demand units: How will they be treated?
- Georgios Antonopoulos (ACER) replies to ENTSO-E, mentioning these are questions that might need to be covered in the future. At the moment, questions of which NC applies to which case, considering mixed customers sides, when including generation and demand, behind the single converter. Further discussion in the future is to be covered within RfG.
- **ACTION** –The Chair mentions that an IGD could be initiated on the topic raised by ENTSO-E (Mario Ndreko) above.
- Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) –need to understand how to put the requirements, depending on capacity and unit level.
- Vidushi Dembi (WindEurope) – comment on ownership and economic units. Question on interpretation within the legal text (e.g. Pmax- before the connection point). This is an open discussion.
- Georgios Antonopoulos (ACER) – replies by saying there are possibilities to try to capture everything in one legal document, as per ACER examples showed. A guidance document or something similar could be a solution at the end to try to capture as many examples as possible. If the stakeholders agree on these examples and the implications, that could also be a possibility.
- Freddy Alcaraz (EUGINE)– question on reactive power on slide 31 (ACER) –in this case of 2 PPM, should each of them comply with the requirements at the point of connection or do you aggregate that requirement depends of the size?
- Georgios Antonopoulos (ACER)- reacts - depends on the owner's decision, as per the example for RfG. 1.0 – slides.
- Mike Kay (GEODE)- further comments on reactive power – if units are not aggregated, they will not be able to meet the reactive power requirements at the connection point, unless the RfG allows pro-rata compliance – which it currently does not.
- Georgios Antonopoulos (ACER)- reacted: there are MS /SO allowing to use PPM to be separated under single connection point.
- Mike Kay (Geode) – further question in case of it is not the case of a MS, the difficulty of understanding /interpreting the law.
- Georgios Antonopoulos (ACER)- reacted by saying this is not a technical issue, with reference to UK example.
- Vidushi Dembi (WindEurope)- comment on example 5 of ACER- questions and clarification needed on compliance.
- Georgios Antonopoulos (ACER)- reacted by mentioning that this is based on the owner/investor decision.
- Alberto Ceretti (CENELEC)– comment/question on slide 32 (ACER slides). Limitations should be clear, e.g. transition circuit are not limited.

- Georgios Antonopoulos (ACER)- reacted by mentioning that the limitation is on Pmax (exemplifying on Pmax) – Once you define Pmax, then you define the type of the unit, and it will not be restricted.
- Tony Hearne (DSO Entity) – comment on reactive power needs- should need separate consideration in the examples.
- Mireia Espadaler (Solar Power Europe) – Question on aggregation (what is the default case in case when developers decide to have single plants or combined – how the agreement will be defined. Question to ACER for further comments opportunities.
- Georgios Antonopoulos (ACER) reacted there are provisions (process clearly defined in RfG). Furthermore, invited SPE to share comments within EC and to ACER.
- Bernhard Schowe (EFAC)- comments on in Germany there is an approach for multiple PGMs, behind a single connection point sharing reactive power compliance.
- Laurent Schmit (Smarten) – Clarification asked of the capability of EVs- considering PV inverters, storage units and charged with DC.
- Georgios Antonopoulos (ACER)- at the moment, the electric vehicles are separated because they have harmonized exhaustive requirements.

7. ENTSO-E - Investigation on Default Underfrequency Support Settings

Rene Suchantke (ENTSO-E) presents the slides, which are available [here](#)

Comments from the ESC members

- Adeline Houtart (EHPA) –makes remarks related to the Heat Pumps industry position, mentioning DSR and asking for to be consulted in the process of GC.
- The Chair, comments to understand EHPA statement, mentioning that ACER and ENTSO-E welcome any further comments.
- Veerle Beelaerts (EHI) makes remarks on heat pumps and asks for attention to investment and harmonised rules.
- Klaus Oberhauser (VGBE) makes remarks from the generation side on quality of frequency and balancing issues –particular attention to the possible stability or other issues associated with the reconnection of the demand, e.g. large number of heat pumps.
- Mario Ndreko (ENTSO-E) -comments to EHPA- main message is that the entire industry is involved and invites EHPA to join the work of ESC (e.g. DSR, out-of-range frequency of HPs).

8. AOB - GC ESC December remote/physical meeting

ACTIONS

- Agreement that in December 2024, both ESC GC and SO will also be held in person in Brussels, Belgium. Hybrid meetings will also be available
- Dates remain unchanged (09.12.2024- GC ESC) and (10.12.2024– SO ESC) – hosted by ENTSO-E (on 09.12.2024) and DSO Entity (on 10.12.2024)

9. SO-GC Joint Session

Agenda. A. ENTSO-E Project inertia updates, B. EU Turbines: Self-synchronizing clutches for power plants

A. ENTSO-E Project inertia updates. Joao Moreira presents the slides [here](#)

João Moreira of ENTSO-E focuses on the need in the immediate future for additional inertia distributed across the European system to be able to cope satisfactorily with system splits issues.

Elaine O'Connell (European Commission) updates the group on a study being conducted by the European Commission on the same topic. The study will take about nine months, and it is not intended to duplicate what ENTSO-E is currently doing. The EC will be more forward-looking, investigating what types of technologies can provide inertia. Elaine O'Connell suggests having a conversation with ENTSO-E to avoid overlaps.

Freddy Alcaraz (EUGINE) asks, referring to slide 12, whether the study will be considering rotating synchronous generation using green gases, like hydrogen; Joao Moreira responds by saying whatever technical solution capable of providing inertia should be considered, including plant driven by including green gases.

Luca Guenzi (EU Turbines) asks for clarification on the right-hand graph in slide 8. In particular, Luca Guenzi asks whether `hmin_fixed_100` requires zero time; Joao Moreira responds by saying that it would mean that `hmin_fixed_100`, the actual curve, would be above the minimum equivalent H all the time. The graph on slide 10 provides a better picture of what is being explained.

Assiet Aren (EUGINE) asks, in relation to inertia markets, whether the study will consider only new PGMs or allow existing power units to be involved in this market. Joao Moreira responds by saying that a wide range of solutions will be needed, and the project inertia is working in this open future hypothesis scenario.

Alberto Cerretti (CENELEC) asks for clarification on the relation between this study and grid forming, saying that, as he understood it, grid forming issue has nothing to do with this, it's only just one of the means to assure the quantity of inertia.

The Chair asks whether there is room for further guidance at the EU level as, for example, in the past, even small countries could split in two, and their control area would be in two different islands; Joao Moreira responds that in the future, the project will look at the examples where a country can split in two, for instance, Germany.

B. EU Turbines: Self-synchronizing clutches for power plants

Luca Guenzi presents the slides, which are available [here](#).

Luca Guenzi explains the possibilities of self-synchronizing clutches for existing or future SPGMs, i.e., turning an SPGM into a synchronous condenser and back into an SPGM on demand.

10. CENELEC: Current state of work on the standards

Alberto Cerretti presents the slides, which are available [here](#)

The agenda includes several points, such as the current status of the EN 50549 Standard and new projects/initiatives

Comments from the ESC members

- Luca Guenzi (EU Turbines) mentioned collected feedback and ongoing projects on the conformity assessment of larger generating units (Type C and D). This project still needs to be officially formalised.

11. ACEA's views on Grid Connections

Adriana Pop (ACEA) and Leonhard Bartsch (ACEA) present the slides, which are available [here](#).

ACEA supports the Commission's intention to amend the regulation for the Network Code on Demand Connection to prevent blackouts and address regulatory needs to harmonise grid codes within the EU.

ACEA expressed strong support for the proposed amendment and emphasized the importance of harmonising standards.

Georgios Antonopoulos (ACER) clarifies that, with regard to standards, according to the proposed Network Codes 2.0 the combination of both the EV and the associated EVSE has to comply with the requirements of the proposed codes.

The Chair extended an invitation to the ACEA to join the ESC for efficient discussions and to stay informed about industry challenges related to the implementation of the forthcoming amendments to the grid connection codes.

ACTION – ACER, ENTSO-E and EU DSO Entity to follow up to formalize ACEA membership with ESC.

End of the meeting

The Chair thanked all the participants and ended the meeting.