

Public

Meeting Summary

Grid Code Development Forum – 05 August 2026

Date: 05/08/20225 **Location:** MS Teams

Start: 09:00 **End:** 10:30

Participants

Attendee	Company	Attendee	Company
Claire Newton	NESO (Chair)	Paul Youngman	Drax
Thomas Goss	NESO (Tech Sec)	Chris Hill	Drax
Tanmay Kadam	NESO (Presenter)	Alan Creighton	Northern Powergrid
Amanda Rooney	NESO (Presenter)	Cifuentes, Nicolas	Wärtsilä
Antony Johnson	NESO	Stephen Sommerville	Aurora Power
Steve Baker	NESO	Chris Smith	Natural Power
Graham Lear	NESO	Nicola Barberis Negra	Orsted
Maria Lopez	NESO	Xiaoming Li	Zenobe
Sarah Williams	NESO	Gordon Frazer	NESO
Gordon Frazer	NESO	Maryam Begum	Cummins
Ola Atef	NESO	Maryam Begum	Cummins
Tanmay Kadam	NESO	Tim Ellingham	RWE
Nnaemeka Anyiam	NESO	Andrew Allan	RWE
Dovile Kvedyte-Corrigan	Ofgem	Leon Burdekin-Roberts	EDF Power

Public

Mike Kay	P2 Analysis	Derryl Miranda	EDF
Vincent, Graeme	SPEN	Mohit Prajapati	EDF Power
Malachi Kakembo	Ecotricity	Bukky Daniel	EDF
Rajiv Jha	National Grid	Benjamin Marshall	SSE
Isaac Gutierrez	Scottish Power	Andrew Urquhart	SSE
Stuart Kerr	Scottish Power	Garth Graham	SSE
		Salim Temtem	SSE

Agenda

Agenda for Grid Code Development Forum (GCDF)

Topics to be discussed	Owner
1. Introductions and review of previous actions	Claire Newton, NESO
2. Code Administrator Update	Grid Code Administrator
3. Alternate Reactive Power Capability This topic aims to provide Grid Code compliance clarity when there is a need to agree on an alternative reactive power capability with a Generator by virtue of network operator's restrictions or system conditions.	Tanmay Kadam, NESO
4. Compliance Clarifications and Corrections Modifications An introduction to a suite of changes proposed in follow up to GC0187: Grid Code Legal Text Corrections 2026. Another Housekeeping modification, plus a change to include small, but material changes will be introduced. We are seeking feedback on what is included as well as the governance route options available.	Tanmay Kadam and Amanda Rooney, NESO
5. AOB: AOB: Technical Requirements for Demand Connections An update on progress of the demand expert group.	
6. Meeting Close	

A link to the Agenda and Presentations from the Augus6t GCDF can be found [here](#).

Public

Summary of meeting

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) & Thomas Goss (GCDF Tech Sec), NESO

The meeting was opened, with an overview of the agenda items that will be covered.

This meeting summary follows the order of the agenda, rather than chronological order of the discussion, which was adjusted on the day to take account of speaker availability: the AOBI item was presented first.

Presentation: Alternate Reactive Power capability – Tanmay Kadam (NESO)

Tanmay Kadam presented on alternate reactive power capability for embedded generators facing DNO or TO network restrictions, detailing compliance assessment scenarios

Case 1: DNO Restriction in place prior to NESO Compliance Tanmay explained that if a DNO imposes a restriction before NESO compliance, the generator must notify NESO, and the restriction is reflected in the bilateral agreement.

The generator must demonstrate compliance both for the grid code minimum and the restricted capability, with on-site testing based on the restriction. Once lifted, compliance with the full grid code must be re-demonstrated.

Case 2: DNO Restriction in place After NESO Compliance If a DNO restriction arises after NESO compliance, Tanmay clarified that this is treated as an operational issue. The generator is not required to re-demonstrate full compliance but may need to resubmit models reflecting the restriction.

Case 3: No Restriction in place but Low network Fault Levels (applicable for both Embedded and Directly Connected) Tanmay describes cases where low network fault levels prevent demonstration of full reactive capability. In such cases, NESO may suggest alternative compliance methods, such as using slightly higher fault levels within the specified range. On-site testing procedures may also be adapted in coordination with the DNO.

Discussion themes / Feedback

An attendee asked regarding Case 1: As this is the ECC, will it apply only to those generators to whom that code applies, i.e. who is paying for the simulation studies, and who is going to pay for any changes as a result of the study?

Public

NESO responded that we would retain the ECC wording, and the obligation therefore remains on the generating user to pay for the studies. Another NESO stakeholder also pointed out that in the case of P28 studies we were finding many cases of plants failing to meet it, the network connection not being strong enough to support the size of the plant. If we tried to trip it the step change would be 6 to 7%, only way to manage it was to restrict the reactive power capability of the plant, in which case the question would be about capturing and translating the data. We don't want this happening but DNO network doesn't need that level of reactive power range, so the idea is to conduct several studies, a theoretical one to prove the plant can meet the power range, and another one to see how it can maintain the power limit.

An attendee asked about the relation to the Grid Code and Embedded users, what size of power station would it relate to?

NESO confirms that it would impact large stations with BEGA or BELA, or med stations with a BEGA, but this is what we need to consider as small power stations it is less certain what the position should be.

An attendee asks about defining the term 'user' as in it could be misread as either the generator or the network, and we need to be more clear about the current embedded generators not being covered by this new approach.

NESO responded to confirm current connections would not need to demonstrate compliance again, only for newly connected generators.

An attendee responded to the above specifically referring to Case 3: asking that if the fault level on an embedded plant might become a permanent basis, how would we know about it? Another stakeholder agreed regarding the wording on case 3 and how it would be applied regarding the step tests and fault dynamics, and worries that the operational limitations are being used for fault ride through studies, would be an artificial constraint

NESO responded that these issues were discussed, and confirms they will not be asking users to repeat studies but only look at reactive power studies with specific respect to LVRT/HVRT. During the fault we would not expect the plants' capability to be restricted, but normal operation which is what the studies are about, the limitation we are talking about is in the power park controller, limiting the reactive power range in routine operation.

An attendee suggested that we are shifting the goalposts, using current values to look at the compliance check, but during a fault we may not be compliant. They were concerned the operational measures will be different from the planned ones, and if we have an SVRT requirement.

NESO confirmed that we do check fault levels during compliance, what has been used, and the assessment models will also look at how the model checks are carried out. We know that a generator is not able to show reactive power levels due to system conditions, this is why we are

Public

asking for studies using higher fault levels to understand if this can have a positive impact. When it comes to operation we would be mindful of this difference, user might not be able to achieve full capability. This situation will not be considered non-compliance, though there is not yet a clear requirement for HVRT.

An attendee asked about how operational restriction is going to be captured going forward, and how a particular site would know about the restrictions? For example it might be necessary to think about the PC or DRC so the users have some proper guidance on capturing these studies.

NESO confirmed that this action would be done in conjunction with the TO's/DNO's but we would need to investigate the potential impact and/or use of the PC/DRC, this was taken away as an action.

Presentation: Compliance Clarifications and Corrections Modifications – Tanmay Kadam/Amanda Rooney (NESO)

Amanda Rooney outlined forthcoming grid code modifications addressing housekeeping and small material changes, explaining the governance process and inviting participation in the work group. She explained that two modifications will be raised: one for non-material housekeeping changes and another for small but material changes. The process allows for items identified as material during consultation to be moved to the material modification.

Therefore some small changes are needed in order to keep the Grid Code correct. In terms of how this would proceed regarding governance routes, the housekeeping modification would ideally be going straight to Code Administrator Consultation (CAC) and the material modification following standard governance with a work group and Ofgem sign-off.

Stakeholders are encouraged to review and flag any concerns.

Amanda invited participants to join the work group and contribute to the housekeeping register, we want to maintain openness to feedback and further discussion as the legal text is developed to ensure all stakeholders have a chance to input. The goal is to present at the August or September panels

Discussion themes / Feedback

An attendee asked if we have checked the materiality of the proposals, as there might be a dependency on the non-material changes.

NESO confirmed that we have looked into this, and many changes are about referencing which has changed or become redundant, or there are some discrepancies due to previous changes.

An attended expressed concern that the Synchronous Power Generator item in the 'Non-material changes' section, as this could have material implications.

Public

NESO confirmed that this was the proposed listing, and all items are up for discussion if there is a feeling that anything in the 'non-material' section is actually material, or vice versa, and there is a low bar to anything staying under 'material' changes.

AOB

AOB1: Technical Requirements for Demand Connections – Graham Lear (NESO)

An update was provided on the Demand Expert Group, an industry group that was set up following a presentation at GCDF in autumn 2025.

The Demand Expert Group is discussing code modifications necessary to ensure suitable technical requirements exist for demand connections that guarantee system security and operability. The group has been meeting monthly to discuss:

- Technical requirements for demand connections being developed by other TSOs.
- Capability of different technologies to meet proposed requirements.
- Gaps in technical requirements in GB and proposed modifications to address these.

NESO has been developing Fault Ride Through proposals for codification and discussing these with the group as well as developers and OEMS bilaterally.

Currently, NESO is proposing to require connections greater or equal to a given MW threshold to have a Fault Ride Through capability. These requirements should extend to demand connected at distribution levels, although the group has yet to agree how best to do this.

The next steps for the group are:

- Continue refining the proposed requirements.
- Discuss the work at Distribution Code Review Panel.
- Begin compiling a Demand Expert Group report.

Interested parties can contact box.GBDemand@neso.energy to get involved.

Questions / Feedback:

Public

How big is the Demand Expert Group and who is represented?

The group is external facing and includes Network Operators, Transmission Owners, developers, original equipment manufacturers (OEMs), Transmission System Operators from other regions. The calls involve approx. 30 participants.

Which TSOs have been engaged with the group, and has newly proposed EU legislation been considered?

Eirgrid (Ireland), Energinet (Denmark), Ercot (Texas) and AEMO (Australia) have attended calls. EU code requirements, both existing and proposed, are being monitored. However, DCC 2.0 may not be finalised until 2027, and whether we rejoin the EU internal electricity market will be important. The initial GB proposals will include system critical requirements that cannot wait, while awaiting the outcomes regarding EU alignment before proposing anything additional.

Should requirements be on the facility or on the plant that can have a material impact on the system?

The current approach being proposed (a MW threshold) is due to the complexity in defining what should be expected to ride through a fault, but this is still up for consideration.

Why is a bilateral approach such as BEDA being put forward when the Grid Code requirements could follow through to the Distribution Code?

The suggestion of a Bilateral Embedded Demand Agreement is only a possibility. We agree it would be a sensible idea to ensure the requirements are codified in both Grid Code and Distribution Code.

An attendee discussed the use of Bilateral Connection Agreements as a way to establish requirements rather than putting them in the code. They noted codification ensures the proposals go through a public consultation, with workgroups, feedback from industry, and an authority decision.

The best route forward to ensure requirements are suitably codified is under review. This will include public consultation to ensure industry viewpoints are considered.

AOB2: Concerning the withdrawn slides Reactive Power (Tanmay Kadam, NESO) which were on the original Agenda for this GCDF session before deciding we were not ready to present.

Mike Kay (P2 Analysis) wished to advise that some of the proposals would not have been legal, especially on changing the ECC. Article 4 of the DCC is clear and we would have to meet all of the requirements, the grid Code modification process alone would not have been sufficient. There

Public

would also be significant difficulties encountered by anyone attempting to implement what was being proposed.

NESO responded to confirm that the wording in the ECC was a direct lift from DCC with strict limitations, and then copied verbatim from the DCC into the Grid Code. This explained who is captured and who isn't but we needed external lawyers to look into this when developing several previous code mods. We agree that reactive spill from DBNO's to the transmission system is a major issue and how it is to be resolved is important and very much up for discussion.

Attendees were reminded that the GCDF can be used by any industry party to present potential Grid Code changes and future agenda items are welcomed.

The dates for the 2026 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 7th October 2026 with the 25th September 2026 being the deadline for agenda items and presentations.
