

Public

Code Administrator Meeting

Summary

Workgroup Meeting 7: CM097 – Electromagnetic Transient (EMT) and Root Mean Square (RMS) Model Submission for Transmission Owners (TOs)

Date: 27 March 2026

Contact Details

Chair: Claire Goult, claire.goult@neso.energy

Proposer: Frank Kasibante, frank.kasibantel@neso.energy

Key areas of discussion

The aim of Workgroup 7 was to provide an update on STCP 12-2 (including Appendix B), discuss an Alternative Request, discuss agreement of the draft Legal Text, discuss the Workgroup Report and Terms of Reference, and review the Workgroup Vote process.

Workgroup Membership

The Chair noted the importance of ensuring that Workgroup membership details, including names, organisations and representation, are correct. They confirmed that these details will form part of the formal record of the Workgroup vote. Workgroup members were asked to review the membership slide and notify the Chair of any corrections.

STCP 12-2 and Appendix B update

A Workgroup member had previously raised comments on STCP 12-2 and Appendix B. The NESO SME confirmed that these comments had been reviewed by the Root Mean Square (RMS) Modelling Team and provided an update on their view.

Appendix B

Simulation duration

A Workgroup member noted that there were inconsistencies in Appendix B, as it contained references to both 20 seconds and 50 seconds for the required simulation duration. The NESO SME confirmed that the document would be updated so that the time requirement is consistently stated as 50 seconds, aligning with the relevant Grid Code provision.

Public

RMS modelling requirements

A Workgroup member raised concerns regarding clarity on percentage deviation requirements, noting ambiguity as to whether this related to rated megawatts or initial reference values. The NESO SME confirmed that the wording would be clarified to ensure the requirement is correctly described. The Workgroup member also noted inconsistent use of time units in the document, with the NESO SME agreeing to amend the document to ensure consistency.

Applicability of Grid Code requirements to Transmission Owners (TOs)

A Workgroup member queried whether references to Grid Code requirements could be interpreted as applying beyond TOs. The NESO SME confirmed that the intention is to update the drafting so that applicability is clearly limited to TOs.

User specific RMS models

A Workgroup member sought clarification on the meaning of 'User specific RMS models', particularly in relation to library models, modified library models, and DLL based models. The NESO SME confirmed that DLL based RMS models are not acceptable and that the drafting would be updated to clarify that DLL-based RMS models are excluded and confirm what is meant by 'User specific RMS models. The Workgroup agreed that further clarification in the document is required.

RMS model submission process

A Workgroup member asked whether RMS model submission requirements had previously been captured through earlier Grid Code modifications. The Proposer stated that this would need to be checked, including whether any consequential STC modifications arose from GC0141. The Chair noted this will need to be confirmed.

STCP 12-2

Model sharing and confidentiality

Workgroup members raised concerns regarding the wording used on sharing TO models with Users, particularly around intellectual property and liability. The NESO SME clarified that any sharing would be subject to Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs) between OEMs, third parties, and NESO, and would be limited to defined purposes such as connection studies. The Proposer noted that Schedule 3 of the STC already contains confidentiality provisions that should be considered in relation to this point. The Workgroup agreed that the drafting should provide greater clarity on safeguards and on the reciprocal nature of model sharing.

Public

Terminology

A Workgroup member noted that the document uses 'Users' and 'Network Assets' inconsistently, which could cause confusion. They clarified that 'Users' has a specific meaning in the STC that is distinct from TOs. The Workgroup agreed that this terminology should be applied consistently and accurately. The NESO SME will review and correct consistency of terminology throughout the document.

Alternative Request

The Chair reminded the Workgroup that an Alternative Request had been raised by Transmission Investment following the earlier Workgroup Consultation stage in 2025, which had been discussed in subsequent Workgroup meetings before CM097 was paused. Since CM097 was reinstated, the Alternative Request Proposer had met with the CM097 Proposer and NESO SMEs to discuss a revised Legal Text draft that was intended to address the concerns highlighted in the Alternative Request.

The Alternative Request Proposer summarised the key concerns of the Alternative Request as the availability of legacy data, the time required to collate or develop EMT and RMS models, and the desire to avoid a blanket requirement where models may not be necessary. They explained that these concerns had largely been addressed through the revised Legal Text drafting, including the introduction of a hierarchy of model types, defined timescales with flexibility where otherwise agreed, and wording that limits model provision to cases where models are required for studies or investigations.

The Alternative Request Proposer confirmed that cost recovery remained the only unresolved issue, particularly in relation to software licences and OFTOs. They stated that while they supported the principle of providing models, the mechanism for recovering these costs was not addressed within CM097 and should be highlighted transparently rather than resolved within this modification. They also raised concerns around drafting, including references that appeared more aligned to Generation Users rather than TOs, and a requirement for TOs to maintain lifetime model maintenance and support frameworks, which they considered potentially disproportionate and closely linked to the unresolved cost recovery issue.

The Alternative Request Proposer stated that, subject to confirmation with their colleague who was not present at the Workgroup meeting, they were minded to withdraw their Alternative Request, on the basis that most concerns had been addressed and the remaining issue would be clearly documented in the Workgroup Report. Workgroup members made no further comment.

Public

Workgroup Report

The Chair confirmed that the Workgroup Report has been circulated to members prior to this meeting and noted that pages 11–13 contain the most substantive revisions. They confirmed that the report will be submitted to the STC Panel on 15 April 2026, so Workgroup members were asked to provide comments as soon as possible to allow time for revisions.

Alternative Request

The Chair highlighted that the report contains a summary of the Alternative Request discussions, with a reference to the cost recovery issue remaining unresolved, but it will be updated to include a suggestion from the Proposer that cost recovery is more appropriately addressed through separate modifications, running in parallel rather than attempting to resolve it as part of CM097.

Terms of Reference (ToR)

The Chair drew attention to the ToR section of the Workgroup Report, noting that the Workgroup must confirm that each ToR has been met prior to the Workgroup Vote. The Workgroup agreed that the ToRs appear to have been addressed, subject to final confirmation.

Action Log Review

The Chair confirmed that all Actions had been resolved prior to the Workgroup pausing in 2025 and that no outstanding Actions remain.

Workgroup Vote process

The Chair outlined the Workgroup Vote process, noting that the Vote is planned for the next Workgroup meeting on 08 April 2026 and Workgroup members must have attended at least 50% of meetings to be eligible to vote. Confirmation of eligibility and voting forms will be circulated prior to the next Workgroup meeting.

The Chair confirmed that the Vote contains two stages, with Stage 1 for the Alternative vote (which may not be required should the Alternative Request be formally withdrawn) followed by Stage 2 which assesses the Original solution against the STC objectives compared to the baseline (the current STC). They confirmed that pre-filling voting forms is welcomed but the votes must be taken live in the meeting in order to be recorded.

Next Steps

The Chair confirmed that Workgroup meeting 8 on 08 April 2026 will focus on the updated STCP and Appendix B, agreement of the draft Legal Text, and confirmation that the Terms of Reference have been met. The Workgroup vote will also be carried out. They confirmed that the Workgroup

Public

Report is scheduled to be issued to the STC Panel on 15 April 2026, the DFMR on 16 June 2026, and the FMR on 16 July 2026. Workgroup members were asked to review the Workgroup Report and provide comments where necessary, including references to the Terms of Reference table.

Actions

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

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

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Claire Goult	CG	NESO Code Administrator	Chair
Matthew Larreta	ML	NESO Code Administrator	Technical Secretary
Anthony Johnson	AJ	NESO	Proposer (Alternate)
Agusti Egea Alvarez	AEA	SP Energy Networks	Workgroup Member Alternate
Arslan Saidi	AS	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Bala Santhanam	BS	Enercon GmbH	Workgroup Member
Bo Jiang	BJ	NGET	Workgroup Member Alternate
Dewu Shu	DS	GE Vernova	Workgroup Member
Gopi Yericherla	GY	NESO	NESO SME
Graeme Vincent	GV	SP Energy Networks	Workgroup Member
Joel Matthews	JM	Diamond Transmission Corp	Workgroup Member

Public

Le Fu	LF	NGET	Workgroup Member
Maria Ebue	ME	Voltalia UK Ltd	Observer
Roger Carter	RC	Transmission Investment	Workgroup Member Alternate
Srinivas Edla	SE	SSEN	Workgroup Member