Public

Meeting Summary

Grid Code Development Forum – 05 November 2025

Date:	05/11/2025	**Location:**	MS Teams
Start:	09:00	**End:**	10:30

Participants

Attendee	Company	Attendee	Company
Claire Newton	NESO (Chair)	Sean Gauton	Uniper
Matthew Dixon	NESO (Tech Sec)	Andrew Larkins	Sygensys
Lizzie Timmins	NESO (Code Administrator)	Garth Graham	SSE
Frank Kasibante	NESO	Dovile Kvedyte-Corrigan	OFGEM
Steve Baker	NESO	Graeme Vincent	SP Energy Networks
Bieshoy Awad	NESO	Daniel Bukky	EDF
Amanda Rooney	NESO	Salim Temtem	SSE
Ronak Rabbani	NESO	Paul Youngman	Drax
Jamie Morgan-Wormald	NESO	Alan Creighton	Northern Powergrid
Pritesh Patel	NESO	John Harrower	SSE
Alex Curtis	NESO	Pamela MacDougall	Amazon NL
Nnaemeka Anyiam	NESO	Kushal Lonare	Amazon
Rajiv Jha	NESO	Andrzej Adamczyk	PSC Consulting
Tanmay Kadam	NESO	Ben Connolly	Amazon

Kinjal Patel	Vantage	Martin Aten	Uniper
David Monkhouse	National Grid	Mike Kay	P2 Analysis
Benjamin Marshall	SSE	Talha Siddiqui	Vantage
Lourdes Soto Cano	Amazon ES	Nicola Barberis Negra	Orsted
Tim Ellingham	RWE	Mohammad Jafarian	SSE
Kahraman Yumak	PSC Consulting	Garry Cotter	Orsted
Chanura Wijeratne	RES	Devansh Gautam	PSC Consulting
Evan Stuber	CSE Storage	Harry Burns	EDF
Sigrid Bolik	Siemens		

Agenda and slides

A link to the Agenda and Presentations from the November GCDF can be found here.

GCDF

Please note: These notes are produced as an accompaniment to the forum recording and slide pack presented and provide highlights only of discussion themes and possible next steps.

Meeting Opening – Claire Newton (GCDF Chair) & Matthew Dixon (GCDF Tech Sec), NESO

The meeting was opened, with an overview of the agenda items that will be covered alongside objectives and expectations for the meeting.

Presentation: Code Administrator Update – Lizzie Timmins, NESO

Presenter updated the group on the starting of workgroups for GC0181 System Incidents Reporting. Presenter also shared a recent decision from the authority on G0166 introducing new Balancing Mechanism parameters for limited duration assets and that it has been implemented into the Grid Code alongside an updated electrical standard on EDL reason codes. There are a few mods awaiting Authority decisions including GC0183 (Space Weather) and GC0174 (ETR data).

Commented [CN1]: @Matthew Dixon (NESO) Please can you check previous meeting summaries, and see if we usually add hyperlinks to the Mod webpages.

Commented [MD2R1]: I can't see that we do - Happy to do so if feel it's necessary.

Commented [CN3R1]: No that's fine, no need if we haven't done it previously.

Presentation: Large Demand Technical Requirements – Ronak Rabbani, NESO

The presenter discussed the background, including the increase in system demand and large demand sites such as data centres and electrolyser plant. Annual demand could rise to as high as 797 TWh and peak demand as high as 144 GW in 2050.

Data centre behaviour was discussed, including the disconnection of large demand due to voltage fluctuations, and different approaches to reconnecting to the network after a fault. The presenter stated that different standards exist across industry to protect IT equipment. Some data centres may switch to on-site generators or batteries first before completely disconnecting from the grid. Examples of international events were given.

To tackle the issue, the presenter raised several ways to manage the challenges. These included requirements to remain connected during normal fluctuations, requirement to ride through events and understanding potential of rapid recovery following events.

The presenter listed several other TSOs who are exploring similar considerations including EirGrid, ERCOT, ENTSO-E, and Energinet.

The presenter invited feedback.

Discussion themes / Feedback

An attendee asked if the changes proposed would be retrospective or prospective.

Presenter confirmed that the changes would be prospective for future contracts and those currently in the contract phase. The details of when the requirements will apply from needs further consideration.

An attendee raised that there would need to be a cost recovery method for plants that have taken final investment decision (FID).

Presenter agreed that this would be taken into consideration.

Another attendee raised that reducing the risk of large loads on system security is not just about fault-ride through but also response of loads to varying voltage. They also raised the need to consider smaller loads which are aggregated together such as mass EV charging or heat pumps. They highlighted work done by the GB Grid Forming Expert Group as a good model for developing technical requirements. The attendee suggested that this modification should include more than just fault ride through.

The presenter expressed views that this fault ride through modification could be one of numerous modifications and that they have proposed to start with the low-voltage issue as it is the clearest. The presenter agreed with the point made surrounding aggregated assets such as EV chargers.

Another attendee continued the discussion by adding that most EV chargers are mass produced and that it is possible to get a fairly automatic good behaviour from these. The attendee also shared that developments in Europe are focused on electrolysers and not large data centres.

Another point was made around thresholds for requirements, and that some developers may try to connect to distribution rather than transmission (for example) to try and avoid these types of requirements.

The presenter agreed that a solution that would allow consistent requirements across the board and not result in large demand centres seeking to come in below a threshold to avoid meeting requirements. The presenter agreed that it would be good to have consistent requirements across the GB system (rather than thresholds varying in Scotland and E&W).

Another attendee carried on this discussion by agreeing that the subject needs to be grasped and there are needs for code change. The attendee continued by saying that some data centres in the US are over 1.5GW in size and that they would represent a significant demand loss.

The presenter thanked the attendee for sharing their thoughts.

An attendee suggested that perhaps an informal workgroup (e.g. expert group, GCDF sub-group) would be worthwhile, tasked with looking specifically at requirements for large demand in order to complete the necessary development work before taking the modification to panel.

The chair invited those with an interest to submit their details.

Presentation: GC0179: Removal of Balancing Code No.4 from the Grid Code – Amanda Rooney, NESO

The presenter (who is also the modification proposer) explained that she was seeking feedback on the work completed so far on GC0179 Removal of BC4. Although the presenter was originally hopeful for a fast-track modification, that was not possible due to some late challenges on the legal text and so instead a workgroup was intended. There were no nominations for the workgroup and so the presenter is bringing the Mod to GCDF, before proceeding to Code Administrator Consultation (CAC).

The modification will remove references to TERRE from the Grid Code as the system underpinning TERRE will be turned off on 31st December 2025. The modification aims to only remove BC4, and references to BC4, from the Grid Code.

The presenter explained that the contentious part of the modification is that one of the Grid Code definitions included a reference to TERRE, meaning that instead of just removing BC4 there also needs to be a definition change. This change was presented for the GCDF and it was stated that if there were no objections to the change, it could progress directly to Code Administrator Consultation (CAC).

Discussion themes / Feedback

Code administrator confirmed that the proposal is to go straight through to CAC through standard governance rather than self-governance, due to its Energy Balancing Regulations (EBR) impact.

Commented [CN4]: @Matthew Dixon (NESO) Although we in the team are generally familiar with the Mods by number, attendees may not be - so I suggest we add a short title after each Mod number, as I have done here.

Commented [CN5R4]: And throughout this summary - no action required, just an FYI.

An attendee asked for clarification that this mod was only deletion / amending definitions and was not seeking to introduce a new term.

The presenter confirmed that BC4 would be deleted, and a definition would be modified and not created.

Another attendee raised that the proposed definition has lost plurality on 'bid offer acceptances' on the original definition and asked if there was a reason behind this.

The presenter confirmed that as Replacement Reserve (RR) instruction was being removed, legal thought that there was no need to keep the original plurality in the definition.

Presentation: BSC Modification P501 Amending BSC Change Process for Changes Affecting NCER T&Cs – Steve Baker, NESO

The presenter highlighted that this presentation is for purpose of raising awareness and invite interest from industry parties wishing to join the BSC mod workgroup for P501, which has been approved to proceed at the BSC panel.

The presenter continued by covering project scope. The Electricity Balancing Guideline (EBGL) and Network Code on Electricity Emergency and Restoration (NCER) were assimilated into UK law in 2018; changes to them must follow a specific process. Unlike the EGBL, the NCER does not have an explicit provision to allow the delegation of tasks by NESO. Currently NESO must carry out NCER-prescribed amendment steps directly, jointly or in parallel with Elexon conducting the BSC change.

The presenter summarised the proposed solution to incorporate the NCER change process within the BSC mod procedures, specifically where the approved terms and conditions for system defence and system restoration service provider under article 4 are mapped to BSC provisions.

If anyone is interested in participating, they can be added into the BSC mod workgroup as a voting member or as a non-voting member by filling out the form linked on the slide pack or via Elexon's website.

Discussion themes / Feedback

An attendee asked where the specific provisions for mapping of the BSC that constitute the NCER terms and conditions were found.

The presenter agreed to take the action away. Post-meeting note: the presenter has sent the specific provisions to the attendee by email.

An attendee asked for confirmation on whether NESO will hold a veto over decisions due to the wording within '…NESO to confirm if amendment is necessary…'

The presenter confirms P501 will ensure that the BSC Modification process aligns with the NCER obligations, and it does this by NESO executing the tasks jointly or in parallel with BSCCo.

Another attendee asked whether the current proposal was to pass responsibility for the determination and consultation over to the BSC. They also asked to confirm that if the change affected the Grid Code or CUSC that NESO would still be running those.

The presenter confirmed that P501 specifically deals with the NCER Art 4 T&C in the BSC. Where NCER provisions exist in the Grid Code or CUSC, the amendment procedures are already carried out by NESO and hence the issue, that P501 seeks to address, do not exist.

Commented [SB6]: @Claire Newton [NESO] Hi I have edited the wording. Technically NESO could refuse to do our part to obstruct, but throughout the discussions on this mod it has always been agreed that NESO would fulfil its part of the process to implement a majority / agreed decision. If we objected to a change it would have been dealt with via BSC Panel.
The above detail is more for WG phase though and not so much for GCDF.

AOB

AOB (i)

An update was given on GC0166 Introducing new Balancing Programme Dynamic Parameters for Short Duration Assets, which went live into the Grid Code on the 5th November. There is an initial 12-month roll-out period for implementing; there is no need to submit the new dynamic parameters until the full end-to-end process has been rolled out. This is expected to be once the corresponding BSC data publication modification, P499, is anticipated to go live towards the end of June 2026. The presenter also shared a meeting held on Monday afternoon regarding GC0166 including a Q&A session, which can be found here.

AOB (ii)

A NESO attendee flagged that a current SQSS modification, GSR030, was having a separate specific mod pulled out of it, GSR034. The Code Administrator Consultation (CAC) for GSR034 went live as of 5th November. GSR034 focuses on the 1800 MW loss of in-feed risk associated with an offshore DC converter. If you are interested in this topic, the attendee pointed towards the following link to read and respond to the consultation.

AOB (iii)

An attendee pointed back to the earlier discussion on large demand centres and stressed the importance on progressing this quickly and wanted to bring this back to GCDF in December and set up a regular meeting, potentially weekly, due to the importance the UK government places on data centres. Another attendee noted that consideration needs to be given to the expectations to join weekly meetings, as it may make individuals disinclined to join the work.

Attendees were encouraged to reach out if they are interested in joining discussion surrounding large demand centres at: box.techcodes@neso.energy

The dates for the 2025 GCDF sessions are available on the GCDF webpage.

The Chair thanked the attendees and presenters for their contributions and closed the meeting.

The next GCDF will be held on the 03 December 2025 with the 21 November 2025 being the deadline for agenda items and presentations.