

Public

# Code Administrator Meeting

## Summary

### Workgroup Meeting 5: CM097 – Electromagnetic Transient (EMT) and Root Mean Square (RMS) Model Submission for Transmission Owners (TOs)

---

**Date: 20 June 2025**

---

#### Contact Details

Chair: Matthew Larreta, [matthew.larreta@neso.energy](mailto:matthew.larreta@neso.energy)

Proposer : Frank Kasibante, [frank.kasibante@neso.energy](mailto:frank.kasibante@neso.energy)

---

### Key areas of discussion

The aim of Workgroup 5 was to clarify quoracy of STC Workgroup meetings, review the Action Log and draft Workgroup Report, and to discuss an Alternative Request.

### Quoracy

The Chair clarified the specific quorum requirements for STC workgroups, referring to STC Code Section B 7.2.4.A2:

*'A Workgroup shall comprise at least three (3) persons [(who may be STC Modification Panel Members)] agreed by the STC Modification Panel provided there shall always be at least one member representing The Company, and at least two members representing other STC Parties (e.g. Onshore Transmission Owners, Offshore Transmission Owners and Competitively Appointed Transmission Owners).'*

The Chair further clarified that voting eligibility is determined by Workgroup members (both STC Party and non-STC Party) meeting the minimum 50% attendance requirement at the time of the Workgroup vote. A Workgroup member asked where this is found in guidance, the Chair took an action to share a reference to the guidance before the next Workgroup meeting.

A Workgroup member noted that the SSEN Workgroup member wasn't included in the STC Party Workgroup member list, but they should be based on SSEN previously being

## Public

known as SHETL, which is an STC Party. The Chair took an action to confirm SSEN's STC Party status.

## Actions review

### Action 11 – Action to remain open

The Proposer provided an update to the Workgroup on their discussions with Ofgem and referred the Workgroup to an Ofgem letter that had been shared in the Workgroup Papers. Ofgem confirmed that they're consulting internally to assess if onshore TOs could have cost recovery arrangements covered and will provide an update in due course.

The Workgroup discussed offshore and onshore cost recovery and compensation arrangements. One Workgroup member raised concerns about a reference in the Ofgem letter to a threshold of £1m per annum for OFTO cost recovery, suggesting that it could lead to insolvency if mismanaged.

The Transmission Investment Workgroup member committed to arranging a meeting with Ofgem (to include NESO representatives and interested Workgroup members) to discuss cost recovery issues and provide an update at a later Workgroup meeting. The action will remain open pending the results of these discussions.

### Action 17 – Action closed

The Chair invited a representative of Transmission Investment to the Workgroup to discuss their Alternative Request.

## Alternate Request

The Proposer of the Alternative Request talked the Workgroup through their proposal. They noted that their proposal recognises the significant cost and engineering resource needed to deliver the Original Proposal and suggested a more pragmatic approach, where the highest priority items are delivered first.

### Differences between the Alternative and the Original Proposal

The Alternative Proposer noted that instead of an absolute obligation to submit models, their Alternative suggests that there should be a prioritisation based on the necessity

## Public

and cost-effectiveness of each submission. This emphasises that not all networks require the same level of modelling, especially older and smaller networks that may not have the necessary equipment or models available. They also raised concerns about the potential delays in fulfilling the obligations of the Original Proposal, which could lead to breaches if not managed properly.

## Costs

The Workgroup discussed the importance of obtaining necessary data without incurring excessive costs and recognised the challenges posed by the offshore transmission process, which often leads to a lack of direct relationships with original developers of the equipment.

## Model Collection Process

The Alternative Proposer and Workgroup members provided insights into the model collection process, suggesting the establishment of a clear priority list for model submissions based on current system challenges. They discussed a structured approach for users to submit existing models within three months, while new models would have a nine-month timeline for development.

## Priority Areas

The Proposer informed the Workgroup about a model collection process which had been drafted to address the Alternative Proposer's concerns. The Alternative Proposer noted that regions facing significant issues, such as SSO (System Security Operations) challenges, could be prioritised with a clear rationale for prioritisation. This structured approach would seek to ensure that the most critical models are addressed first, promoting efficiency and effectiveness in the modelling process.

## Guidance Note on EMT

The Workgroup discussed a draft Guidance Note on EMT, shared onscreen by the NESO SME. The Workgroup discussed governance issues relating to the incorporation of this guidance into existing frameworks such as the Grid Code and STCP. The Proposer and NESO SME took an action to consider how to incorporate the Guidance Note into STCP 12-2 and if/how this impacts CM097.

## Public

The Alternative Proposer committed to consider the points raised during the Workgroup discussion and to further refine their proposal, subject to obtaining additional input from Workgroup members.

## Draft Workgroup Report

The Chair talked the Workgroup through the comments and amendments made by Workgroup members to the Draft Workgroup Report, which was previously shared on the NESO Collaboration Space. The Chair updated and redrafted text based on input from Workgroup members, noting that further development will be needed over the course of the remaining Workgroup meetings.

## Timeline

The Chair noted the need to reschedule Workgroup 6, which was originally scheduled for 26 June 2025, due to its proximity to this Workgroup meeting. The Workgroup agreed to reschedule Workgroup 6 to the 17 July 2025.

## Next Steps

The Chair confirmed that rescheduled invitations for Workgroup 6 will be issued shortly, along with sharing the summary document for Workgroup 5.

## Actions

For the full action log, click [here](#).

| Action Number | Workgroup Raised | Owner        | Action   | Due by | Status |
|---------------|------------------|--------------|--|--------|--------|
| 11            | WG2              | FK / ML / JM | Meet with Ofgem to discuss cost recovery issues and provide an update at Workgroup 6.                          | WG6    | Open   |
| 17            | WG4              | Chair        | Invite a Workgroup Consultation respondent to the next Workgroup meeting to discuss their Alternative Request. | WG5    | Closed |

## Public

|    |     |       |   |     |     |
|----|-----|-------|---|-----|-----|
| 18 | WG5 | Chair | Share link to STC citing minimum attendance requirements for Workgroup Vote.                        | WG6 | New |
| 19 | WG5 | Chair | Confirm SSEN's STC Party status and if required, update the quoracy requirements for the Workgroup. | WG6 | New |
| 20 | WG5 | FK/AJ | Consider how to incorporate the EMT Guidance Note into STCP 12-2 and if/how this impacts CM097.     | WG6 | New |

## Attendees

| Name                 | Initial | Company                   | Role                     |
|----------------------|---------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Matthew Larreta      | ML      | NESO Code Administration  | Chair                    |
| Karen Stanton-Hughes | KSH     | NESO Code Administration  | Tech Sec                 |
| Frank Kasibante      | FK      | NESO                      | Proposer                 |
| Anthony Johnson      | AJ      | NESO                      | Alternate                |
| Arslan Saidi         | AS      | Ofgem                     | Authority Representative |
| Bala Santhanam       | BS      | Enercon GmbH              | Workgroup Member         |
| Gopi Yericheria      | GY      | NESO                      | Alternate                |
| Graeme Vincent       | GM      | SP Energy Networks        | Workgroup Member         |
| Joel Matthews        | JM      | Diamond Transmission Corp | Workgroup Member         |
| Maria Ebue           | ME      | Volitalia UK Ltd          | Observer                 |
| Mike Lee             | ML      | Transmission Investment   | Workgroup Member         |
| Roger Carter         | RC      | Transmission Investment   | Alternate                |
| Yuan Chen            | YC      | NESO                      | Observer                 |