

Public

Code Administrator Meeting

Summary

Workgroup Meeting 1: Enhance the Effectiveness of the system Incidence Reporting

Date: 04 November 2025

Contact Details

Chair: Jess Rivalland, jessica.rivalland@neso.energy

Proposer: Guy Nicholson, guy.nicholson@statkraft.com

Key areas of discussion

The initial objectives of the Workgroup 1 were to examine the proposed solution, reach consensus on the Terms of Reference, evaluate any cross-code implications, and establish an agreed timeline.

Code Modification Process Overview

The Chair explained the Grid Code modification process, including stages from proposal to implementation, emphasising the need for member input, alternative solutions, and the workgroup vote. Expectations for participation, respect, confidentiality, and preparedness were discussed. Members were reminded to review meeting dates and respond to invites to ensure quorum.

A description was given of how alternatives can be proposed and the voting process, including requirements for attendance and majority approval. The process for developing and voting on alternatives (WACMs) was clarified.

Objectives and Timeline

The timeline for the modification process was reviewed, with key dates for Panel submission, consultations, and Ofgem decision highlighted. Members were asked to confirm availability for upcoming meetings.

Terms of Reference (ToR)

The Workgroup members reviewed the Terms of Reference; the Proposer raised a question about technical specifications, a link to the technical documents was added to the chat by the NESO SME. The group Workgroup members agreed to the Terms, pending clarification on technical points.

Public

Proposers Presentation

The Proposer presented a plan aimed at improving system incident reporting by shortening the reporting timeframe, enhancing the detail of data sampling, and including regional frequency information. Drawing on recent incident analyses, the presentation emphasised the value of precise and prompt data for maintaining system stability. The proposal suggested that reports should be provided on a weekly basis, with data sampled at 100-millisecond intervals and frequency measurements gathered from a minimum of five regions across Great Britain.

Discussion of Technical Feasibility and Challenges

NESO's SME provided an overview of the organisation's current data capabilities, highlighting limitations related to data granularity and confidentiality. The workgroup subsequently considered the feasibility of implementing weekly reporting, increased sampling rates, and the inclusion of regional data, noting concerns regarding resource requirements and data ownership. The operational challenges posed by the proposal, particularly the need for high-resolution data and additional resources were highlighted by NESO SMEs. They agreed to further explore the practicality of gathering data from five regions and to analyse the financial implications associated with a shift to weekly reporting.

It was noted that while Industry needed to be conversant with the challenge of measuring frequency, there were potential areas of improvement, e.g., more context provided in the reports, improvement of data quality, BMU reporting and further work to make Phasor Measurement Unit (PMU) coverage wider.

Legal Text and Solution Refinement

The draft legal text was reviewed and the Workgroup debated wording around regional data ("at least five different regions if available") and sampling rates. Consensus emerged to include flexibility for data availability and to further assess technical feasibility and costs.

Cross Code Impacts

Potential impacts on the System Operator Transmission Owner Code (STC) and the need to review data flows and obligations under the STC and Energy Data Task Force were identified. Workgroup members took an action to investigate further.

Next Steps

Actions were assigned to review technical specifications, assess lessons from other economies, analyse TO impacts, clarify confidentiality policies, and estimate costs/benefits of weekly vs. monthly reporting. JSC agreed to share slides, and GN to draft and share a benefits case FK to provide cost analysis before or at the next meeting.

Actions

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

Action	Workgroup	Owner	Action	Status	Date due by
Number	Raised				
01	WG1	JSC	Share the slides presented at Workgroup 1 with Workgroup members	Open	28/11/2025
02	WG1	FK and JSC	investigate reporting practices in other countries (Europe, US, etc.).	Open	28/11/2025
03	WG1	FK and AU	Review STC sections and Energy Data Task Force requirements for data sharing.	Open	28/11/2025
04	WG1	GW	Assess cost and workload implications for Transmission Owners (TOs) providing additional data.	Open	28/11/2025
05	WG1	FK and JSC	Check NESO data triage process against Energy Data Taskforce guidelines.	Open	28/11/2025
06	WG1	FK and GN	FK & JSC to provide ballpark estimate resource costs for weekly vs. monthly reporting and consider the Iberian blackout impact. GN to draft and share a benefits case	Open	28/11/2025
07	WG1	MB	Suggest thresholds for publishing larger incidents weekly and smaller ones monthly; NESO to consider if this mitigates workload concerns.	Open	28/11/2025
08	WG1	FK	Clarify what improvements are possible now, what would require more time, and how	Open	28/11/2025

Public

much better future data could be.

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Jess Rivalland	JR	Code Administrator	Chair
Deborah Spencer	DS	Code Administrator	Technical Secretary
Guy Nicholson	GN	Statkraft	Proposer
Andrew Larkin	AL	Sygensys	Observer
Andrew Urquhart	AU	SSE	Workgroup Member
Frank Kasibante	FK	NESO	Workgroup Member
Garth Williams	GW	On behalf of STC Panel	Workgroup Member
Helge Urdal	HU	Consumer Rep	Observer
Jesus Sanchez Cortez	JSC	NESO	NESO SME
Matthew Ball	MB	EDF Energy	Alternate
Tim Ellingham	TE	RWE	Workgroup Member