39th Grid Connection European Stakeholder Committee (GC ESC)

18 September 2025, 09:30-11:30

Location: ACER offices, Trg republike 3, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

Minutes

Participants		
Uros Gabrijel	ACER	Chairperson
Adriana Pop	ACEA	Member
Leonhard Bartsch	ACEA	Member Substitute
Marco Pasqua di Bisceglie	ARERA	Member
Marc Malbrancke	CEDEC	Member
Thomas Schaupp	CENELEC	Member
Alberto Cerretti	CENELEC	Member
Julian Treichel	CharIN	Member
Alexandra Tudoroiu-Lakavičė	COGEN	Member
Gunnar Kaestle	COGEN	Member
Florentien Benedict	DSO Entity	Member
Tony Hearne	DSO Entity	Member
Serdar Bolat	DSO Entity	Member
Andrea Hamzova	DSO Entity	Member Substitute
Arthur Hubert	EURELECTRIC	Member
Santiago Gallego Amores	E.DSO	Member
Bernhard Schowe-von der Brelie	EFAC	Member
Freddy Alcazar	EUGINE	Member
Richard Masquelier	EHI	Member
Mélanie Auvray	EHPA	Member
Marco Zaccaria	ENTSO-E	Member
Flemming Brinch Nielsen	ENTSO-E	Member
Juan Giner	ENTSO-E	Member
Simone Scala	ENTSO-E	Guest
Sergio Martinez Villanueva	ENTSO-E	Member
Ellen Beckstedde	EUI/FSoR	Observer
Jakub Fijalkowski	European Commission	Observer
Keith Chambers	EUROPGEN	Member
Luca Guenzi	EU Turbines	Member
Steffen Eckstein	EU Turbines	Member Substitute
Herve Biellman	EU Turbines	Member Substitute
Assiet Aren	EUGINE	Member
Thierry Vinas	EURELECTRIC	Member
Mike Kay	GEODE	Member
Erno Leväniemi	GEODE	Member Substitute

Isabel Alcalde	Hydrogen Europe	Member
Michael van Bossuyt	IFIEC	Member
Martin Stoessl	Orgalim	Member
Catarina Augusto	Solar Power Europe	Member Substitute
Thorsten Buelo	Solar Power Europe	Member
Rainer Fronius	Vgbe energy e. V.	Member
Klaus Oberhauser	Vgbe energy e. V.	Member
Klaus Pfefferkorn	Vgbe energy e. V.	Member Substitute
Roman Bertle	Vgbe energy e. V.	Member Substitute
Vidushi Dembi	WindEurope	Member

1. Opening

1.1. Review of the agenda

The Chair opens the meeting and asks for comments on the agenda and AOB.

- Thierry Vinas (Eurelectric) asks to get any updates from the European Commission on the next steps for RfG 2.0 and DC 2.0 NCs under the AOB.
- Luca Guenzi (EU Turbines) requests feedback on the consultation regarding the network code on demand response and inertia markets.
- Gunnar Kaestle (COGEN Europe) referring to three grid incidents discussed the day before during the SO ESC, asks to include a brief discussion item to summarize lessons learned and potential changes needed in requirements. He suggests that if this initial discussion is considered useful, a more detailed agenda item could be included in the next GC ESC meeting.

1.2. Approval of minutes from 05/06/2025 meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting are approved and can be accessed here.

1.3. Follow-up actions from previous meeting

Juan Giner (ENTSO-E) reminds that the ongoing actions will be tracked in the minutes instead of the previous Excel action tracker.

The following action points still need to be addressed:

- **Action – FMI standards:** To open the discussion again later in 2026
- **Action - Baltic region synchronisation with the Continental Europe system**: To investigate synchronisation of Baltic region and report back during the next meeting on the requirements that currently apply to the Baltic region

Freedy Alcazar (EUGINE) mentions that EUGINE will propose to discuss the FMI standards in the first GC ESC meeting of 2026.

2. ACER – Briefing on P2G Workstream updates

The Chair provides an update on the P2G workstream. He mentions it was decided to revive the initiative earlier this year. Since the last update in June, two additional meetings were held on 9th July and 28th August, with significant progress made.

A draft legal text has been developed, and mutual understanding of technical challenges—mainly on the chemical side rather than the converter side—has improved. These challenges vary depending on technology, unit size, and configuration. The next meeting is scheduled for 6th October, with future meetings to be decided based on the progress of the draft legal text improvement and the necessary discussions on proposed topics.

3. *European Commission – Clarification on DR NC "Have your say" EC consultation – implications on DC NC*

Jakub Fijalkowski (European Commission) gives an update on this item. Regarding Thierry's request for AOB, there is no new definite information, and the adoption of amended regulations remains on hold. However, awareness of the relevance of the grid connection codes is increasing, and previous stakeholder actions and letters sent to the EC have had a positive effect. Stakeholders are encouraged to maintain pressure, with the hope that the work on CNC can begin once the CACM file is closed in the coming months.

Regarding the Demand Response Network Code and to ensure consistency with existing regulations, awareness has been raised of proposed changes on the NC DC 2.0 and possible timing inconsistencies. Two options are under consideration: (1) insert the changes in NC DC 1.0 or (2) delay the NC DR changes until a general NC DC revision. Jakub Fijalkowski (European Commission) shares a preliminary slight preference for the second option to avoid signalling that some changes are more important than the overall NC DC revision. A solution will be found collaboratively.

Luca Guenzi (EU Turbines) remarks the opportunity of exploiting the demand response regulation to introduce local inertia markets in the EU regulation. Comments were provided a year ago to promote its introduction into the regulation. Luca Guenzi (EU Turbines) remarks a recognized need for a market framework for inertia, considering future inertia requirements already by 2030. Currently, no other initiatives address this market except the NC DR, making it a key opportunity to integrate these comments into the legal framework. Jakub Fijalkowski (European Commission) notes that the inertia issue could be addressed in different ways. It may be covered during the revision of SOGL as part of broader updates. Another option is to consider a policy where inertia is procured centrally rather than as a local product, with distribution ensured accordingly. While the issue is acknowledged and some work from ENTSO-E is ongoing on the methodology, Jakub Fijalkowski (European Commission) suggests bringing it to the DR at this stage may cause delay.

Thierry Vinas (Eurelectric) comments that while discussions at the Member State level (e.g., by national administrations in Germany, France, or Italy) are progressing well, efforts should focus more on advocating at the EU level to the European Commission the urgency of the connection codes updates.

Jakub Fijalkowski (European Commission) notes that discussions on this matter are expected to start once the CACM file is closed, likely toward the end of the year. Additional pressure is unlikely to accelerate the timeline. If no tangible updates are available by the December meeting, pursuing action at that point could be considered. For now, active follow-up is not perceived as necessary.

Michaël Van Bossuyt (IFIEC) emphasizes that visibility on how NC DC will relate to the Demand Response network code and its timing is important. The NC DC work will be split across different areas to ensure consistency with the NC DR, making it essential to understand what will be addressed, where needed. Jakub Fijalkowski (European Commission) acknowledges the importance of the points raised and will be discussed internally and with ACER, given the allocation of responsibilities between network codes.

Mike Kay (GEODE) asks for clarification about the mentioned two options, raising a question on the first one whether the marked-up changes to the NC DC 1.0 would be subject to a new consultation, or simply taken forward through the existing process. Jakub clarifies that, while the decision is not yet final, there would likely be limited room for a new consultation. If option 1 is pursued—integrating targeted changes into DCC 1.0—the expectation is that these would proceed directly as an interim solution rather than through a full consultation process.

Gunnar Kaestle (COGEN Europe) remarks the importance of ensuring level playing field. Moreover, he emphasizes that a balanced distribution of inertia is important to avoid risks, such as losing inertia in the event of a system split. An example from Germany is provided, where biogas plants can provide flexibility and, with appropriate technical equipment, could contribute up to 20 GW of rotating machinery capacity, even when not actively burning biomass.

Isabel Alcalde (Hydrogen Europe) notes that, while early approval of the NC DC is important, pursuing option one as an interim solution would bypass the European Commission's consultation. Since a call for evidence was recently held for the Demand Response network code, it is remarked the importance for stakeholder to be involved. The recommendation is therefore to follow the normal procedure and move forward with the NC DC 2.0 as quickly as possible, also to avoid issues with Member States implementing their own network codes independently.

Richard Masquelier (EHI) shares a comment similar to Isabel Alcalde (Hydrogen Europe)'s one. While acknowledging the need to maintain political awareness and pressure on the Demand Connection code, it is noted that this would not accelerate the file. He seeks the clarification on the strategy for maintaining pressure—whether this means continuing to send high-level letters to the Commission. The concern stresses that some Member States are beginning to implement their own demand connection codes, which is a red line, as a harmonized European approach is strongly preferred.

Flemming Brinch Nielsen (ENTSO-E) remarks that, speaking from a Member State perspective, implementing national requirements is not intended to bypass EU processes, but it becomes necessary in the absence of specific requirements for instance to ensure system stability, as legally permitted. However, he expresses preference for harmonised requirements at EU level, with a call to speed up the CNC amendment process.

4. EU DSO Entity updates

4.1. General overview

Florentien Benedict (EU DSO Entity) provides an update on EU DSO activities. A supporting document for DSOs on grid-forming roadmaps was completed, with the final version dated 28 July.

On the Expert Group on Certification, the group now includes 61 experts. Discussions cover certification for V2G, associated EV supply equipment, and heat pumps. Interaction with three DGs of the European Commission is ongoing, with a detailed presentation planned later in this meeting.

Following communication of Mr. Christof Lessenich (DG ENER) on extended timeline for Grid Connection Network Codes, a letter was sent in July to the EC, highlighting the need to facilitate renewable energy integration, promote distribution network planning and operation, and support internal market functioning. Four main risks were identified: increased system costs, unfair energy transition, delayed renewable energy integration, and lower system stability. The letter emphasized the need to finalize and implement amended codes promptly, requesting European Commission prioritization.

Regarding Iberian Incident Investigation, EU DSO Entity requests formal participation in preparing factual and final reports, contributing analysis and recommendations. The proposal of revising the relevant legislation to assess grid incidents, from Article 15 of Regulation 2017/1485, to ensure DSO involvement in line with Article 55 of Regulation 2019/943, is emphasised.

4.2. Supporting grid-forming document

A supporting document for DSOs on grid-forming power park modules was finalized on 28 July, after a full consultation process. Dissemination will follow board approval (18 September), with stakeholders and regulators to be informed. The document underwent consultation throughout its development, and efforts will be made to ensure that everyone is informed once the final version is published.

4.3. FRT LV – internal survey

An update is provided on the UV FRT questionnaire conducted under EU DSO Entity with member companies. The RFG 2.0 Network Code introduces new requirements for type A generators. DSOs generally do not anticipate major issues in adjusting settings to comply, though detailed analysis may be needed in some cases to mitigate the risk of uncontrolled islands. Some DSOs are still assessing solutions, which may require investments or operational changes. The new settings will apply only to new generation, allowing time to address any issues.

Gunnar Kaestle (COGEN Europe) suggests that regarding the terminology “low voltage ride-through” refers to generators connected to low-voltage grids, not to voltage dips. Low voltage is defined as below 1,000 volts AC. The Entity agrees and the term undervoltage fault ride through would be used in future.

Assiet Aren (EUGINE) comments linking the presentation to the previous expert group investigation on European harmonized certification and product family definitions. He notes that in Spain, the smallest product definitions require repeated testing, which can cause issues. The key takeaway is that fulfilling the requirement and demonstrating that the machine meets the requirements is important, but repeating tests for different products is not necessary. Special chapters outline how FRT tests should be conducted and how product family definitions should be applied.

Gunnar Kaestle (COGEN Europe) gives a brief clarification on conformity assessment for FRT. According to the CENELEC Test Standard EN 50549 10, it is possible to perform conformity testing on a computer using certified and validated components. If components A, B, and C have known features, the full system can be simulated digitally for testing. Further details may be provided by Luca, who has more familiarity with the standard.

The presentation on EU DSO Entity updates is accessible here.

5. ENTSO-E updates on Technical Groups

Juan Giner (ENTSO-E) provides updates on the ongoing ENTSO-E's technical groups involving stakeholders. Two groups were launched in June 2024. One on Forced Oscillations (TG FO) with WindEurope as the only stakeholder, and one on Grid Forming Capability (TG GFC) with wider stakeholder participation.

The TG FO is developing a methodology to detect forced oscillations and verify compliance of PPMs with draft NC RfG 2.0, as well as assessing the suitability of proposed default ranges simulations.

The TG GFC is updating ENTSO-E's Phase I report to incorporate stakeholders' feedback, aiming to deliver a Phase II report that proposes exhaustive grid forming requirements and compliance verification schemes based on the requirements defined in draft NC RfG 2.0.

Both groups will deliver ENTSO-E's reports reflecting a compromise between ENTSO-E's and stakeholders' views. Final conclusions and outcomes are expected to be presented at the December GC ESC meeting. Involved stakeholders were invited to add an appendix to each report to explain diverging views (if any). Most stakeholders indicated support for the report, pending review of the final version. ENTSO-E is now addressing received feedback from internal and stakeholders' review. Only editorial changes are accepted at this stage, with technical comments to be reflected in the appendix. Finalized reports are expected to be ready by the end of September, with publication planned for October. Stakeholders will be informed once they are available online, ahead of the December meeting.

Alberto Cerretti (CENELEC) notes that the previous review period had already expired. He highlights that once the text is approved, any subsequent changes would require another working group session which will slow down the process. Juan Giner (ENTSO-E) clarifies that only editorial comments were accepted during this second review period.

Luca Guenzi (EU Turbines) requests feedback on the ongoing discussions regarding forced oscillation, noting a lack of visibility on the topic. Clarification is needed on the scope of work; specifically, how forced oscillation affects overall PPMs requirements and the system's behaviour. He asks whether there are any detailed documents or information available to better understand the ongoing analysis. Rainer Fronius (VGB Powertech) shares concern given that the document may be finalized with only limited opportunity for discussion. The Chair clarifies that the forced oscillations addressed in the TG FO are coming from mechanical oscillations that impact wind turbines. Juan Giner (ENTSO-E) further explains that the forced oscillations requirements discussed apply to all PPMs but are mainly relevant for wind turbines, which are more exposed to external oscillations and therefore investigated in the ENTSO-E report. Besides, this TG on FO focuses on requirements defined in the draft NC RfG 2.0, and this is not linked to the ongoing Iberian black-out investigation. These TGs correspond to ENTSO-E preparatory work for future Implementation Guidance Documents (IGDs), under its legal mandate. A public consultation will be launched on each IGD once the amended regulation is adopted; ENTSO-E made an exception to involve stakeholders at an earlier stage, but ENTSO-E still has the legal mandate to draft the IDGs in accordance with the regulation. Main conclusions and takeaways will be presented in December, and feedback collected will be considered during the IGDs work.

Gunnar Kaestle (COGEN Europe) says that clarification on forced oscillation is needed. It refers not only to wind tower movement, but also involves effects observed in field tests with small wind farms, biogas plants, battery inverters, and power-to-heat systems. In tests with connected heat units, damping varied, including instances of negative damping, which is considered a type of forced oscillation. Juan Giner (ENTSO-E) explains that the technical group is currently studying periodic oscillations caused by external factors, such as waves for wind turbines, focusing on sub-synchronous ranges. Flemming Brinch Nielsen (ENTSO-E) adds that the group assesses the requirements for forced oscillations defined in the draft NC RfG 2.0 but does not provide design solutions to mitigate these oscillations, developers should decide how to comply. The relevant proposals are included in draft NC RfG 2.0 and apply broadly, not just to wind but also to PV systems and other PPMs. Marco Zaccaria (ENTSO-E) remarks that the TG FO was triggered mainly to provide additional details and deep dive the proposed default settings and values included in the related articles of the draft NC RfG 2.0 requirements. While the focus on this TG FO is on wind turbines, the regulation applies to all PPMs.

Hervé Biellmann (EUTurbines) asks whether the studies on forced oscillations and sub-synchronous resonances, currently focused on wind generation, will have implications for traditional turbine generators—specifically regarding shaft line frequency resonances or required protections. Juan Giner (ENTSO-E) reacts that the work applies only to non-synchronous generators (PPMs). The technical group is not designing solutions to reduce oscillations but is developing a methodology to evaluate and check compliance with the draft NC RfG 2.0 limits in the sub-synchronous range. Default values in the code are assessed, with recommendations for flexibility where needed, but detailed mitigation measures are out of scope.

Action – ENTSO-E to inform GC ESC once the reports from the TG FO and TG GFC are published.

The full presentation can be found here.

6. ESC EG on Certification on EVs/HPs - updates

Mike Kay (GEODE) gives an update mentioning that slides were updated after a recent Commission meeting. Since June, both workstreams have advanced draft technical annexes for possible inclusion in NC RfG 2.0 and NC DC 2.0 and engaged with the Commission on certification issues. The EV workstream received a request from ENTSO-E to review LFSM-UC aspects, with a meeting still pending. New members, including Tesla, have joined, and potentially ChargeUp, strengthening the work's credibility with the Commission.

Julian Treichel (CharIN) continues an update on EVs, clarifying that work is ongoing on the technical annex for RfG 2.0, expected for completion by end of the year. It introduces interoperability functions between EVs and EVSE, along with new EV testing requirements to support a European-wide EV certification scheme. EVSE will continue under national grid code compliance. Discussions are ongoing on whether EV certification could be integrated into vehicle type approval. For NC DC 2.0, a technical annex will also be developed soon.

Leonhard Bartsch (ACEA) highlights two key issues: on certification, grid code compliance is currently national, but vehicles need a European-wide certification with minimal bureaucracy. On timing, certification affects onboard charger design and may trigger full vehicle type re-approval. It was also mentioned that whether DG ENER could set regulatory requirements while another (e.g., DG GROW) manages certification.

Mike Kay (GEODE) continues an update on Heat pumps workstream, saying the workstream is drafting a technical annex for the DC code, focusing on test methods and simpler LFSM-UC approaches. Turning to certification for both heat pumps and EVs, discussions with the Commission (DG ENER, DG MOVE, DG GROW) highlights possible certification routes (CE marking, homologation), but details remain complex. For heat pumps there are uncertainties over how the NC DC 2.0 requirements could align with heat pump type definitions in the Ecodesign regulations. For EVs and EVSEs, the EV workstream now has the view that EVSE should be certified by member states in the same way as, and alongside, Type A generation. And for EVs, as above, ACEA and other stakeholders are still considering the pros and cons of certification via the vehicle homologation requirements. The work is expected to continue into 2026, with updated terms of reference planned for approval at the December ESC.

Flemming Brinch Nielsen (ENTSO-E) asks whether the working group's role includes making new technical proposals for the RfG or is limited to standardization between vehicles and charging equipment.

The response of Mike Kay (GEODE) clarifies that the aim is not to change technical requirements but possibly to provide clarifications in a technical annex on implementation and testing. However, minor tweaks to the legal text may be needed, as suggested by ENTSO-e in their July proposal to the EV workstream in July. Mike Kay said that the underlying performance requirements are not in question.

Gunnar Kaestle (COGEN Europe) asks how an EVSE can be certified or tested without knowing which specific EV is connected to it.

Mike Kay (GEODE) answers that EVSE and EV can be certified separately because relevant standards define required functions and communications between them, ensuring interoperability regardless of specific pairings.

Action – Mike Kay (GEODE) to arrange an update of the EG Certification's Terms of Reference for the December ESC GC.

The slides are accessible at the following link here.

7. CENELEC updates

Alberto Cerretti (CENELEC) provides updates on family standard 50549. Edition 2 is being prepared (not amendments), with comments being collected before work begins. All three Edition 2 updates will follow the publication of the new network codes.

Thomas Schaupp (CENELEC) continues, explaining that the 2nd edition has been finalized internally as of August after multiple working rounds. A working document is currently circulating within the technical committee, with minimal feedback expected. If the November inquiry is positive, publication is anticipated by mid-2026. This work predates RfG 2.0, and its revision in the context of RfG 2.0 will begin afterward.

Leonhard Bartsch (ACEA) asks question about the timeline for the RfG 2.0 revision or amendment, specifically regarding when it will be available to align the 50549 standard with the RfG 2.0 requirements.

Thomas Schaupp (CENELEC) answers that the RfG 2.0 revision will take place after RfG 2.0 itself is published. No timeline can be provided currently, as progress depends on the European Commission. The first step will be revising EN 50549-1 and EN 50549-2, followed by targeted updates to EN 50549-10, which are expected to be minor.

Gunnar Kaestle (COGEN Europe) raises concern that grid-forming inverters may not meet certification requirements. The question is whether similar conflicts exist with standard 50549-2, and if certification of grid-forming inverters could face hurdles.

Thomas Schaupp (CENELEC) responds that a grid forming standard is urgently needed, as grid forming units do not match grid following requirements, and tweaking them may or may not make them compliant. The evaluation of grid forming units was delayed. A consolidated comment list from the first draft is being implemented into a new draft, which will include optional deactivation of grid forming, closed-loop stability tests, and test cases for PV and wind generation. Publication is expected in October 2026.

Thierry Vinas (Eurelectric) seeks clarification on Gunnar's remark that grid forming assets do not meet grid following requirements, and whether this affects the deployment of grid forming technologies.

Thomas Schaupp (CENELEC) answers that grid following standards have specific requirements for current injection during faults, which depend on grid conditions. Grid forming units behave differently, so testing them against grid following standards is often ineffective. Separate standards for grid forming units are needed.

Thorsten Buelo (SolarPower Europe) says that today's standards were designed for grid following control, but using grid forming control is not prohibited as long as the requirements are met. Some adjustments may be needed, but critical aspects, such as islanding detection, differ significantly for grid following units, which is currently a key challenge for defining grid forming requirements in distribution networks.

Alberto Cerretti (CENELEC) continues updating on the new projects on dispatchable loads. The project leader is Gunnar Kaestle. The draft is under approval of CCMC for circulation with an official decision expected at the plenary in November. Expert support is still needed, and delivery depends on approval and sufficient experts. Three new work items from the Swiss Technical Committee cover Type C, Type D, and testing led by Luca Guenzi.

Working Group 03 approved an official position to TC8X text and national committees to reduce delays in RfG 2.0 and DC 2.0 publication, highlighting risks of inconsistent national requirements, increased costs, and potential system stability issues. Italy has aligned its national roadmap with CENELEC standards and RfG 2.0, aiming for readiness by year-end, but publication of RfG 2.0 and DCC 2.0 is critical to avoid freezing decisions and standards.

To avoid possible misalignments between EU work on GFCs and outcomes of IEC/IEEE Standards, in June 2025 TC8X officially sent a category C liaison proposal to ENTSOE. SC8A would accept a category C liaison request from ENTSOE. Marco Zaccaria (ENTSO-E) expresses his appreciation to Alberto for support and invitation. He confirms that the request is still being assessed internally and a follow-up will be provided as soon as possible.

Thomas Schaupp (CENELEC) continues that CENELEC significantly supported the TG-GFC draft and will present results at the December meeting. Stakeholders could add statements as annexes, which CENELEC used. Alignment was achieved between workstreams, and the developing CENELEC standards will align with the report's results, providing a strong basis for standardization. Harmonized standards are seen as essential to reduce risks from varying national implementations and to ensure conformity with EU directives.

The slides are accessible here.

8. AOB

8.1. Next Meeting in December 2025

The Chair informs that the next SO and GC ESC meetings are planned for December in Ljubljana, pending confirmation. An ad hoc joint ESC meeting will be organized remotely to cover incidents from the Iberian Peninsula, Northern Macedonia, and the Czech Republic, likely shortly after the factual report publication related to the Iberian Peninsula incident (3rd October). Participants may be asked to present slides.

Planning for 2026 meetings will be decided in December, coordinating internally to avoid overlaps with the ESC on market and demand response.

8.2. Other topics

The Chair mentions that Thierry Vinas (EURELECTRIC)'s request for the EC update was provided, and Luca Guenzi (EUTurbines)'s topics on demand response, network codes, and inertia markets were also discussed.

Action – ACER to organize ad hoc workshop to cover incidents from the Iberian Peninsula, Northern Macedonia, and the Czech Republic.

Annex: Action Tracker

#	Raised on	Topic	Description	Responsible	Due date
1	GC ESC 19/03/2025	FMI standards	To open the discussion again later in 2026	EUGINE & ENTSO-E	2026
2	GC ESC 05/06/2025	Baltic region synchronisation with the Continental Europe system	To investigate synchronisation of Baltic region and report back during the next meeting on the requirements that currently apply to the Baltic region	ENTSO-E	09/12/2025
3	GC ESC 18/09/2025	ENTSO-E TGs	ENTSO-E to inform GC ESC once the reports from the TG FO and TG GFC are published	ENTSO-E	When published
4	GC ESC 18/09/2025	ESC EG on Certification on EVs/HPs	To provide an update of the EG Terms of Reference for ESC approval	Mike Kay	09/12/2025
5	GC ESC 18/09/2025	AOB	To organize ad hoc meetings to cover incidents from the Iberian Peninsula, Northern Macedonia, and the Czech Republic.	ACER	After 3 October