

Public

# GC0155

Workgroup 25, 18 November 2025

Online Meeting via Teams

# WELCOME

# Meeting Recording

# Agenda

Topics to be discussed	Lead
Welcome	Chair
Review of Action Log	All
Review Draft Workgroup Consultation	All
Review Draft Legal Text	All
Timeline Update	Chair
Any Other Business	Chair
Next Steps	Chair

# Review Action Log

# Action log

Action number	WG raised	Owner	Action	Details	Comment	Due by	Status
61	WG15	All	Workgroup members to provide feedback on why BCA doesn't work and how they feel they can better comply	<p>Fault Current Injection</p> <p>The Workgroup reviewed the wording of this section and it was noted that there was some points of contention around the proposed wording. It was agreed that this would be discussed in more detail.</p> <p>CC.6.3.15.1 (a) (ii)</p> <p>The workgroup reviewed wording for CC.6.3.15.1 (a) (ii). Some Workgroup members felt that further review was required to provide clarity.</p> <p>Workgroup Members expressed concern that the application of this text would cause none-compliance should it be applied retrospectively. Some Workgroup Members felt there was a requirement for a 'Start from' date rather than retrospective application.</p> <p>BA questioned if this would be solved with the introduction of a bilateral agreement or exception clause.</p> <p>One Workgroup Member stated that they disagree that this would be effective if applied retrospectively even with an exemption clause but could be effective moving forwards.</p> <p>BA agreed to draft Exception Clause wording to sit within BCA (Action 60) and present back to the Workgroup.</p> <p>BA asked the workgroup to consider and feedback on why the BCA does not work and how they could comply (Action 61)</p>	<p>To be provided during WG discussions &amp; documented within the WG consultation document.</p> <p>Discussions documented in the Workgroup Consultation document – propose to close</p>		<b>Propose to close?</b>
64	WG16	BA	Review text for ECC.6.3.15.8 and consider non-compliance issues	<p>ECC6.3.15.8</p> <p>A Workgroup member expressed concern that it would not be possible to comply with the suggested wording if this was to be applied retrospectively and questioned if an impact assessment could be done on this. BA agreed to review CC on this and feedback at the next Workgroup (Actions 64).</p>	<p>To be reviewed when discussing legal text</p> <p>Reviewing legal text on 04 September – propose to close</p>		<b>Propose to close?</b>

# Action log


Action number	WG raised	Owner	Action	Details	Comment	Due by	Status
66	WG16	All	Provide feedback on the Issues with the current requirements and validate that these points are correct.	<p>The Issues with the current requirements</p> <p>The Workgroup went on to discuss overvoltage related requirements. A Workgroup member noted that this was not applicable in Scotland. The Proposer suggested that there would be an equivalent that would be applicable.</p> <p>The Proposer asked the Workgroup to consider this section and provide feedback (Action 66).</p>	<p>To be provided during WG discussions &amp; documented within the WG consultation document.</p> <p>Documented in the Workgroup Consultation – propose to close</p>		<b>Propose to close?</b>
72	WG23	RW/AH	Latest Workgroup Consultation document to be shared on the collaboration space and shared with members who don't have access.		Propose to close	WG24	Propose to close
73	WG23	ALL	Review Workgroup Consultation document. Build in comments and amendments not limited to neso implementation costs, fault injection requirement in CC and fault current injection under unbalanced faults.		Propose to close	WG24	Open
74	WG23	BA	Provide the PDF document related to unrealistic modelling scenarios to the workgroup and include it as an annex in the Workgroup Consultation document.		<p>This document has already been shared with the Workgroup (Workgroup meeting 2)</p> <p>Propose to close</p>	WG24	Open
75	WG23	SM	Legal text needs to be updated to the newest baselines of the Grid Code sections. (any current comments to be transposed to the new baselines)		Propose to close	WG24	Open
76	WG23	RW/AH	Updated Legal Text to be shared on the collaboration space and shared with members who don't have access.		Propose to close	WG24	Open
77	WG23	ALL	Review updated Legal Text.		Propose to close – reviewing on 04 September	WG24	Open

# Action log

Action number	WG raised	Owner	Action	Details	Comment	Due by	Status
78	WG24		BA	Update the GC0155 Proposal Form to clearly reflect the current scope, removing any references to GC178, and circulate the revised document to the Workgroup for review.	GC0155 Proposal Form updated. Circulated to Workgroup Members	WG25	Propose to Close?
79	WG24		BA/RW	Add an additional section to the Workgroup Consultation document to accurately document the differing viewpoints and discussions from Workgroup 24 and then circulate to the Workgroup for input and review.	Draft Workgroup Consultation document has been updated to include this section	WG25	Propose to Close?
80	WG24		BA/RW	Incorporate updates to the Workgroup Consultation document, including the revised Proposal Form, Legal text, and a paragraph clarifying the handling of the Terms of Reference item regarding overvoltage's and then circulate the updated draft for review at the next meeting.	Included with Papers. Proposer confirmed no changes have been made to the legal text	WG25	Propose to close?
81	WG24		RW	Submit a timeline extension request to the Grid Code Review Panel for a two-month extension to the GC0155 timeline, reflecting the need for two additional Workgroup meetings before reaching Workgroup Consultation.	Timeline approved by the Grid Code Review Panel on 30 October	WG25	Propose to Close?


# Review Draft Workgroup Consultation

Ren Walker – NESO Code  
Administrator




# Draft Legal Text

Ren Walker – NESO Code  
Administrator



# Timeline

Ren Walker – NESO Code  
Administrator




# Timeline for GC0155 as at 21 October 2025

Milestone	Date	Milestone	Date
Modification presented to Panel	01 December 2021	Code Administrator Consultation	27 April – 19 May
Workgroup Nominations (15 business days)	20 December 2021 to 14 January 2022	Draft Final Modification Report (DFMR) issued to Panel (5 business days)	17 June 2026
Workgroup 22 – 26	24 April 2025 24 June 2025 13 October 2025 18 November 2025 08 December 2025	Panel undertake DFMR recommendation vote	25 June 2026
Workgroup Consultation (15 business days)	15 December 2025 – 08 January 2026	Final Modification Report issued to Panel to check votes recorded correctly (5 business days to check)	26 June – 03 July 2026
Workgroups 27 – 29	27 January 2026 23 February 2026 16 March 2026	Final Modification Report issued to Ofgem This is clear 5 business days after Final Modification Report is issued to Panel to check votes recorded correctly	06 July 2026
Workgroup report issued to Panel (5 business days)	15 April 2026	Ofgem decision needed by	TBC
Panel sign off that Workgroup Report has met its Terms of Reference	23 April 2026	Implementation Date	TBC

# Any Other Business

Ren Walker – NESO Code  
Administrator



# Next Steps

Ren Walker – NESO Code  
Administrator

