

29th Market European Stakeholder Committee (MESC)

Wednesday, 14 September 2022, 10:30-16:00
CEER premises and Online Meeting

Draft Minutes

| Participating Members | | |
|---|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Christophe | Gence-Creux | ACER/Chair |
| Mathilde | Lallemand | EC |
| Christian | Baer | Europex |
| Rickard | Nilsson | Europex |
| Michael | Van Bossuyt | IFIEC |
| Inger Kristin | Holm | IFIEC |
| Helene | Robaye | Eurelectric |
| Donia | Peerhossaini | Eurelectric |
| Natalie | Lob | Eurelectric |
| Lorenzo | Bigilia | EFET |
| Sonia | Saly | EFET |
| Jérôme | Le Page | EFET |
| Magnus | Thorstensson | GEODE |
| Gunnar | Kaestle | COGEN Europe |
| Annette | Jantzen | EUGINE |
| Valerie | Reif | FSR |
| Thomas | Burman | ClientEarth |
| Stefan | Doerig | SmartEN |
| NRAs/ NEMOs/ACER/ ENTSO-E representatives | | |
| Amaury | Salauze | CRE |
| Clement | Poet | CRE |
| Sven | Kaiser | E-Control |
| Nico | Schoutteet | CREG |
| Lisa- Marie | Lisa-Marie | BNetzA |
| Thomas | Hölzer | BNetzA |
| Barbara | Zwinka | BNetzA |
| Rafael | Gómez-Elvira | All NEMO Committee Chairman |
| Tore | Granli | All NEMOs Committee |
| Rodrigo | Escobar Rodríguez | All NEMOs Committee |
| Rose | Sagrant | All NEMOs Committee |
| Katrin | Schmitz | ENTSO-E |
| Rodrigo | Gonzalez | ENTSO-E |
| Andre | Estermann | ENTSO-E |
| Mario | Turcik | ENTSO-E |
| Benjamin | Genêt | ENTSO-E |
| Jean | Verseille | ENTSO-E |
| Miha | Pregl | All NEMOs Committee |
| Laura Moreno | Laura Moreno | ENTSO-E |
| Javier Barrantes | Javier Barrantes | ENTSO-E |
| Kjell | Arne Barmsnes | ENTSO-E |
| Peter | Scheerer | ENTSO-E |

| Participating Members | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|---------|
| Ali | Haider | ENTSO-E |
| Volha | Veramyeva | ENTSO-E |
| Pilar | Muñoz-Elena | ENTSO-E |
| Marta | Mendoza-Villamayor | ENTSO-E |
| Zoltan | Gyulay | ENTSO-E |
| Kristine | Marcina | ENTSO-E |
| Marco | Foresti | ENTSO-E |
| Rafael | Muruais Garcia | ACER |
| Mathieu | Fransen | ACER |
| Ernst | Tremmel | ACER |
| Marco | Pavesi | ACER |
| Cristina | Vázquez Hernández | ACER |
| Athina | Tellidou | ACER |
| Thomas | Kawam | ACER |
| Zoran | Vujasinovic | ACER |
| Guro | Guro Grotterud | ACER |
| Martin | Viehhauser | ACER |

1 Opening

1.1. Welcoming address + Approval of minutes + [Draft Agenda](#) (Christophe Gence-Creux, ACER)

The Chair welcomes the participants after more than two years of online meetings and asks whether there are comments on the agenda or on the minutes of the last meeting. In the absence of comments, the agenda and the minutes of the last meeting are approved. Chair expects a lot of discussion on Market Design, Forward Markets and Demand Side Response items.

1.2. Update on recent developments (recent decisions, physical vs on-line meetings)

The Chair explains that ACER worked during the summer to release the decision on alternative BZ configurations, which was published nearly on time.

2. Market Design

2.1 Update from the EC on emergency measures and its proposal for a new market design

Mathilde Lallemand (EC) explained that a new regulation on emergency measures will be released today, and a press conference will take place in the afternoon. EC invites stakeholders to check the final text. The Council will do the revision and it will go through qualified majority voting in a fast process. Content measures cover a time span from 1 December 2022 till end of March 2023. Several actions are covered by the proposal: Demand reduction, solidarity contribution, cap of revenues of inframarginal technologies and regulated tariffs for consumers. EC remains available for questions on the implementation. Detailed planning for the market review next year is not yet confirmed.

Helene Robaye (Eurelectric) expresses concerns on implementation specifically on the complex administrative processes. Eurelectric takes note on the call for discussion and asks if the timing of the application from December till March, refers to transaction date or delivery date.

Mathilde Lallemand (EC) confirms that the implementation is a challenge and the text leaves flexibility to the Member States, and that the application is on delivered electricity, in the Commission proposal).

Christian Baer (Europex) asks if the Extraordinary Energy Council will confirm the final day to adopt it and if it would be of mandatory application for all Member States.

Mathilde Lallemand (EC) confirms there is not clear date to adopt it but is expected before the end of September 2022. She also confirms that it is applicable to all Member States as a mandatory regulation.

Jerome Le Page (EFET) highlights that the proposal has a lot of flexibility and doesn't look like a European solution. He also raises questions on the Long-Term Market Design reform and questions how little DG energy has been involved in different subjects. Mathilde Lallemand (EC) confirms that DG ENER was fully involved.

Michael Van Bossuyt (IFIEC) from the industry side, highlights that most demand reduction happens in peak hours and the risk of losing the industry all together in Europe. Despite the involvement of the Council and the Member States, IFIEC hopes and advocates to be involved on Long Term Market Design and hedging.

Zoltan Gyulay (ENTSO-E) thanks personally Mathilde and the EC colleagues for the tremendous effort and asks how long this transitory regime will be in place and how third country flows would be treated on the Market Design reform. He highlights that NEMOs, TSOs, DSOs and the Industry won't be able to solve the question if there is not clear direction on this topic. Mathilde Lallemand (EC) answers that the transitory regime is applicable for 4 months and that it is possible to extend it till one additional year. She notes the question about the third countries flows.

Peter Scheerer (ENTSO-E) makes a personal note to Mathilde to thank her and highlights the importance of the topic, Market Design affects all the timeframes and products and ongoing implementation. It is of highest priority to understand the implication on all time frames and all products.

Mathilde Lallemand (EC) explains that the Emergency regulation comes on top of current regulatory framework and corresponding implementation, and highlights that it doesn't mean the suspension of any implementation so far.

Rafael Gómez-Elvira (NEMOs) asks if unanimity is needed in the Council. He also asks about National solutions in place and if it is clear that Member States with emergency measures will need to drop them.

Mathilde Lallemand (EC) confirms that the approval is by qualified majority. National solutions will be debated in the Council. Price cap is compatible with extra tax measures.

Christian Baer (Europex) is extremely worried on the statements of the EC president that the Market was not created to integrate RES. He defends that the current Market design is fine with a couple of improvements possible.

Mathilde Lallemand (EC) explains that the impact assessment covers the different options, and it is wise not to exclude any choice.

Natalie Lob (Eurelectric) thinks that it is good to provide freedom to the Member States in the implementation. She voices her concerns on when the revenue cap will be implemented, during or after the market processes, as it is a big difference.

The Chair closes the topic and confirms that, as far as the long-term improvements are concerned, the right way to go was proposed already with the April's paper released by ACER and regulators, and they will push for that.

3. CACM

3.1 Update on CACM 2.0

Mathilde Lallemand (EC) explains that the Public Consultation answers are now published on the website. As CACM is very linked to the discussion on electricity Market Design, and due also to the lack of resources on ministries and EC, the reform of CACM will be put on hold for now. The process will re-start from next year, but there is no commitment on the date yet. It is important to have a stable vision on the Market Design first. The process will resume next year.

Jerome Le Page (EFET) explains that several points are complex and controversial, there should be a way to advance on wider topics and leave the governance topics for later.

Mathilde Lallemand (EC) explains that CACM cannot be reopen twice, better done at once, try to advance on some points to support early implementation for some parts. Governance and structure cannot be discussed now.

The Chair (ACER) explains other examples of early parallel implementation process. And invites participants to come up with a list of potential topics for early implementation for next meeting.

Nico Schoutteet (CREG) says that one year ago, there was a first initiative from NEMOs and TSOs to apply CACM 2.0, so there is room for voluntary implementation.

Helene Robaye (Eurelectric) supports the voluntary quick wins of the implementation, respecting the spirit of CACM.

The Market Coupling Steering Committee (MCSC) will come back with a list of potential topics for early implementation for next meeting.

Rafael Gómez-Elvira (NEMOs) explains that if CACM 2.0 is put on hold until we have a clear view on the new Market design, NEMOs shall receive a formal statement (e-mail, letter, ...).

Mathilde Lallemand (EC) confirms that discussions on CACM won't follow until we have clarity on the Market design. Once we have a clear view on the plan for next year, then CACM will be back on the plan. An e-mail will be sent to ECBC on the postponement.

Rafael Gómez-Elvira (NEMOs) highlights that nobody supports a single legal entity.

The Chair (ACER) confirms that governance won't be on the list of priority topics for implementation. He also confirms that he will discuss with NRAs on the areas to move early and faster and discuss this list with NEMOs and TSOs. All MESC will be consulted.

Andre Estermann (ENTSO-E) thanks for the news, asks EC and ACER to keep ENTSO-E and TSOs in the loop when CACM will be relaunched. He asks about the future FCA regulation amendments.

Mathilde (EC) informs that FCA postponement has not been discussed yet. CACM and FCA are related, and most likely FCA will happen after CACM. Forward market was also an important point of the market design review.

The Chair (ACER) explains that he will discuss with EC and NRAs and come back with some proposals at the next meeting. He also asks about the impact on the Connection Codes Amendments. Mathilde (EC) agrees that it is a fair point to be checked.

3.2 [Update on Core FB project](#): learnings from the first months after go-live and next steps

Benjamin Genêt (ENTSO-E) presents the slides. FB project had a smooth go-live, few small issues were quickly fixed. It is observed that price convergence has increased on the borders. Flow based is working correctly. Germany shows fluctuations on the net positions, peaks of importing and exporting. Peak price on 20 July in France was due to nuclear availability.

Jerome Le Page (EFET) is happy about Core FB project and that the two extra months delay had provided good outcome. He also sees progress on Intraday and looks forward to the next steps. He raises only one comment on the validation incident and how it was recorded and reported in August. There were a couple of incidents on that day, and a final delay on the data publication. He highlights that there are lessons to be learnt from this.

Benjamin Genêt (ENTSO-E) explains that we are on the way to a more mature process. The reduction linked to validation needs to be justified, specific explanations will be provided by the concerned TSOs.

Nico Schoutteet (CREG) welcomes the improvements, operationally is working, there are concerns on validation reductions and low capacities. One of the measures related to the validation of the flow based with impact on market coupling resulted on low margin related to uncoordinated validations. It adds in the table a column with time stamps. Occurrence of this problem is limited, but it has a big impact. Implement ACER decision, 20 minimum ramp is also key.

Miha Pregl (NEMOs Committee) explains that in addition to the slides showed on price convergence, Core CCR fully converged except Poland. But there is one worrying border SL/Croatia. Before Core there was full price convergence.

Gunnar Kaestle (COGEN Europe) explains that negative prices show inflexibility in the system. There is a loss of information if prices are encrypted. 15 years ago, in Germany negative prices were introduced because they give information, they are used for better market performance.

Benjamin Genêt (ENTSO-E) fully agrees, whatever the cause, grid copes with inflexibility, can be accommodated. CORE FB decision has been annulled by the court of justice; decision needs to be revisited. Make it legally compliant doesn't mean there won't be more conflict.

The Chair states that the decision will be reissued. The decision was based on formal regulation, BoR of Appeal took the decision just after CEP was released. BoR of Appeal should have taken the decision according to CEP. ACER to redo the decision according to CEP, not changes expected on the content.

Jerome Le Page (EFET): because ECJ ruling is on procedural ground, if the same content is proposed by ACER in a new CCM, can we expect a new legal fight between ACER and BNetzA, and further legal uncertainty?

BNetzA: will check position internally.

3.3 Update on the automatic increase of the max DA harmonised price and review of HMMCP methodology

Rafael Gómez-Elvira (NEMOs Committee) presents the [NEMOs committee slides](#). Yesterday, they published the communication to market participants that they suspended the increase of the maximum clearing price planned for the 20 September. NEMOs and TSOs are extremely concerned with market and energy crisis. Factual letter from NEMOs and TSOs to EC and ACER. The Energy Council called on NEMOs to avoid the increase of the clearing price. NEMOs will inform the NRAs. Ensure the proper implementation is a duty of the NRAs. New methodology will be proposed by mid-September in the PCG meeting.

Miha Pregl (NEMOs Committee) explains that NEMOs are working on the amendment of the methodology now.

The Chair confirms that ACER/EC do not have the legal ground to suspend the application of methodology and that only NRAs have enforcement powers

Mathilde Lallemand (EC) explains that in the EC letter, they expressed sympathy and understanding, but EC does not have the legal basis to suspend the application of the methodology either. She urges to accelerate the update of the methodology and its implementation following regulatory approval.

Nico Schoutteet (CREG) raises that there should be an assessment on how to handle a situation as the increase of price of Baltics.

Miha Pregl (NEMOs Committee) says that there is already a discussion not only on NEMO side, but common for NEMOs/TSOs on the Market Design Task Force.

The Chair confirms that more visibility is needed on the incident and lessons learnt.

Michael Van Bossuyt (IFIEC) raises a comment on VoLL and the suspension of methodologies. If DSR is not reacting to price signals, then the price is not high enough. Lots of discussions on price levels. Reasons behind, market on normal functioning, by lowering the cap, demand response is not triggered but curtailment is triggered instead. No grounds to suspend the methodology. Price sensibility is part of the market signal.

The Chair is not sure how relevant was this to the Baltic case but confirms that ACER believes that price signals are important. The future methodology should keep the same philosophy but limit the overall number of increases over a certain period of time to provide some stability in the current difficult context.

Rickard Nilsson (Europex) European system has dependencies on import/export. Increasing limits, NEMOs never had more than technical limits. Big assumption that increasing the price will mean more price reaction. Difficult to show, increase for no reason has also consequences.

Michael Van Bossuyt (IFIEC) says it is not a solution to change the Market Design and methodologies because individual parties don't take individual responsibilities.

Rafael Gómez-Elvira (NEMOs) says that NEMOs strongly believe in the need of pricing scarcity, and it is a key element of the Market design. NEMOs are not challenging the Market Design or methodologies. The decision is a result of a call of Member States in the Energy Council. In the middle of the review of the proposal.

Jean Verseille (ENTSO-E) – In Intra Day Market you can raise the price. Possibility for flexibility is allowed on the ID market.

Jerome La Page (EFET [presentation](#) not shown due to changed circumstances) highlights that NRAs / ACER / EC don't take responsibility. EC needs to make a formal statement. He wonders which next regulation will not be applied. He calls for legal certainty as fast as possible, and rule of law. And making sure that price caps remain technical. Decoupling ID price cap from DA should ensure that ID prices reflect true scarcity in case DA prices are capped for economic reasons

Mathilde (EC) says EC cannot overstep legal mandates. EC has a constructive approach, trying to ease the processes. But understands the process is far from ideal.

Christian Baer (Europex) says the processes are important, but we should not be stubborn in times of crisis, give good signals to the market.

Mathilde (EC) says that processes should be preserved in any case.

Michael (IFIEC) concludes that he is not in favour of high prices but just raising the awareness of the side effects of this measure.

3.4 [Update on SDAC & SIDC](#)

Miha Pregl (NEMOs Committee) provides the updates of SDAC and Jean Verseille (ENTSO-E) on SIDC.

Helene Robaye (Eurelectric) – MCCG meeting needs a deep discussion on the change of the products in Day Ahead.

Miha Pregl (NEMOs Committee) fully agrees on that statement.

Jean Verseille (ENTSO-E) data is penalizing the extension to Greece and Slovakia. Data in August shows new records. Use of platform is still attractive.

Gunnar Kaestle (COGEN Europe) raises question on time unit used.

Jean Verseille (ENTSO-E) explains that for Germany is 15 minutes, but otherwise it depends on national legislation. Cannot match 15 min product and hour product, matching is on hold.

Lorenzo Bigilia (EFET) asks if Continuous CPM will be eventually resumed.

Jean Verseille (ENTSO-E) confirms that other areas need to be prioritised at the moment, given the NRA guidance to prioritise IDAs.

Helene Robaye (Eurelectric) asks about arbitration to be done for CPM, reflects list of possible items to be rediscussed in the future. Money and resources need. SIDC requires a lot of resources. Eurelectric challenges the use of applying additional auctions.

Jerome La Page (EFET) supports Eurelectric.

Mathilde Lallemand (EC) asks for timeline IDAs - Beginning 2024 timeline for IDAs.

3.5 [Update on the BZR process](#)

Marco Pavesi (ACER) explains that ACER decision looks for maximization of the economic efficiency and cross-zonal capacity through a better BZ delineation. He explains the summary of configurations finally proposed and explains that there will be additionally 2 combinations that the TSOs will study from the two most prominent options in the course of the BZ review.

Marta Mendoza (ENTSO-E) explains that the timeline has been updated and the dates are fixed to start the study, she also highlights that there is a new step to define the combinations following ACER decision, that may require time not yet allocated. There is a public workshop on Friday (16 September 2022) where further details from ACER on its decision will be provided, as well as an update from the regions and on the liquidity and transaction cost studies. She invites stakeholders to register in ENTSO-E website and join it.

Gunnar Kaestle (COGEN Europe) asks ACER about the division of Germany in 3 zones. He highlights that there are discussions in Germany about the need of 2 zones due to redispatching and questions the reason behind proposing three zones. He also asks about the fundament of Zonal pricing and asks to first try to solve market issues with market solutions and grid problems with grid planning.

Marco Pavesi (ACER) proposes to check the annex to see the proposed configuration for Germany splits in 2-3-4 BZs. He asks to check Art 14 of the electricity regulation, where the main constraints to conduct this work are defined.

Chair says this proposal doesn't prevent to have locational price signals at national level.

Donia Peerhossaini (Eurelectric) asks the public consultation date and regrets that only configurations were targeted for BZs splits and zone merges were not considered. She asks about the criteria considered and asks for more transparency on the process of

choosing alternative configurations. She also asks what will be different from ENTSO-E LMP analysis and on the assessment for 2025. Future market design impacts on future analysis. What will be different to what has been done in the selection process.

Marco Pavesi (ACER) explains the pros and cons of the mergers. TSOs feedback on configurations has been considered and aligned with the control area borders of TSOs in Germany for the cases where the discrepancy of those borders from the initially proposed configurations was limited. It was taken into consideration also the remark about Italian municipalities. Climate, costs, fuel prices will be considered. Possibility for TSOs for sensitivity analysis. Model current crisis into future assumptions.

Marta Mendoza (ENTSO-E) confirms that the review will be looking into sensitivities. Public Consultation will happen 22.12 – 23.01, but may be postponed for a couple of weeks. The liquidity and transition costs studies will be done at European level. Welcome on Friday for specific questions.

Rickard Nilsson (Europex) raises the lack of specific info on the Nordic proposed configurations (more clarity on the grid related, expected import/export capacities...). He also highlights that there is not counter factual (mergers BZs), we only see splitting and re-splitting.

Marco Pavesi (ACER) refers to allocation of nodes, on slide 11 of the ACER slides and annex 6 of the decision which specifies nodes allocated to BZ. In Sweden the nodes are anonymized. He suggests engaging with SVK and ENTSO-E so that they can provide more information about the allocation of nodes.

He explains that ACER has considered mergers in the northern part of Sweden. There was no proposal from the Nordic TSOs to have only two bidding zones in Sweden. In addition, the outcome of the algorithm with two bidding zones in Sweden were poorer than the status quo, hence no alternative configuration with only two bidding zones in Sweden was proposed.

Rafael Muruais (ACER) explains that the time horizon is 2025. Publication of information on the Swedish grid is constrained by Swedish legislation, hence it was not possible for ACER to provide more information due to SvK confidentiality policy.

Jerome La Page (EFET) asks how stakeholders had been involved on the transition and transaction study.

Marta Mendoza (ENTSO-E) explains that the BZ Consultative Group has been consulted on the studies and feedback is being incorporated in terms additional clarifications and increased scope. Efforts are done in transparency taking into account the limitations on resources. Next consultative group will be on 13 October. MESC will be also updated in its next meeting.

3.6 [Update on SvK's derogation request to the 70%](#)

Not discussed at the meeting.

4. FCA

4.1 [Update on the policy paper and possible revision of the FCA GL](#)

Martin Povh (ACER) presents an update of the policy paper. The plan is to have another public workshop in October. Timeline as proposed is under question after the discussions in the morning. The overall outcome of the consultation is presented. Oppositions and concerns are presented: narrow scope and suggestions (National state interventions, collaterals, liquidity fragmentation, regulatory uncertainty, design complexity and barriers to PPAs).

André Estermann recalls that the urgency is not there anymore. Keep the momentum, refining objectives whenever it comes. Market participants to look to the future, need for future hedging. Transparency to market participants is key.

Martin Povh (ACER) explains that there will be more flexibility on the process, as there will be a couple of more months. Contradicting measures don't add to the credibility of TSOs.

Europex agrees to delay the study, streamline the review of FCA. FCA shall be postponed until fundamental decisions are taken on Market Design.

Martin Povh (ACER) says anything can be changed in the FCA but must be fit for purpose. Market Design discussion will need to be finalized first. Policy paper can be finalized anyway.

[EFET presentation](#) focuses on the proposals that work well, keep the liquidity that exists in the market. Not only about transmission risk hedging. Need to think about the big picture. Drastic reforms need proof of concept. Some other considerations are more radical design and should be tackled in the market design discussion.

Eurelectric agrees with EFET, welcomes the creative discussion. Bilateral discussions were useful. Discussion should go beyond the LTTR issue. It is difficult for TSOs to issue volumes, it is way lower than in day ahead. Changing the type of products is changed how the product is issued. Possibility in the future to hedge. If the hub to zone risk cannot be hedged, then the issue will be shifted to the zones.

4.2 [Update on the decision on Hedging opportunities on the SE-FI border](#)

Martin Viehhauser (ACER) presents the slides. ACER decision on how to address the insufficient risk hedging opportunities on the BZ border between Finland and Sweden as the Finish and Swedish regulator did not reach an agreement on the best way forward. The decision will be published the day after the MESC meeting.

Two options were assessed: Issuing LTTRs and a solution based on EPADs (cross-zonal coupling of EPADs or continuous markets for EPADs)

Martin Viehhauser (ACER) explains that LTTR may bring some risks and EPAD coupling may bring more value specifically avoiding market fragmentation.

ACER recommends TSOs to further explore EPAD coupling, which appears to be more effective in improving hedging opportunities compared to the market maker function. Now the TSOs on the FI-SE bidding zone borders have 6 months to develop and submit a proposal to their NRAs (i.e. by March 2023) followed by a Regulatory approval process of 6 months (which can be extended to 12 months) for implementing the approved methodology.

Jerome LePage (EFET) asks if it is realistic to ask TSOs to come up with a methodology on a solution that has not been tested in 6 months. We are surprised and disappointed by decision. It seems like we invent a new solution without proof of concept, just to save the Nordic system price and EPADs – which have proved their inefficiency in forward over the last decade. When will that untested system actually be in place?

ACER: Deadline for methodology is 6 months + 6 months for implementation.

Gunnar Kaestle (COGEN Europe) reminds California energy Crises and Magnus Thorstensson (GEODE) says that from Swedish perspective, it is not a new instrument and that Svenska Krafnat has already a pilot project for some months.

4.3 Update the recent JAO consultation on LTFBA (credit limit and bid prioritisation) and the informal communication on the SAP proposal

Helene Robaye (Eurelectric) on behalf of EFET and Eurelectric presents [the slides on their views on JAO's LTFBA bid prioritisation proposal and informal SAP proposal](#). She recalls two items/actions: the need to further assess the collateral requirements and the request to impose a clear monitoring of the FTRs in the future.

Andre Estermann (ENTSO-E) highlights that the process is still on-going that further engagement with stakeholders will follow, through specific meetings with JAO for the implementation and through ENTSO-E to provide feedback on the methodologies.

Eurelectric raises concerns on the FB methodology and highlights the need to at least monitor its impact and request that all bids will be accommodated. Feedback will be collected on the 29 September.

Martin Povh (ACER) highlights that they see low probability of finding another solution than FB allocation and supports the monitoring of its implementation. ACER is looking into collateral question, idea to lower collateral requirements. They will speak to NRAs and MPs.

5. Balancing

5.1 Update on the go-live of PICASSO and MARI

Dominik Schlipf (ENTSO-E) presents the [Balancing slides](#). Picasso already went live and Mari, following the decision of the steering committee taken the day before, will go live the day after without TSOs exchanges. On the 5 October, decision not yet approved, Ceps and the German TSOs may join Mari and start the exchanges.

5.2 Quick update of the CZCA methodology consultation.

The Chair informs that ENTSO-E is checking the results of the public consultation. Further information will be provided in the following meeting.

6. AOB

- Demand response: Update by ACER on the outcome of the public consultation and next steps
Athina Tellidou (ACER) presents [the outcome of the public consultation on the framework guidelines on demand response](#).
The discussion with NRAs will continue, with the aim of their submission to EC by December of this year. Stakeholders at the MESC ask ACER to keep involving them.
- Ukraine: Update by TSOs & NEMOs
No update is provided
- (tbc) Update by the EC on the offshore strategy
Mathilde Lallemand (EC) informs that the EC published a study in their website and invite the MESC participants to read it.
- (tbc) Update by the EC on the DA market coupling arrangements with UK (follow-up on MRLVC)
No progress to report.

Next meeting date:

- 7 December 2022 (on-line)