

Electricity Connection Policy Generation and System Services (ECP-GSS-2)

Frequently Asked Questions

23/10/2026



The Oval, 160 Shelbourne Road, Ballsbridge, Dublin D04 FW28
Telephone: +353 1 677 1700 | www.eirgrid.ie

Contents

Contents	2
1 Introduction	4
2 Draft Assumption Webinar	4

Revision History		
Revision	Date	Description
RO	Q4 2026	Queries received from ECP-GSS-2 assumptions webinar and Industry Representatives engagement

COPYRIGHT © EirGrid

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be modified or reproduced or copied in any form or by means - graphic, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, taping or information and retrieval system, or used for any purpose other than its designated purpose, without the written permission of EirGrid

Disclaimer

EirGrid has followed accepted industry practice in the collection and analysis of data available. While all reasonable care has been taken in the preparation of this data, EirGrid is not responsible for any loss that may be attributed to the use of this information. Prior to taking business decisions, interested parties are advised to seek separate and independent opinion in relation to the matters covered by this report and should not rely solely upon data and information contained herein. Information in this document does not amount to a recommendation in respect of any possible investment. This document does not purport to contain all the information that a prospective investor or participant in the Single Electricity Market may need.

For queries relating to the document or to request a copy contact: info@eirgrid.com

1 Introduction

Through the various publications and webinars, the purpose of this paper is to capture and respond to industries question. Capturing details from start to end of ECP-GSS-2 process. The productive engagement will lead to changes, updates, additional information published and perhaps improvements for consideration for ECP GSS.

We thank the industry for engagement, while some answers are outstanding, we plan on updating document regularly throughout the ECP-GSS-2 process, adding in details once they are available. Through revision history will inform you of changes and added details.

2 Draft Assumption Webinar

Following on from assumption webinar held on 25.09.2026, please see below questions asked and answers provided. While some answers are outstanding, we will update once details are available.

Q1: Which periods will pro-rata allocation of constraint apply to and which will grandfathering of constraint apply to? Is that for all scenarios and, if so, what is the base case?

All base case study scenarios will be run with both grandfathering and pro-rata constraints applied for the full horizon, as was the case with ECP-GSS-1.

Q2: Are interconnector flows able to respond to network constraints during those subsequent stages (constraint and curtailment) or is predetermined hourly interconnector flow unchanged?

Interconnector flows are fixed after surplus stage, and they are the same for subsequent stages (constraint and curtailment).

Q3: What are the assumptions around rooftop solar uptake? Will their profiles also adopt the 2022 weather year, or is it instead baked into a change in intraday demand profiles? Have you considered using a rolling weather year approach rather than a single representative year - as per AEMO for example?

Rooftop solar uptake assumptions are based on input from ESNB. The existing methodology for modelling embedded solar can be found in the Methodology Statement¹. We will notify industry and update the Methodology Statement when an updated methodology is implemented.

¹ <https://cms.eirgrid.ie/sites/default/files/publications/Constraint-Forecast-Studies-for-ECP-Methodology.pdf>

Currently, a single representative weather year is implemented in all studies. We do not currently use a rolling weather year approach, to adopt the methodology it would need to be added to the industry process improvement list and assigned to priority. Hourly profiles for onshore wind, offshore wind, solar, demand as well as renewable profiles for Britain and France are all based on the year 2022.

Q4: Questions about Solar profiles Update

- **What changes have been made to the solar profiles?**

In GSS-1 Ireland was split into 3 regions, North, Centre and South however this does not represent the real distribution of solar irradiance across the country. Thus, for GSS-2 it was decided to move to 12 areas (plus Northern Ireland) to better capture differences in capacity factor particularly between the Northwest and Southeast of the Island. This also aligns the solar areas with the wind areas and can give us better insight in area wise dispatch down results.

- **Will the ECP constraint team validate the profiles against operational data, e.g. by getting actual DC/AC ratios from connected solar sites and comparing against metered output plus dispatch down for recent years?**

The DC/AC ratio of each solar farm is available to EirGrid and there are sufficient generators to give a good indication of the typical DC/AC ratio at the national level. The solar profiles were rigorously validated against the metered output of the currently operational solar farms and showed very close agreement. The use of a single DC/AC assumption for all solar farms is the same method used in previous iterations of ECP.

- **Have EirGrid consulted with Solar Ireland or solar experts when developing their new solar profiles and also obtained their advice on the 30% over-installation assumption?**

EirGrid have engaged with a wide range of experts and industry members on the updated solar profiles and continued engagement is ongoing. The solar profiles will be monitored pre and post results and any refinements will be considered in the next iteration.

- **Can you explain the Capacity Factors for Solar PV? Are they calculated on hourly/monthly basis?**

Hourly solar profiles are applied in the ECP Constraints Analysis model. For the ECP-GSS-2 assumptions webinar, annual average capacity factors based on these hourly profiles were presented for information purposes.

- **It appears to treat Solar PV more harshly and offsets any potential benefit of pooling Solar with Wind that was presented on the Constraint Allocation slide.**

The changes to the applied solar profiles are not intended to treat any generators more harshly, but to better capture the observed availability of utility scale solar units. The changes to constraint dispatch down allocation is part of a separate

workstream, aiming to better reflect the actions undertaken in real time system operations.

Q5: Do all Batteries / LDES as a whole reduce constraints?

In ECP 2.5 and ECP-GSS-1 Constraint Analysis a sensitivity was modelled to investigate the impact of batteries. In both of these studies some battery capacity was removed from a base case scenario while other inputs (wind & solar capacity, demand, operational constraints etc.) were kept constant. Both of these sensitivities showed a benefit from additional installed battery capacity in reducing dispatch down in the modelled scenarios. Please note that these sensitivities analysed the impact of battery capacity, not LDES specifically.

Q6: When you mean longer duration for the storage i.e. those longer than one hour, is there a maximum duration for these set of assumptions?

A differentiation is made in our modelling where energy storage technologies with ≤ 1 hour storage duration contribute to POR/SOR/TOR while energy storage technologies with > 1 hour duration contribute to replacement reserve.

There is no maximum duration limit for battery storage set in the ECP model. All batteries that are in the current ECP pipeline will be modelled with the duration provided internally at EirGrid.

Q7: It is good to see that you will be allocating constraints between wind and solar on an hourly basis. Can you please confirm why you are not you are currently applying the same approach in the hourly allocation of surplus and curtailment?

Surplus and curtailment dispatch down are already applied on an hourly basis according to market rules.

In ECP studies to date, constraint dispatch down was applied on an annual basis. The purpose of the process improvement discussed in the ECP-GSS-2 assumptions webinar is to update the methodology to allow for allocation of constraint dispatch down on an hourly basis.

Q8: Are EirGrid reviewing their interconnector model, particularly in the context of the high nighttime imports (vs low imports/high exports during the day time) that were observed in their previous ECP-2.5 and GSS-1 Constraint Analysis?

Since ECP-2.5, we updated interconnector methodology and applying dynamic price method. Interconnector flows under this methodology are highly dependent on a number of input assumptions including but not limited to installed RES capacity, price forming assumptions and RES profiles in SEM and the overseas region.

There is currently no proposal to change this methodology for ECP-GSS-2 Constraint Analysis. Participants will be notified of any proposed changes prior to publication.

Q9: Any changes planned regarding EirGrid's constraint subgroup assumptions?

The ECP constraints forecasting team will review the constraint subgroup used and add it to the process improvement list and will engage with industry if significant changes are made to the constraint subgroups.

Q10: It has been requested on multiple previous occasions that the Midland Renewable Hubs are included in a sensitivity scenario. Can you please clarify if this will be included in the GSS-2 analysis?

ECP team are regularly engaging with the team responsible for renewable energy hubs. The response hasn't changed they are awaiting input from industry and there was not sufficient information available to adequately model the renewable hubs. When sufficient information is available, the ECP team will consider renewable hubs for future iterations. If sufficient information is now available, the ECP team will consider renewable hubs for future iterations.

Q11: Why were the 10% and 20% portfolios selected for ECP-GSS-2?

The ECP Constraints Analysis methodology is to consider all connected and pipeline projects that have not lapsed or withdrawn, including all applicants from the latest ECP application batch. In recent ECP iterations the ECP pipeline has grown significantly, and it has been observed that a significant portion of the Initial Application List withdraw from the process.

As a result of this, the ECP Constraint Analysis team received feedback from industry. In GSS-2 a more conservative approach has been taken.

Q11: Why are constraint subgroups used and how are they identified?

To ensure a fair allocation of constraints among generators, constraint subgroups are identified. The subgroups are selected on the basis that they share a common transmission bottleneck and are selected based on an assessment of the raw Plexos results and based on our experience of dispatch down on the real system.

Once a constraint subgroup has been identified, any dispatch down experienced by a generator within that subgroup is shared by all the generators in that subgroup according to their availability.

Network subgroups will evolve as the network reinforcements are rolled out. This means that previously identified sub-groups may be grouped together (or split) as the congestion bottlenecks shift around the network.

The constraint subgroups used in each ECP iteration can be found in the Excel Report for that iteration. For more information check the ECP methodology report.