

Public

SQSS Code Review Panel

Date: 28/04/2026

Location: Microsoft Teams

Start: 10:00

End: 12:40

Participants

Attendee	Initials	Company
Teri Puddefoot	TP	Chair
Kayte Stanton-Hughes	KSH	Panel Technical Secretary
Alan Creighton	AC	Panel Member, Network Operator Representative
Antony Johnson	AJ	Panel Member, NESO Representative Alternate
Bieshoy Awad	BA	Panel Member, NESO Representative Alternate
Blane Jones	BJ	Authority Representative Alternate
Calum Watkins	CW	Authority Representative
Claire Newton	CN	NESO Representative
Cornel Brozio	CB	Panel Member, SP Transmission Representative
Garth Graham	GG	Panel Member, Generator Representative
Graeme Vincent	GV	Panel Member, SP Transmission Representative
Graham Lear	GL	NESO Representative
Le Fu	LF	Panel Member, NGET Representative
Martin Brown	MB	Panel Member, OFTO Representative
Mike Lee	ML	Panel Member, OFTO Representative
Roddy Wilson	RW	Panel Member, SHET Transmission Operator Representative
Observers / Presenters	Initials	Company
Achilleas Moschakos	AM	NESO Representative - Observer
Cathy Fraser	CF	NESO Representative - Observer
James Prideaux-Richards	JPR	NESO Representative - Observer
Maldon Goodridge	MG	NESO Representative - Presenter
Mingyu Sun	MS	NESO Representative - Observer
Ryan Baldwin	RB	NESO Representative - Observer
Apologies	Initials	Company
Dovile Kvedyte-Corrigan	DKC	Authority Representative Alternative

Public

1. Introductions and Apologies

The Chair welcomed Panel members and thanked them for attending the meeting. Apologies were received from Dovile Kvedyte-Corrigan.

2. Minutes from previous meeting

There were no minutes to agree, final minutes for 24 March 2026 will be presented at the May Panel.

3. Review of actions log

The SQSS Panel reviewed the open actions:

Action 40.8: (Open) AJ provided an update on Grid Code Workgroup GC117, which concerns alignment for small, medium and large power stations across Great Britain. The GC0117 proposal was sent back by Ofgem last year, with Ofgem requesting further work, including a review of the cost-benefit analysis (CBA), consideration of technical limits, and DSO/NESO alignment. NESO advised that work to date has focused on the CBA, which will be re-run using the latest available data. Stakeholder comments on key sensitivities have been sought and discussed, with feedback incorporated where practicable. An email update confirmed that the CBA re-run is about to commence and that further updates will be provided as it progresses. It was confirmed that no SQSS modification associated with GC0117 will progress until the GC0117 Workgroup re-submission has been considered by Ofgem and a decision issued. No further action is expected until Ofgem decides on the GC0117 send-back.

Action 42: (Open) The Panel discussed Action 42 as being a legacy action and its original purpose is now unclear, so historic minutes need to be checked to confirm what was originally requested. The Panel believe this relates to SQSS terminology (using “ISOP” rather than “The Company”), possibly connected to the ISOP/NESO go-live and/or a previous change that brought the governance framework into the SQSS (referenced as GSR033). Panel members felt that any resulting change expected would be non-material and could be handled as a textual amendment in a future housekeeping modification; should this turn out to be more material, it could be picked up as follow-on work from GSR033.

Action 46: (Closed) Panel agreed this action has been met.

Action 48: (Open) CN updated the Panel on the GSR036 proposal – legal text and case studies. Panel members were reminded to review the updated GSR036 and submit comments. It was noted that final comments are being sought, with the intention to bring the proposal back to the May SQSS Panel and, subject to Panel view, proceed directly to CAC.

Public

Action 49: (Open) CN advised that SMC had now held three to four workshops with interested parties to work through the issue in more detail. There has been active stakeholder engagement and iterative discussions, with attendees helping to shape the work as it has progressed. The Panel thanked those who had taken part and noted that, on the basis of those workshops, the work now appears to be close to completion.

Action 50: (Closed) Panel agreed this action has been met.

Action 51: (Closed) Panel agreed this action has been met.

New Actions

Action 52: (Open) TP to review historic minutes/notes to confirm intent of Action 42 and liaise with SMC regarding including any needed text changes in the next housekeeping modification, with an update at the May Panel.

Action 53: (Open) All Panel members would be asked to provide their views on FRCR governance options for both the short and long term, with responses to be collated and discussed at the May Panel. In parallel, Ofgem’s view is to be sought on whether it would be comfortable with an FRCR recommendation coming directly from NESO without a Panel role.

Action 54: (Open) BJ/CW to sound out Ofgem on acceptable FRCR governance/assurance (incl. whether a panel role is required); report back at the May Panel.

Action 55: (Open) TP to send out request (via Teams) to each Panel member, to identify their preferred FRCR governance option(s) for 2027 and longer term. TP to collate for a discussion at the May Panel.

Action 56: (Open) NESO/FRCR team: To refine viable options considering wider process changes (incl. code manager context).

4. Authority Decisions

There were no Authority decisions.

5. New modifications

There were no New Modifications.

6. In flight modification updates

There were no in-flight modifications

7. Workgroup Reports

Public

No Workgroup Reports were presented to the Panel.

8. Draft Final Modification Reports

No Draft Final Modification Reports presented to the Panel.

9. Update on other Industry Codes

Links to other Industry Codes recent Panel meetings were included in the Panel Papers.

10. Code Administrator Update

There were no Code Administrator Updates.

11. Any Other Business (AOB)

Frequency Risk and Control Report (FRCR) – Governance

GL presented on update on the FRCR governance advising that, following discussions in late 2024, NESO introduced external assurance for FRCR 2025 (Accenture, supported by an engineering assurance team). Although largely well received, the Panel vote included abstentions, reflecting concerns about the technical complexity and what the Panel is effectively being asked to “sign off”.

Consultation feedback (high level) received:

- Most respondents did not support moving FRCR oversight purely into a NESO licence condition (concerns about reduced/removed industry oversight).
- Continued oversight via the SQSS Panel was generally supported.
- Views were mixed on what SQSS Panel oversight should cover (process assurance only vs technical assurance managed elsewhere).

Governance options discussed:

1. Independent specialist to conduct a comprehensive technical review; governance remains within the SQSS.
Pros: minimal change; no code change; independent scrutiny.
Cons: identifying/contracting the right party; trust and funding questions.
2. Partner with another TSO to perform the review.
Pros: independent peer scrutiny; no code change.
Cons: set-up effort; accountability/conflict concerns (mutual “marking homework”).
3. Separate technical panel/body signs off technical adequacy; SQSS Panel confirms process governance.

Public

Pros: clearer technical assurance.

Cons: added complexity/time; set-up and funding required.

4. New single panel outside SQSS governance to sign off both process and technical aspects.

Pros: one body; less duplication.

Cons: major set-up effort; capability/competence requirements.

5. NESO licence requirement for FRCR oversight (not favoured in consultation feedback).

Pros: reduces obligation on SQSS.

Cons: industry perception; potential code changes; resource/time implications.

Discussion highlights included:

- Code governance reforms: SQSS/Panel arrangements may change; options should consider the future Code Manager / Stakeholder Advisory Forum model and the “shelf life” of any new governance structure.
- Cost vs benefit: View that cost should not be a blocker where consumer benefits are material (and funding mechanisms exist).
- Capability constraint: Key challenge is finding reviewers with sufficient specialist technical competence for a niche analysis.
- Where FRCR governance should sit: Mixed views—some felt SQSS Panel should set standards rather than audit implementation; others cautioned that a move to licence-only oversight could reduce stakeholder sign-off/representation.
- External references: Keith Bell’s report cited as support for independent technical scrutiny, a continuing role for SQSS Panel, and clearer accountability.
- FRCR 2025 approach: Process-focused assurance raised as a potential ongoing model (“option 6”), acknowledging that time constraints previously limited deeper audit.
- Confirmation required for, whether changes are required for FRCR 2027, decision lead-times, and the timeline for FRCR 2027 work.

Frequency Risk and Control Report (FRCR) – Report

MG gave a presentation to the Panel, regarding the FRCR Supplementary Report:

FRCR 2027 planning

FRCR 2027 scoping underway (to ~June); methodology work thereafter, timeline (indicative) is estimated for late summer/early autumn, calculation November-December for submission targeted for March 2027.

Public

Governance and independent scrutiny of FRCR

Panel role/assurance: the discussion noted the Panel’s limited technical decision-making capacity and the desire for deeper involvement in model detail. Panel members strongly supported independent scrutiny to increase confidence in the outputs and to ensure they can withstand external challenge. Panel members questioned whether Ofgem would accept FRCR recommendations from NESO without a Panel view, and what assurance would be required.

The Panel discussions of the Options:

Option 2 (longer-term), peer review by another TSO supported in principle, but feasibility, resourcing/reciprocity and multiyear set-up time noted (possible shadowing in 2027; fuller role from 2028).

Outcome (provisional): pursue Option 1 for FRCR 2027 while developing Option 2 as the preferred longer-term assurance arrangement.

Option 1 (near-term): independent technical specialist review (model/submission) viewed as a “least regrets” approach for FRCR 2027.

Next Steps

Chair to circulate the governance options and request all Panel members’ views on what’s deliverable for FRCR 2027 and what’s preferred longer term (including any additional options). Responses to be collated and discussed at the May Panel to agree the recommended way forward.

Ofgem view to be sought on comfort with an FRCR recommendation coming directly from NESO without a Panel role.

The next SQSS Panel meeting will be held on 27 May 2026, 10am-12 noon via Microsoft Teams.

New Modification Proposals to be submitted by 06 May 2026.

SQSS Code Review Panel Papers Day is 13 May 2026.