

Public

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Workgroup Meeting 11: Enhance the Effectiveness of System Incidents Reporting

Date: 21 September 2026

Contact Details

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

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

Meeting purpose

The meeting focused principally on reviewing version 0.4 of the Workgroup Consultation, closing or updating existing actions and identifying the remaining drafting required before publication. The Workgroup reviewed the general and element-specific consideration sections and discussed the intended consultation questions. The updated Legal Text was noted but not substantively reviewed.

Key areas of discussion

Welcome, introductions and meeting objectives

The Chair confirmed that the priority was to bring the Workgroup Consultation to a standard suitable for publication on 01 October 2026. The agenda also included the Action Log, Legal Text, Terms of Reference and next steps, although the Workgroup Consultation review occupied most of the meeting.

Actions Log Review

Actions 36 and 63

The NESO Representative confirmed that SPT had provided PMU deployment information and consented to its public use. Equivalent consent or information remained outstanding from NGET and SSEN Transmission. The Workgroup agreed that the available SPT information could be used without delaying the consultation while the remaining information was pursued.

Outcome: Actions 36 and 63 remained open pending further information from NGET and SSEN Transmission. The SPT information could be included in the consultation.

Actions 43, 50 and 51

For Action 43, the Workgroup confirmed that no specific publication tool should be prescribed and that the drafting should retain flexibility for a downloadable, accessible or API-based format. A further discussion with the relevant NESO data-portal colleagues was

Public

proposed after consultation. Action 50 was closed on the basis that Elexon BMU IDs and the relevant ETYS naming convention would be used, with the approach to be clarified following consultation feedback and Legal Text development.

The high-level PMU architecture diagram satisfied Action 51 and that action was closed. However, an Observer requested further information on the data carried through the architecture, including voltage and phase-angle data, where data is stored and its retention. The Observer agreed to provide the specific request in writing, and the NESO Representative agreed to seek additional information.

Outcome: Actions 43, 50 and 51 were closed. A new action was required for the additional PMU architecture and data-flow information.

Actions 52 and 53

The NESO Representative confirmed that the requested historic voltage-excursion data could not be provided at the requested granularity because the current SCADA reporting rate did not support it. Workgroup members distinguished current data availability from the proposal's intention to require reporting when suitable PMU and wide-area monitoring data became available. The Proposer confirmed that the draft would proceed using the best information currently available.

Outcome: Actions 52 and 53 were closed. The Workgroup Consultation would state the present data limitation and explain that reporting would develop as relevant data became available.

Remaining actions

Actions 55, 59, 60, 61 and 64 were closed because updated Legal Text, the solution-element list, the restructured Workgroup Consultation and Workgroup member comments had been provided. Action 56 remained open for the NESO Representative to consider a formal Alternative Request after the Workgroup Consultation. Action 62 was closed after the Chair confirmed that published System Incident Reports are shared with Grid Code Review Panel members each month, although they are not a standing agenda item.

A further action was agreed for the Proposer to consider how the expected use of monthly and annual reporting by the Grid Code Review Panel and SQSS Panel should be clarified. The Workgroup noted that each Panel's role and responsibilities had a different scope but both would still have interest in the proposed reporting..

- **Action 36 | Open:** SPT information had been received and approved for public use. NGET and SSEN Transmission information and consent remained outstanding.

Public

- **Action 43 | Closed:** No specific publication tool was identified. The solution should preserve flexibility for an accessible, downloadable or API-based format. Further portal engagement would be addressed separately after consultation.
- **Action 50 | Closed:** Elexon BMU IDs and the relevant ETYS naming convention would be used. The approach required clarification in the Workgroup Consultation and Legal Text.
- **Action 51 | Closed:** A high-level architecture diagram was provided. A separate new action was created for additional information on data types, storage and retention.
- **Action 52 | Closed:** The NESO Representative confirmed that the requested historic voltage-excursion data could not be provided at the requested granularity.
- **Action 53 | Closed:** The NESO Representative confirmed that it could not provide data at the requested granularity to support further refinement of the proposed thresholds.
- **Action 55 | Closed:** Updated Legal Text was provided before the meeting.
- **Action 56 | Open / Amended:** The NESO Representative would consider an Alternative Request after reviewing Workgroup Consultation responses.
- **Actions 59, 60 and 61 | Closed:** The element list was incorporated, the Workgroup Consultation was restructured and comments were provided.
- **Action 62 | Closed:** The Chair confirmed how reports are provided to the Grid Code Review Panel and recorded the scope for further clarification of the Panel's expected use of them.
- **Action 63 | Open / Amended:** The action remained linked to Action 36 while further Transmission Owner information was sought.
- **Action 64 | Closed:** Updated Legal Text was provided.

Review of Workgroup Consultation version 0.4

Cover, impact summary and executive summary

The Chair explained that version 0.4 consolidated comments and edits made in the collaborative version and offline. The Workgroup accepted clarificatory amendments to the cover and opening sections. NESO was to be added as an impacted party, while the level of impact remained uncertain. Members also identified possible impacts on Transmission Owners and parties providing DSM and PQM data and supported a consultation question seeking evidence on those impacts.

The executive summary would include the relevant background from the [GC0105](#) decision and clarify that the proposal sought both better data for system-wide analysis and faster

Public

reporting for affected parties. The interaction with the STC and STCP 27-1 would be described as potentially beneficial to delivery, but not a dependency on GC0181.

Issue, solution and supporting context

The Chair and Proposer agreed to refine the description of the issue offline, using the comments received to improve clarity without changing the defect. The Workgroup agreed to include the relevant Energy Data Task Force reference and to remove or generalise named asset-owner examples where identification was unnecessary.

The Workgroup Consultation would distinguish the Proposer's initial solution from the solution developed through Workgroup discussion. The position of annual reporting in the initial or developed solution would be checked against the original proposal. Defined terms, acronyms and capitalisation would also be reviewed consistently across the document.

Solution elements and Legal Text traceability

The Workgroup supported retaining the 19-element presentation. The Proposer agreed that each element should be linked to the relevant Legal Text provision, potentially through a table or annex. The Chair also agreed to introduce section numbering to improve navigation. The Legal Text itself was not substantively reviewed.

Outcome: The element-based approach was retained. Legal Text traceability and navigation improvements were to be added before publication.

Current process, evidence and annexes

The Workgroup supported including screenshots and examples of current System Incident Reports, with the Proposer offering to provide further examples of frequency and voltage information. The previous description of NESO's reporting-process task breakdown would no longer be labelled confidential. Earlier meeting materials, the current-process flowchart, historical event data and cost-benefit material would be linked where relevant. The previously presented process Gantt charts had been added as annexes.

The Workgroup agreed that the PMU architecture diagram should be linked or annexed and that the current uncertainty about impacts on NESO, Transmission Owners and other affected parties should be stated. A Workgroup Consultation question would seek evidence on those impacts.

Data sharing, confidentiality and interactions

Discussion on embedded generation loss was to be moved to the Rate of Change of Frequency (RoCoF) element because the proposed RoCoF trigger was intended to identify

Public

events where embedded losses might otherwise be unseen. The Workgroup Consultation would also link the discussion on Ofgem's data best-practice guidance to the earlier Workgroup material where it had been presented.

Workgroup members supported a broad Workgroup Consultation question on confidentiality and commercial sensitivity, allowing generators and other affected parties to explain any concerns. The Chair agreed to check the earlier NESO data-triage material and ensure that the Workgroup Consultation accurately described the relevant classification approach. The stated PMU rollout period also required clarification, including whether it referred to a calendar year or charging year.

Generic and element-specific considerations

The Workgroup agreed to retain separate generic and element-specific consideration sections, using cross-references to reduce duplication. Other reporting practices, implementation considerations and the respective roles of the Grid Code Review Panel and SQSS Panel would be moved or expanded in the generic section. The Proposer asked for a brief reference to the April 2025 Iberian blackout, particularly the role of PMUs in post-event analysis..

The Workgroup then reviewed the 19 elements. Key points included clarifying the current and proposed reporting periods; using consistent Grid Code terminology for Business Days where appropriate; adding NESO's position to the relevant elements; reducing overly long drafting where possible; linking [GC0105](#) and [GC0151](#) to the relevant OC provisions; checking PMU rollout dates; and adding further text where element-specific discussion was limited.

For the RoCoF trigger, the Proposer stated that the appropriate threshold remained under consideration and may fall between 0.1 Hz/s and 0.25 Hz/s. The Workgroup Consultation would make that uncertainty clear rather than present a settled figure. The wording on potential cascade failures was retained because it already reflected uncertainty about causality.

Workgroup Consultation questions and next steps

The Proposer explained that the specific questions were intended to seek feedback on each of the 19 elements. The Workgroup supported that approach but did not complete a detailed collective review of every question. The question on publication format would be strengthened to ask how industry wished to receive System Incident Report data.

The Chair concluded that the remaining drafting could be progressed by email rather than through a further full Workgroup meeting based on feedback from the Workgroup. The Chair would consolidate the meeting changes and share a revised draft with the Proposer. The Chair and Proposer agreed to have a short check-in meeting, after which the revised consultation would be issued to Workgroup members for confirmation that it

Public

accurately reflected the discussion. The planned publication date remains 01 October 2026.

Outcome: No further full Workgroup meeting was scheduled before publication. Final drafting, consultation questions and confirmation would be managed offline, with a short Chair-Proposer check-in.

Legal Text and Terms of Reference

The Proposer had provided updated Legal Text before the meeting. The Workgroup referred to it when discussing naming conventions, annual reporting, reporting thresholds and traceability, but did not undertake a clause-by-clause review. The Terms of Reference were shown in the meeting slides but were not substantively reviewed.

Next Steps

- The Chair would consolidate the agreed Workgroup Consultation updates and share a revised draft with the Proposer.
- The Chair and Proposer would hold a short check-in on Wednesday morning to review the remaining drafting.
- The revised Workgroup Consultation would then be issued to Workgroup members for confirmation that it accurately reflected the Workgroup discussion.
- Legal Text traceability could continue in parallel and did not need to be complete for the Chair-Proposer check-in.
- The planned Workgroup Consultation publication date remains 01 October 2026.

Actions

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

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

Public

Action number	Workgroup raised	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
43	WG6	SMC	Review terminology for online data portals and System Restoration Regions.	WG7	Closed
50	WG7	SMC	Provide a single, consistent source/list for BMU, GSP, and transmission circuit names.	WG8	Closed
51	WG7	JSC	Develop and share a high-level architecture diagram showing information flow from PMU rollout to NESO systems.	WG8	Closed
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	Closed
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	Closed
55	WG9	GN	Update and provide the Proposer's draft Legal Text following Workgroup feedback.	WG10	Closed
56	WG9	FK	Amended at WG10: ensure NESO's developing different approach is accurately described in the Workgroup Consultation; consider a formal Alternative Request after consultation.	WG10	Open / Amended
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	Closed

Public

Action number	Workgroup raised	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
60	WG10	KK	Restructure the Workgroup Consultation around the solution elements and issue version 0.3.	11 September	Closed
61	WG10	All WG members	Review version 0.3 and provide comments.	17 September	Closed
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	Closed
63	WG10	FK	Seek available tabular or mapped PMU deployment information to support Action 36 and the consultation.	WG11	Open / Amended
64	WG10	GN	Provide updated Legal Text	WG11	Closed
65	WG11	AL	Provide a written request specifying the additional information required on PMU data flows, including data types, storage and retention.	WG12	New
66	WG11	FK	Seek the additional PMU architecture and data-flow information requested under Action 65.	WG12	New
67	WG11	KK / FK	Arrange engagement between the Proposer and the relevant NESO data-portal colleagues after consultation to consider publication format and any related Legal Text refinement.	post-WG Consultation	New
68	WG11	GN	Consider drafting to clarify the expected use of new reporting by the Grid Code Review Panel, taking account of the respective responsibilities of the Grid Code Review Panel and SQSS Panel.	WG12	New

Public

Action number	Workgroup raised	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
69	WG11	KK	Update the Workgroup Consultation to reflect the drafting changes and follow-ups identified during Workgroup Meeting 11, and issue the revised version for final Workgroup confirmation.	01 October	New
70	WG11	GN	Provide additional examples of current System Incident Report outputs, including available frequency and voltage material.	01 October	New
71	WG11	GN / KK	Map the 19 solution elements to the relevant Legal Text provisions.	01 October	New
72	WG11	FK	Review and add concise NESO positions to the element-specific consideration sections and review the consultation questions.	01 October	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
Ahmed Koriem	AK	NESO	Observer
Andrew Larkins	AL	Sygensys	Observer
Andrew Urquhart	AU	SSE	Workgroup Member

Public

Calum Watkins	CW	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Frank Kasibante	FK	NESO	Workgroup Member
Gareth Williams	GW	SPT – on behalf of the STC Panel	Workgroup Member
Jesus Sanchez Cortes	JSC	NESO	Observer
Matthew Ball	MB	EDF Energy	Workgroup Member
Rohit Alexander	RA	Statkraft	Workgroup Member
Tim Ellingham	TE	RWE	Workgroup Member