

Public

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Workgroup Meeting 9: Enhance the Effectiveness of System Incidents Reporting

Date: 10 August 2026

Contact Details

Chair: Keren Kelly, keren.kelly1@neso.energy

Proposer: Guy Nicholson, guy.nicholson@statkraft.com

Meeting purpose

The meeting focused on reviewing the draft Workgroup Consultation, including how it should explain the development of the Proposer's solution, present the evidence and differing views, link discussion to the draft Legal Text and frame Workgroup Consultation questions. The Workgroup also considered a potential NESO Alternative Request, the Terms of Reference, the timetable, and open actions.

Key areas of discussion

Welcome, introductions and meeting objectives

The Chair welcomed new attendees, reminded members of the expected standards of conduct and confirmed that the main purpose of the meeting was to review the draft Workgroup Consultation and identify consultation questions.

The Chair confirmed that there had been no recent Workgroup attendance from the System Operator Transmission Owner Code (STC) Panel representative and agreed to follow this up after the meeting.

Potential Alternative Request

The Chair confirmed that NESO had not submitted a formal Alternative Request. The NESO representative explained that NESO was developing comparative material and possible alternative Legal Text in areas where its position differed from the Proposer's solution, including reporting frequency and the scope of System Incident Reporting.

A Workgroup member considered that industry should be able to review the Proposer's solution and any NESO Alternative Request together in the Workgroup Consultation. The NESO representative agreed and stated that the drafting would be progressed for submission to the Code Administrator.

The Chair explained that the Workgroup would vote on whether the request should progress as a formal Workgroup Alternative Grid Code Modification. If it did not progress,

Public

the request and the Workgroup's decision would still be recorded in the Workgroup Consultation for transparency.

Outcome: NESO to prepare the Alternative Request for circulation and consideration at the next Workgroup meeting.

Draft Workgroup Consultation review

Access and status of the draft

The Chair confirmed that the emailed Workgroup Consultation document and the version in the collaboration space were the same. Some members had experienced access difficulties, which the Code Administrator agreed to follow up. The Chair also noted that highlighted text and template prompts would need updating as the solution and potential alternative developed.

Executive summary and evolution of the solution

The Workgroup considered that the executive summary should explain the purpose and importance of the Modification before setting out detailed parameters. This included its relationship with Security and Quality of Supply Standard (SQSS) and Frequency Risk and Control Report (FRCR) and the use of incident-reporting data in supporting system analysis.

Workgroup members considered that the draft reflected the modification as originally submitted but did not adequately explain how the Proposer's solution had developed through the Workgroup process. Areas identified included PMU data, phase jump angle, voltage parameters, reporting processes and data sharing.

The Chair clarified that "Original" in the "Proposer's Original Solution" referred to the Proposer's solution for governance and voting purposes, even where that solution had evolved during the Workgroup process. The Workgroup Consultation would make this distinction clear.

The Proposer intended to update the Proposer's draft Legal Text, and the NESO representative intended to provide updated NESO drafting. The Chair confirmed that the Workgroup Consultation would distinguish between Legal Text supporting the Proposer's solution and any Legal Text supporting a potential alternative.

Outcome: The Code Administrator was to revise the opening sections to explain the purpose of the modification, the development of the Proposer's solution, and the distinction between that solution and any potential alternative.

Public

Presentation of differing Legal Text positions

The NESO representative proposed a concise comparison of the areas of alignment and difference between the Proposer's solution and NESO's developing position for inclusion in the Workgroup Consultation. The Proposer supported this approach, provided that each position and its justification were presented separately and neutrally.

The Chair considered that a comparison would help readers who had not attended earlier meetings. The NESO representative confirmed that the existing material required updating before circulation.

Outcome: A summary comparison was supported in principle, but its content and placement remained subject to further review.

Evidence, benefits and cost-benefit material

The Workgroup considered that the Workgroup Consultation should explain how more timely and granular data could support analysis of system events, generator performance, fault ride through, trends and potential risks. Each proposed data requirement should be linked to its intended purpose and benefit.

The Proposer requested that the cost-benefit material be brought together and supported by the relevant calculations or source material. Previously presented estimates of £13 billion for the impact of a blackout and £50,000 for annual reporting costs were discussed. The NESO representative recalled that NESO had provided other figures under Action 25 and noted that operational feasibility was not solely a matter of cost.

The Workgroup did not agree the figures or reach a final cost-benefit position. The Chair agreed that the evidence, assumptions and differing views should be presented more clearly.

The Workgroup also discussed the rationale for weekly reporting, including the limited retention of some operational data. Members supported asking consultation respondents how they use current information and how this might change with faster, more granular or wider-area reporting.

Outcome: The Workgroup Consultation was to consolidate the cost-benefit and impact-assessment material, identify supporting evidence and unresolved points, and seek further input from industry through consultation.

Structure, Legal Text traceability, and annual reporting

The Workgroup considered that the Workgroup Consultation should be structured by topic and Legal Text provision rather than by the chronology of earlier meetings. Each proposed requirement should identify the relevant clause, proposed change, justification, evidence and differing views.

Public

Phase jump angle was discussed as an example of a proposed new reporting trigger. The Workgroup Consultation should explain the reason for the change, the basis for any thresholds and how data availability would affect reporting. The Proposer stated that the drafting was intended to allow reporting to develop as systems and data became available.

The Workgroup also supported adding a separate section on annual reporting. A suggestion that the annual report could identify when further data or reporting capabilities were expected to become available was supported for consideration.

Outcome: The Code Administrator was to restructure the Workgroup Consultation, link the discussion to the relevant Legal Text provisions, and add sections on implementation and annual reporting. Legal Text changes remained subject to further drafting and review.

Reporting process and publication format

The Workgroup noted that real-time data processes existed elsewhere in the industry and that the consultation should better reflect this point.

Members considered that the Grid Code should not prescribe a spreadsheet where a portal, API or another downloadable and machine-readable format might be more appropriate. Technology-neutral wording was preferred. The expression “published on the Company’s Website” was suggested but was not agreed as final wording.

The Proposer clarified the distinction between reporting frequency and publication delay. The current arrangements were described as monthly reporting published up to approximately three months later, while the proposal sought weekly reporting within five working days, subject to flexibility for exceptional circumstances. The Proposer also suggested including or linking to an example of a current System Incident Report.

Outcome: The redrafted Workgroup Consultation was to clarify reporting frequency and publication delay, include technology-neutral wording for further consideration and provide clearer context on current reports.

Workgroup Consultation questions and implementation

Consultation questions

The Proposer considered that Workgroup Consultation questions should address each substantive proposed change and distinguish between the triggers for producing a System Incident Report and the information included within it.

The NESO representative proposed questions covering:

- how industry uses the information currently provided;

Public

- whether industry actions would change with faster, more granular or wider-area reporting;
- the resulting industry and consumer benefits; and
- whether the proposed wording preserved flexibility in the future publication format.

Draft questions would be included in the redrafted Workgroup Consultation document for further review.

Implementation approach

The Workgroup considered that the Workgroup Consultation needed a clearer explanation of implementation, including the tools, analysis and operational work required. Although elements such as PMU data, publication through a website or portal and automation had been discussed. The NESO representative, with technical input from the NESO SME, noted that implementation would require further work. For example, phase jump angle reporting could require relevant locations and thresholds to be identified.

Outcome: Draft specific questions and a dedicated implementation section were to be added to the redrafted Workgroup Consultation document. The implementation detail remained open for further evidence and review.

Workgroup Consultation plan, timetable and next meeting

The Chair confirmed that a redrafted Workgroup Consultation document would be issued by the end of the week for detailed review. The review period was expected to begin on 17 August 2026 and continue until the next meeting.

The next Workgroup meeting was scheduled for 03 September 2026 from 10:00 to 13:00. The NESO Alternative Request was expected to be circulated approximately one week beforehand for review, with a view to conducting a Workgroup vote at the meeting.

A revised modification timetable would also be prepared for Grid Code Review Panel approval.

Outcome: A redrafted Workgroup Consultation document and the potential Alternative Request were to be circulated before the next Workgroup meeting. The revised overall timetable remained subject to Grid Code Review Panel approval.

Terms of Reference

The NESO representative considered that most Terms of Reference had been addressed, with further consideration required in relation to relevant electrical standards. They clarified that the Workgroup had considered the standards but was not responsible for revising them.

Public

The Chair confirmed that the Workgroup would later complete a formal review of each Terms of Reference item and identify where it had been addressed in the Workgroup Report.

The NESO representative stated that no impact had been identified in relation to regulated sections and EBR.

The Workgroup also discussed interactions with SQSS, FRCR and STC. These were considered relevant interactions, but no consequential changes to other codes were identified currently.

Outcome: Formal completion of the Terms of Reference review remained outstanding. Relevant interactions were to be recorded, but no consequential code changes were confirmed.

Actions Log Review

The Chair noted that the actions list had not been updated following the previous meeting. The Workgroup reviewed selected actions rather than the complete list. The review and outcomes are recorded below.

- **Action 34 | Open:** A verbal update on PMU standards had previously been provided, but the Proposer requested the written summary required by the action. The Chair agreed to follow up the earlier verbal update with the NESO representative.
- **Action 35 | Open:** The NESO representative stated an understanding that no STC change was required at present, while recognising that this could change as the solution developed. The action will remain open pending finalisation of the solution.
- **Action 36 | Open:** The NESO representative considered that the purpose had largely been addressed by discussion of coverage across the seven System Restoration Regions, but acknowledged that the requested complete map was not available. The Proposer asked that the action remain open until the Workgroup had reviewed the position after consultation. The Chair confirmed that it would remain open.
- **Action 43 | Open:** The Workgroup related this action to future-proof terminology for publication and System Restoration Regions. NESO to provide suggested wording in writing for the Proposer to consider.
- **Action 47 | Closed:** Follow-up required. The Chair considered the action on “auto reclosure” ready to close because standardisation would probably require a separate modification. The Proposer accepted closure provided the wider drafting issue was captured. The Chair stated that it would be recorded on a log used to capture issues of this nature.
- **Action 50 | Open:** The NESO representative sought clarification of the requirement for a consistent, machine-readable source for BMU, GSP and transmission-circuit naming. The Proposer explained that users needed a single source against which report

Public

references could be checked. The NESO representative agreed that further work was required.

- **Action 51 | Open:** The Chair restated that this action concerned visibility of NESO's internal architecture work. The NESO representative agreed to contact the Network Control Programme team to determine what material was available.
- **Action 52 | Open:** The NESO SME stated that current system measurements, with a reporting rate described as two to five seconds, could not provide accurate one-second voltage-excursion data and questioned whether the proposed thresholds would capture non-significant events. The Proposer requested the best available data with limitations stated. The Chair said any inaccuracies and assumptions should be documented. The NESO SME agreed that NESO would provide material on the action.

Next Steps

- The Code Administrator was to share a redrafted Workgroup Consultation by the end of the week, incorporating the meeting feedback and draft consultation questions.
- Workgroup members were to carry out a detailed review of the redrafted Workgroup Consultation and add comments before Workgroup Meeting 10.
- The Proposer was to update the draft Legal Text following Workgroup feedback.
- The NESO representative was to prepare and submit a potential Alternative Request and supporting Legal Text for circulation approximately one week before the next meeting.
- The Code Administrator was to prepare a revised modification timetable for Grid Code Review Panel approval.
- The next Workgroup meeting was scheduled for 03 September 2026, 10:00 to 13:00, to review the revised Workgroup Consultation and consider the potential Alternative Request.

Actions

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

Action number	Workgroup raised	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
34	WG5	FK	Review and update references to PMU standards in relevant documents, ensuring alignment with the latest IEEE 2018 standard and STCP 2701 Appendix B, and recommend any	WG7	Open

Public

Action number	Workgroup raised	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
			necessary changes. Written summary still required.		
35	WG5	FK	Align GC0181 data requirements with STCP 2701 Appendix B and clarify if a modification to the STC is needed to codify information exchange from TOs to NESO and NESO out. Written confirmation of the present view required.	WG7	Open
36	WG5	FK/JSC	Map current and planned PMU locations to restoration regions and provide a clear visual representation, including coverage of HVDC links and bootstraps, to ensure comprehensive system monitoring.	WG7	Open
43	WG6	SMC	Review terminology for online data portals and System Restoration Regions.	WG7	Open
47	WG6	SMC	Explore feasibility of defining “auto reclosure”. Wider issue to be captured for separate assessment.	WG7	Closed
50	WG7	SMC	Provide a single, consistent source/list for BMU, GSP, and transmission circuit names.	WG8	Open
51	WG7	JSC	Develop and share a high-level architecture diagram showing information flow from PMU rollout to NESO systems.	WG8	Open
52	WG7	JSC	Provide data on occurrences of voltage excursions below 0.85 and above 1.1 per unit for more than one second, to validate proposed reporting thresholds, with limitations and assumptions stated.	WG8	Open
53	WG8	JSC	Following the provision of data from action 52, NESO to consider alternative voltage excursion	WG9	Open

Public

Action number	Workgroup raised	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
			thresholds and provide feedback to the Workgroup.		
54	WG9	KK	Restructure and issue a revised draft of the Workgroup Consultation, incorporating the feedback and draft Workgroup Consultation questions from Workgroup Meeting 9.	WG10	New
55	WG9	GN	Update and provide the Proposer's draft Legal Text following Workgroup feedback.	WG10	New
56	WG9	KB	Prepare and submit the potential Alternative Request and supporting material for circulation before Workgroup Meeting 10.	WG10	New
57	WG9	AL	Provide high-level bullet points on the proposed order and justification for the executive summary for Code Administrator consideration.	WG10	New
58	WG9	KK	Prepare a revised modification timetable with the Proposer for Grid Code Review Panel approval.	WG10	New

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Keren Kelly	KK	Code Administrator	Chair
Ayo Bammeke	AB	Code Administrator	Technical Secretary
Matthew Larreta	ML	Code Administrator	Technical Secretary
Guy Nicholson	GN	Statkraft	Proposer
Alice Siri	AS	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Andrew Larkin	AL	Sygensys	Observer
Andrew Urquhart	AU	SSE	Workgroup Member

Public

Claire Newton	CN	NESO	Observer
Frank Kasibante	FK	NESO	Workgroup Member
Jesus Sanchez Cortes	JSC	NESO	NESO Subject Matter Expert (SME)
Rohit Alexander	RA	Statkraft	Workgroup Member
Tim Ellingham	TE	RWE	Workgroup Member