

Public

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Workgroup Meeting 10: Enhance the Effectiveness of System Incidents Reporting

Date: 3 September 2026

Contact Details

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

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

Meeting purpose

The Workgroup meeting focused on progressing the Workgroup Consultation for publication. The Workgroup reviewed the revised timetable, considered the timing of a potential Alternative being considered by NESO, reviewed the structure and content of an updated Workgroup Consultation, considered a proposed element-based presentation of the solution, and reviewed selected open actions.

Key areas of discussion

Welcome, introductions and meeting objectives

The Chair welcomed attendees and confirmed that the meeting would prioritise the Workgroup Consultation, with updates also covering the potential Alternative being considered by NESO, draft Legal Text, Terms of Reference and actions. The Chair reported that the Grid Code Review Panel had approved a revised timetable on 27 August 2026. This included a further Workgroup meeting on 21 September 2026, Workgroup Consultation from 01 to 22 October 2026 and submission of the Workgroup Report to the Panel in February 2027.

The Chair confirmed that future meeting invitations, including the meeting on 21 September 2026, would be issued after the meeting.

Potential Alternative Request

Status and proposed timing

The NESO Representative explained that the potential Alternative Request required further internal review. Following discussion and evolving feedback from the Workgroup, NESO confirmed that it did not plan to submit an Alternative Request before the Workgroup Consultation.

Public

Treatment in the Workgroup Consultation

The Workgroup agreed that the Workgroup Consultation should instead describe NESO's developing position as a different approach, making clear that it was not a formal Alternative Request or Workgroup Alternative Grid Code Modification.

NESO would consider the Workgroup Consultation responses before deciding whether to submit an Alternative Request at a later stage.

Outcome: NESO would not submit an Alternative Request before the Workgroup Consultation. The Consultation would describe NESO's different approach without presenting it as a formal Alternative. The existing action would be updated accordingly.

Review of Workgroup Consultation

Review approach and accessibility

The Chair noted that comments had been added to the collaboration-space version and that offline copies had been shared with Workgroup Members for their review and comment. The Chair explained that version 0.2 had been reorganised to introduce key themes and link Workgroup discussion to the proposed Legal Text requirements. Workgroup members supported drafting for those in industry outside of the Workgroup and asked for clear references to earlier Workgroup meeting papers and summaries where supporting material had been presented.

The Proposer offered additional background material on the origins of GC0105 and the history of System Incident Reporting. The Chair agreed that useful background should be included but would determine its most appropriate location in the document.

Defect wording and distinction between system-wide and site-specific analysis

The NESO SME considered that wording stating that industry parties were "unable" to investigate system disturbances promptly or accurately was too absolute, because affected parties held their own monitoring information and would investigate events at their connection points. An Observer explained that timely system-wide information remained valuable where an event was remote from a site or did not trigger local recording equipment. The Proposer agreed that the existing process should be described as capable of improvement rather than as non-functional.

A Workgroup member emphasised that the defect remained the Proposer's stated case and that differing views should be recorded later in the consultation. The NESO Representative suggested softening the wording to "could be unable" or similar. After further discussion, wording along the lines that parties "may have some difficulty" carrying out effective analysis was proposed. The Proposer agreed that "unable" should be changed.

Public

The Workgroup also distinguished between the fixed scope of the defect and the evolving solution. The Chair confirmed that the defect could be clarified for the reader but should not be materially changed, whereas the Workgroup could develop the solution. The Proposer agreed to revise the sections of the consultation describing the Proposer's defect and proposed solution using that distinction.

Outcome: The Workgroup Consultation was to distinguish system-wide information from the site-specific information that Users collect for their own compliance and investigation. The defect would be clarified but not expanded.

Interactions and external material

The Workgroup supported identifying System Operator Transmission Owner Code Procedure (STCP) 27-1 as an interaction. The NESO Representative considered that later clarification or amendment to STCP 27-1 might be required to keep references to PMU standards sufficiently neutral as standards and equipment evolved. The Proposer stated that GC0181 should not be dependent on completing other Code Modifications and should allow reporting to improve as data and processes became available. Similar treatment was discussed for any future need to obtain improved data from Distribution Network Operators.

A Workgroup member proposed a transparent statement that the Workgroup had not yet considered the post-event regulatory review of the operation and management of the electricity system because its findings were unavailable. Members supported this. The Workgroup also discussed written Operational Transparency Forum (OTF) questions and responses concerning frequency excursions, System Incident Reports and inertia data. The Chair agreed to reference the relevant questions, responses and specific slide locations where appropriate.

Outcome: The Workgroup Consultation would explain relevant interactions, make clear that later changes to other arrangements should not delay GC0181, and identify material that had not yet been considered. Relevant OTF material was to be referenced where verified.

Proposer's drafting input and development of the solution

The Proposer asked which sections required further drafting input from them. The Chair confirmed that the description of the defect and proposed solution could be updated for clarity, while retaining the original scope. The draft would distinguish between the Proposer's original proposal and the updated solution developed through the Workgroup process. The Proposer agreed to provide revised drafting material to the Code Administrator for consideration in the next version of the Workgroup Consultation.

Public

Evidence, current process and supporting material

The Proposer asked for examples or screenshots of current System Incident Reports and for the Workgroup Consultation to include concise quantitative information on the current reporting process, rather than only stating that information had previously been presented. The NESO SME agreed to consider what data could be added without overwhelming the document. Members also supported linking to the relevant Workgroup meeting papers and summaries and including the process Gantt charts as an annex.

An Observer questioned how the existing requirement to provide System Incident Reports to the Grid Code Review Panel was reflected in the process. The NESO Representative understood that the Panel received links through its papers, but noted uncertainty about whether the reports were discussed or clearly visible to industry. The Chair accepted an action to confirm the position with the Panel Secretary and improve public clarity where necessary.

The Workgroup accepted drafting changes to the cost-benefit, NESO impact and Transmission Owner impact sections as broadly representative of earlier discussions. The high-level solution architecture remained unavailable and was expected after consultation. References to the Energy Data Task Force and Transmission Licence condition D2 were supported, subject to editorial verification of the exact source and title.

Outcome: The next iteration of the Workgroup Consultation document was to include clearer source references, selected evidence and examples, the process charts as supporting material, and clarification of how reports are provided to the Grid Code Review Panel.

Element-based presentation of the Proposer's solution

The Chair explained that the current version of the Workgroup Consultation had attempted to organise discussion around the proposed Legal Text drafting. The Proposer presented a high-level list of 19 proposed solution requirements which the Workgroup described as 'elements':

1. Move from Monthly to Weekly reporting (to move the availability of data closer to real time).
2. Move from reporting up to 3 months after the event to reporting [5] working days after the event (to move availability of data closer to real time).
3. Allow NESO extra time in exceptional circumstances.
4. Improve the data reporting format(s), consistency and quality (to better enable automated analysis of both single events and overall trends).

Public

5. Include a duty to report known data only (given that NESO may not always have data or the capability to analyse and track data, and to allow NESO to improve reporting over time as technology and data processing and automation evolves).
6. Including frequency data in reports at 100ms (vs 1s now) and from 7 different regions (to improve accuracy of ROCOF calculations and have regional ROCOF, improving the analysis of events).
7. Update frequency reporting from a single GB region, 1s data set, provided monthly to 7 new regional frequency measurements at 100ms provided 1 hour after real time (improving data availability to industry to analyse events closer to real time).
8. Include data from PMUs (Phasor Measurement Units) in reporting (PMUs have been installed on the NETS and have proved to be vital overseas e.g. in analysing events such as the Iberian Blackout in April 2025).
9. Improve OC3 by updating and coordinating previous changes made in GC0105 and GC0151.
10. Change the triggers for reporting requirements for voltage events (as no voltage events have been reported).
11. Add reporting when there is a significant change in phase angle (i.e. a phase angle jump / vector shift).
12. Add reporting whenever there is a ROCOF exceeding 0.25Hz/s to report events when infeed/exceed losses may be unknown, or uncertain in whole or in part.
13. Add reporting of sub-synchronous oscillations (noting these were implicated in the Iberian Blackout April 2025).
14. Update the duration of data reported before and after events (to increase efficiency and the focus on relevant data).
15. Improve the detail of reported of inertia data (to aid a clearer understanding of the different sources of inertia on the system at specific events).
16. Include DSM and PQM from plants that have tripped.
17. Include the tripping of HVDC transmission links (which NESO are not currently reporting, and which were a key factor in the 22 December 2023 event and will play a much bigger part in the future NETS).
18. Require bespoke NESO analysis of events where there may have been cascade failures (e.g. events occurring within a certain time of each other).
19. Include an annual report (so that NESO is tracking and reporting trends with the aim of identifying issues before they become critical and present report to SQSS and GCRP).

Public

Members considered the element-based structure clearer and more accessible. The NESO Representative supported the list but requested that each element also record the relevant Workgroup discussion and differing views. A Workgroup member suggested using each element as a heading in the Workgroup consideration section, enabling targeted consultation questions and clearer comparison with any future alternative. The Chair agreed that the list should present the solution requirements at a high level, with the detailed Legal Text and discussion supporting each element.

The Proposer noted that some elements, including reporting of HVDC link trips, required further Legal Text development and that precise thresholds and parameters would need to be linked to the relevant clauses. No final Legal Text was agreed during the meeting.

Outcome: The Workgroup agreed to restructure the Workgroup Consultation around the Proposer's high-level solution elements, supported by the relevant Legal Text, evidence and differing views. The Proposer was to provide the list immediately after the meeting and update their proposed Legal Text. The Code Administrator was to rework the Workgroup Consultation accordingly.

Consultation questions

The Workgroup agreed that specific consultation questions should be reconsidered once the element-based structure had been incorporated. Questions could then be targeted at elements where further industry evidence was needed. Workgroup members noted that questions should remain neutral, distinguish current use of OC3 data from possible future use under GC0181 and consider confidentiality where relevant.

Outcome: The consultation questions remained for further drafting and review in version 0.3.

Timetable and next steps for Workgroup Consultation drafting

The NESO Representative encouraged all members to review the next Workgroup Consultation draft because only ten working days remained before the next meeting. The Workgroup agreed that the Code Administrator would issue an updated Workgroup Consultation by 11 September 2026. Members would provide comments by 5pm on 17 September 2026, allowing consolidation before the meeting on 21 September 2026.

The Chair stated that the meeting on 21 September 2026 might be extended and that a short contingency meeting could be arranged later that week if any publication-critical issue remained unresolved. The target consultation publication date remained 01 October 2026.

Public

Actions Log Review

The Workgroup reviewed Actions 34, 35 and 36. The remaining actions were not substantively reviewed because of time constraints. The NESO Representative offered to provide written commentary on Actions 43, 50, 51, 52, 53 and 56 before the next meeting.

- **Action 34 | Closed:** The NESO Representative stated that STCP 27-1 might require later clarification so that new PMUs could comply with current standards without mandating replacement of existing equipment installed to earlier standards. The Chair proposed closing the GC0181 action because the remaining work would be progressed separately and GC0181 was not dependent on it. The NESO Representative agreed.
- **Action 35 | Closed:** The NESO Representative stated that wider alignment work involving the STC and STCPs would continue after GC0181. The Chair proposed the same treatment as Action 34 and the NESO Representative agreed.
- **Action 36 | Open:** The NESO Representative explained that the earlier PMU map had been considered insufficient and that producing a complete mapping would require further work with Transmission Owners. A Workgroup member suggested obtaining tabular deployment information. The STC Panel representative agreed to assist, and the Chair confirmed that the Code Administrator would follow up. The Proposer and an Observer considered the information important for informed Workgroup Consultation responses. The Chair confirmed that the action would remain open.
- **Action 43 | Open:** Not substantively reviewed. The NESO Representative stated that written commentary would be provided before the next Workgroup meeting.
- **Action 50 | Open:** Not substantively reviewed. The NESO Representative stated that written commentary would be provided before the next Workgroup meeting.
- **Action 51 | Open:** The NESO Representative stated during the Workgroup Consultation review that the high-level architecture material had not yet been obtained and that the action remained open. The material was considered most likely to be available after consultation.
- **Action 52 | Open:** Not substantively reviewed. The NESO Representative stated that written commentary would be provided before the next Workgroup meeting.
- **Action 53 | Open:** Not substantively reviewed. The NESO Representative stated that written commentary would be provided before the next Workgroup meeting.
- **Action 54 | Closed:** Version 0.2 of the Workgroup Consultation had been issued and reviewed at the Workgroup meeting.
- **Action 55 | Open:** The Proposer confirmed that Workgroup Consultation sections describing the Proposer's original proposal, proposed solution and draft Legal Text required further updating, and asked the Chair to confirm the submission deadline.

Public

- **Action 56 | Amended:** The Workgroup agreed that a formal NESO Alternative Request was no longer required before the Workgroup Consultation. The immediate requirement was to describe NESO's developing approach accurately in the Workgroup Consultation. NESO would consider a formal Alternative after the Workgroup Consultation.
- **Action 57 | Closed:** The relevant high-level structure and drafting comments had been provided and considered.
- **Action 58 | Closed:** The revised modification timetable had been approved by the Grid Code Review Panel on 27 August 2026.

Next Steps

- The Chair would issue a revised version of the Workgroup Consultation by **11 September 2026**, incorporating the Proposer's high-level solution elements and updated drafting.
- Workgroup members were asked to review the revised consultation and provide comments by **5pm on 17 September 2026**.
- The Workgroup would review the consolidated draft at its next meeting on **21 September 2026**, with the aim of publishing the Workgroup Consultation on **01 October 2026**.

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 necessary changes. Written summary still required.	WG10	Closed
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.	WG10	Closed

Public

Action number	Workgroup raised	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
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 thresholds and provide feedback to the Workgroup.	WG9	Open
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	Closed

Public

Action number	Workgroup raised	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
55	WG9	GN	Update and provide the Proposer's draft Legal Text following Workgroup feedback.	WG10	Open
56	WG9	KB	Amended at WG10: ensure NESO's developing different approach is accurately described in the consultation; consider a formal Alternative Request after consultation.	WG10	Open / Amended
57	WG9	AL	Provide high-level bullet points on the proposed order and justification for the executive summary for Code Administrator consideration.	WG10	Closed
58	WG9	KK	Prepare a revised modification timetable with the Proposer for Grid Code Review Panel approval.	WG10	Closed
59	WG10	GN	Provide the high-level list of solution elements and revised drafting material on the Proposer's original proposal, proposed solution and draft Legal Text, for incorporation into the Workgroup Consultation.	WG11	New
60	WG10	KK	Restructure the Workgroup Consultation around the solution elements and issue version 0.3.	11 September	New
61	WG10	All WG members	Review version 0.3 and provide comments.	17 September	New
62	WG10	KK	Confirm with the Grid Code Review Panel Secretary how System Incident Reports are provided to the Panel and how public visibility can be improved.	WG11	New
63	WG10	KK / GW	Seek available tabular or mapped PMU deployment information to	WG11	New

Public

Action number	Workgroup raised	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
			support Action 36 and the consultation.		

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 Larkins	AL	Sygensys	Observer
Andrew Butler	ABU	NESO	Observer
Frank Kasibante	FK	NESO	Workgroup Member
Gareth Williams	GW	SPT – on behalf of the STC Panel	Workgroup Member
Garth Graham	GG	SSE	Workgroup Member
Jeno Abraham-Kodmon	JAK	NESO	NESO Subject Matter Expert (SME)
Mathew Chandy	MC	EDF Energy	Workgroup Member
Rohit Alexander	RA	Statkraft	Workgroup Member
Tim Ellingham	TE	RWE	Workgroup Member