Public

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Workgroup Meeting 4: Enhance the Effectiveness of System Incidents Reporting

Date: 18 February 2026

Contact Details

Chair: Jess Rivalland, jessica.rivalland@neso.energy
Proposer: Guy Nicholson, guy.nicholson@statkraft.com

Key areas of discussion

The aim of Workgroup 4 was to focus on reviewing the timeline, discussing key Workgroup actions, considering external Inputs, and moving forward on legal text development.

Click **here** to view the slide pack for the meeting.

Actions Update

Actions 4, 11, 12,16,17,18,19, 23 and 24 remain open
Actions 7, 20, 21 and 22 were closed.

External Data Sharing

A NESO Subject Matter Expert (SME) outlined the organisation's comprehensive four-tier data classification framework, which categorises information as public, general, confidential, or strictly confidential. This system governs the labelling and management of data based on its sensitivity, providing clear protocols for storage, access control, and physical security. The framework is designed to ensure strict adherence to Ofgem's data best practice requirements as well as NESO's internal ringfencing policies.

NESO's SME also outlined the data sharing triage process, which systematically evaluates each request by assessing applicable legal constraints and a range of risks, including security, commercial, privacy, and reputational factors. Additionally, the process requires obtaining consent from relevant third parties, such as Transmission Owners (TOs). Each assessment is thoroughly documented and subjected to review by both risk specialists and legal counsel, ensuring that openness is maximised while all identified risks are effectively mitigated.

During the discussion, a Workgroup member questioned the scope of data sharing.The NESO SME explained that NESO escalates high-risk situations to market monitoring to prevent any violations, particularly in the absence of a Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA). Another member stressed the necessity of making data widely available to prevent potential market manipulation. In response, the SME reaffirmed NESO's commitment to transparency and its rigorous approach to reviewing triage decisions.

During the discussion, a NESO representative expressed reservations regarding the distribution of raw PMU data, citing concerns about reputational and legal implications should specific incidents be linked to identifiable assets. In response, the SME clarified that NESO's triage process is designed to identify and address such risks, ensuring that any data sharing is contingent upon

obtaining consent from Transmission Owners (TOs) and implementing appropriate risk mitigation measures. Furthermore, data classified as strictly confidential is subject to enhanced controls to safeguard its integrity and security.

It was emphasised that NESO conducts annual reviews of recurring data sharing arrangements to reassess the associated risk profiles, with provisions for more frequent evaluations should risk factors evolve or new concerns arise. Following the triage and approval process, data is disseminated in accordance with its designated classification. NESO is also committed to promoting transparency by proactively publishing data deemed low risk on its public portal.

Analysis of GC0105 System Incident Data

The Proposer presented data illustrating the monthly and weekly distribution of incidents, noting that while weekly reporting may lead to an increased workload, the impact is not substantial. NESO representatives further clarified that the number of incidents formally reported is significantly lower than the total number of events actually analysed. The reporting process requires thorough sifting and extensive cross-referencing (which includes control room reports, among other data sources) to ensure accuracy and compliance.

Reporting timelines

A NESO representative presented a confidential comprehensive table outlining the sequential tasks required to generate frequency reports. These tasks encompass data extraction, execution of analytical code, in-depth investigation, submission of data requests to Transmission Owners (TOs), and the final review process. A NESO colleague emphasised that delays in receiving data from TOs represent a bottleneck in the workflow. Additionally, factors such as prevailing operational conditions, the reliability of analytical tools, and the availability of staff further influence the overall reporting timelines.
NESO representatives evaluated the potential for deploying PMU data and additional full-time employees (FTEs) to expedite reporting timelines. However, they emphasised that dependencies on other teams and the overall information flow constrain the benefits of merely increasing staffing levels. Under optimal conditions, including the use of PMUs and favourable weather the reporting period could be reduced to 3.38 days. Despite these improvements, NESO noted that transitioning to a weekly reporting cadence continues to present significant challenges and might not be feasible.

Workgroup members debated the process for identifying reportable events, with NESO representative detailing the checks required across BMU outputs, control room reports, Remit, Elexon, and other sources to ensure events meet Grid Code criteria. The Proposer requested a process flow chart to better visualise the workflow and clarify elapsed versus working time.

NESO representatives agreed to produce a process flow chart, and investigate whether records exist for the total number of events initially analysed each month. They also committed to updating incident reporting tables for completeness, a NESO representative highlighted the need to improve messaging and clarify dependencies for future discussions.

The discussion highlighted that the reporting process for system incidents relies on data provided by the TOs. If the TOs do not provide the required data in a timely manner, it could delay the reporting process. It was suggested that the STC Panel might need to be involved to address these issues, particularly if a modification to the STC is required to formalise data-sharing obligations or timelines.

Legal Text

The Workgroup discussed whether to move from monthly to weekly reporting, with NESO SMEs suggesting monthly is currently feasible, while the Proposer and a Workgroup member proposed transitional options such as fortnightly or shifting to weekly once PMU data is operational. The Workgroup agreed to revisit this after further analysis and tool implementation.

The Proposer recommended that phase jump angles of 5 degrees or greater be classified as significant events, referencing NESO's current requirements for users to both model and report such occurrences. In response, NESO representatives indicated that this topic requires additional discussion within the grid forming expert group and that further clarification is needed regarding measurement capabilities. It was also pointed out that location-specific factors must be taken into account.

The Workgroup debated whether reports should include raw datasets or just summary reports, with a NESO SME favouring reports for clarity. Thresholds for reporting (e.g., 250 MW loss, 0.1 Hz/s RoCoF) were discussed, with the Proposer suggesting additional criteria for automated detection and redundancy avoidance, and NESOs SME proposing changes to region definitions and data intervals.

NESO SMEs raised concerns about the feasibility of reporting certain data (e.g., 100 ms frequency data, phase jump angles) given current tool limitations and data volume. The Workgroup agreed to keep some requirements open pending further internal NESO review and tool development, with actions assigned to clarify technical capabilities.

The Proposer explained the rationale for Section C, which aims to report broader transmission faults and events beyond significant incidents. NESO SMEs clarified that auto reclosures are not currently reported in GC0151 or GC0105 due to their frequency and asset ownership, it was agreed that NESO would investigate whether this information can be sourced from TOs.

Cost and Workload Implications for Enhanced Reporting

The Workgroup discussed the cost and workload implications of moving to weekly reporting, with the Proposer requesting confirmation of placeholder figures and NESO to provide more detailed cost data for the CBA analysis.

Placeholder Cost Figures

The proposer used a placeholder of £50,000 per annum for weekly reporting in the CBA, seeking confirmation from NESO. A Workgroup member indicated that weekly data provision should not be cost prohibitive, but more detailed breakdowns are needed for accuracy.

Action for Cost Data

The Chair agreed to keep the action open for NESO to provide more cost data, and the Proposer requested input to refine the CBA analysis, with the Workgroup agreeing to revisit this once more information is available.

Next Steps

The Chair outlined the agreed actions and forthcoming steps, which include updating the incident tables, developing process flowcharts, clarifying the criteria for phase jump angles, and investigating the feasibility of auto reclosure reporting. Progress on these items will be reviewed at the next Workgroup meeting.

It was agreed that the Chair would circulate the legal text, data sharing slides, and reporting process slides, setting up a collaboration space for all members to review and comment on the legal text, ensuring collective progress ahead of the next meeting.

Actions

For the full action log, click here.

Action Number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Status	Date due by
04	WG1	GW	Assess cost and workload implications for Transmission Owners (TOs) providing additional data.	Open	Ongoing
07	WG1	MB	Suggest thresholds for publishing larger incidents weekly and smaller ones monthly; NESO to consider if this mitigates workload concerns.	Closed	WG3
11	WG2	AL	Prepare a short presentation on phase jumps.	Open	WG3
12	WG2	All	Review the GC0181 defect description to determine if phase jump data can be included.	Open	WG3
16	WG3	MD	Provide the data guidelines and check if the direct policy documents can be shared with the Workgroup.	Open	WG4

17	WG3	FK	Provide more information regarding confidentiality, costs, and data sharing with the TOs.	Open	WG4
18	WG3	JAK	Provide information on PMUs being installed are of the same technology or specification and to clarify their technical capabilities.	Open	WG4
19	WG3	GN	Review and improve the framing of the cost-benefit analysis for blackout prevention, specifically by comparing the expected probability of a blackout event to the calculated benefit of enhanced reporting.	Open	WG4
20	WG3	MC	Provide specific information on the system incident report spreadsheet such as format changes.	Closed	WG4
21	WG3	All	Review legal text when circulated with updated wording.	Closed	WG4
22	WG3	MD	Share the background of numbers and reporting times for the System Incident Report	Closed	WG4
23	WG3	GW	Provide map showing where future and current PMUs are installed and the identification of zones/regions these PMUs fall into.	Open	WG4
24	WG3	FK/JAK/MD	Contact EU TSOs to look at the frequency data resolution and see if they do more than the legislative standard	Open	WG4
25	WG4	JSC	Provide more detailed cost data from NESO to confirm whether	Open	WG5

			the placeholder figure of £50,000 per annum for weekly reporting is sensible		
26	WG4	JSC	Provide an example of a previous incident with attached PMU data to demonstrate how PMU data could be used in system incident reporting, once operational PMU data is available.	Open	WG5
27	WG4	JSC	Update the incident reporting tables for weekly and monthly incidents to include a complete record from 2022 to 2025, using available public data.	Open	WG5
28	WG4	MD	Create a process flowchart for the incident reporting process and a Gantt chart clarifying the steps and time allocations, including separation of working and waiting times.	Open	WG5
29	WG4	MD	Explore whether there is a record of the total number of events initially investigated each month and obtain this data if possible.	Open	WG5
30	WG4	AG	Consult with SMEs to clarify how phase jump angles, which are location specific, should be handled and reported in the legal text.	Open	WG5
31	WG4	FK/JSC	Define the degree or extent of the phase jump angle that qualifies as a significant event for inclusion in the legal text.	Open	WG5
32	WG4	AG	Check whether auto-reclosures are reported in GC0151 and establish the teams and tools	Open	WG5

	responsible for capturing this information

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Jess Rivalland	JR	Code Administrator	Chair
Deborah Spencer	TM	Code Administrator	Technical Secretary
Guy Nicholson	GN	Statkraft	Proposer
Ankit Gupta	AG	NESO	Observer
Alice Siri	AS	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Frank Kasibante	FK	NESO	NESO SME
Garth Grahm	GG	SSE	Alternate
Gareth Williams	GW	On behalf of STC Panel	Workgroup Member
Jesus Sanchez Cortes	JSC	NESO	NESO SME
Mathew Chandy	MC	EDF Energy	Workgroup Member
Matthew Dixon	MD	NESO	Alternate
Simon Morris	SM	NESO	Observer
Tim Ellingham	TE	RWE	Workgroup Member