

Public

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Workgroup Meeting 8: Enhance the Effectiveness of System Incidents Reporting

Date: 31 July 2026

Contact Details

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

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

Key areas of discussion

The Chair outlined the agenda for the meeting, including a review of the draft Legal Text, consideration of NESO comments, a review of the actions log, consideration of the Terms of Reference, discussion of the Workgroup Consultation plan, and a review of the timeline and future meeting dates.

The Chair noted that the meeting had originally been scheduled for 14 July but had been rescheduled due to limited availability of Workgroup members. They confirmed that an additional Workgroup member nomination had recently been received, which would improve quoracy for future Workgroup meetings.

The Proposer requested an update on the status of the Workgroup Consultation Report. The Chair confirmed that a draft Workgroup Consultation Report would be circulated to Workgroup members on 03 August.

Draft Legal Text review

Review of Reporting Frequency Provisions

The Workgroup reviewed NESO's comments relating to the proposed move from monthly to weekly publication of System Incident Reports. The NESO SME reiterated NESO's position that monthly reporting, with a one-month processing window, remains the shortest feasible reporting frequency. The NESO SME and NESO Workgroup member explained that report production involves investigation, verification, data collection, analysis and operational processes which constrain delivery timescales.

The Proposer disagreed with this position and stated that the purpose of the modification is to improve the timeliness of information available to industry. The Proposer maintained that weekly publication remains a core element of the proposal and explained that earlier access to information allows users to analyse incidents and identify trends more effectively.

Public

Workgroup members discussed whether alternative reporting frequencies could be considered and questioned whether investment in systems and processes would allow more frequent reporting to be achieved in the future. The NESO Workgroup member stated that they agreed with the principle of providing more timely data but highlighted current operational and delivery constraints. A Workgroup member expressed a desire for NESO to consider what is reasonably achievable, rather than anchoring positions in current capabilities.

Future Proofing of Data Reporting

The Proposer raised concerns regarding NESO comments on the proposed dataset requirement. The Proposer noted that NESO had previously taken an action to clarify terminology relating to online data portals and how data should be made available through the Legal Text, including consideration of data portals and APIs (Action 43). The Proposer stated that the Workgroup had previously requested drafting to ensure that the reporting arrangements were future proof and would not inadvertently limit future publication methods.

The Proposer explained that the intention was not to mandate a particular format but to allow future use of APIs, data portals or other technologies, without requiring future code changes. The NESO SME queried what problem was being addressed by the proposed drafting and whether there was an issue with the current reporting format. The Proposer clarified that the issue was not the current reporting format but ensuring that future reporting arrangements were not constrained by overly prescriptive Legal Text. The Proposer stated that the objective was to provide flexibility for NESO to utilise the most appropriate reporting tools and technologies in the future.

The NESO Workgroup member advised that NESO Legal had previously suggested that publication requirements could potentially be satisfied through a requirement to publish reports on the website without introducing a separate dataset obligation. The Proposer requested that NESO provide alternative drafting that would deliver the intended flexibility, whilst avoiding unnecessary prescription within the Legal Text. The Chair noted that Action 43 remained open and recorded that the issue of publication format should be considered as part of that action.

Voltage excursion reporting thresholds

The NESO SME explained that NESO did not support the proposed thresholds of below 0.85 p.u or above 1.1 p.u for one second or greater. They stated that these values are derived from equipment compliance and fault ride-through requirements rather than criteria currently used to identify significant system incidents, and questioned whether exceeding these thresholds should automatically constitute a reportable event.

Public

The Proposer explained that existing reporting thresholds have not generated meaningful reporting activity and argued that recent events in Iberia demonstrated the need to identify potential precursor conditions before major system incidents occur. The Proposer stated that reporting should help identify whether potentially concerning conditions are occurring more frequently and provide earlier visibility of emerging risks.

The Proposer stated that, if NESO considered the proposed thresholds inappropriate, the Workgroup would benefit from NESO proposing alternative thresholds together with supporting justification. The Proposer advised that, in the absence of alternative proposals, the proposed thresholds would remain within the modification.

The NESO SME agreed to discuss the matter further with colleagues and stated that the existing Grid Code contains voltage reporting limits and reporting periods, which NESO considered appropriate.

Phase Angle Reporting Thresholds

The Workgroup reviewed proposed requirements to report phase angle changes of 12 degrees or more occurring within 20 milliseconds. The NESO SME stated that NESO did not believe sufficient evidence had been provided to demonstrate why the selected values represented the most appropriate criteria for mandatory reporting. They explained that NESO was not rejecting the concept of phase angle reporting, but wished to understand the methodology used to derive the proposed thresholds before determining whether alternative values would be more appropriate.

Workgroup members discussed phase angle events, vector shift protection, international examples, and previous Workgroup evidence presented by a Workgroup member. A Workgroup member questioned whether it was necessary to identify a precise threshold before introducing reporting and suggested that the purpose was to establish monitoring of relevant events.

The Proposer noted that substantial effort had been invested by Workgroup members in developing supporting evidence and stated that, where NESO disagreed with the proposed thresholds, the Workgroup would benefit from alternative proposals or supporting drafting being provided.

Workgroup Consultation

The Chair confirmed that it was acceptable for differences of opinion to be shared within Workgroup meetings and that these should be reflected in the Workgroup Consultation,

Public

so that industry could comment on them.

The NESO Workgroup member suggested that the Workgroup may benefit from further discussion on OC3.6, proposing that drafting improvements could be developed following discussion with NESO Legal, particularly in areas where NESO considered the proposal to be workable. They confirmed that discussions with NESO Legal were expected the following week and indicated that NESO intended to share proposed wording after those discussions, particularly in areas where agreement could be identified.

Revised Timeline

The Chair explained that a revised timeline will be presented for approval at the August Grid Code Review Panel. They confirmed that the draft Workgroup Consultation will be shared with Workgroup members on 03 August, in readiness for Workgroup 9 on 10 August and asked for views on whether it was realistic to review the Consultation document within one week.

A Workgroup member stated that one week was a tight timeframe, particularly because the document would need to clearly explain what was possible, what remained disputed, and the balance of views within the Workgroup. The Proposer and other Workgroup members confirmed that they supported retaining the 10 August Workgroup meeting to maintain momentum. The Chair stated that the expectation was that the Workgroup Consultation would not be finalised at that Workgroup meeting, noting that additional drafting and discussion time would be needed.

The Chair confirmed that the 03 September had been suggested as a potential date for Workgroup meeting 10 but this would be confirmed.

Consultation Questions

The Chair asked Workgroup members to consider whether any specific consultation questions should be added as part of their review of the draft Workgroup Consultation document. The Proposer stated that the proposed thresholds and new reporting triggers should be included in the consultation questions, so that industry could provide views on whether the proposed values were appropriate or whether different values should be used.

The Chair confirmed that supporting information previously presented to the Workgroup, including papers and supplementary material, would be included as annexes to the

Public

draft Workgroup Consultation, so that respondents could consider the wider evidence base when responding.

Terms of Reference

The Chair stated that one of the forthcoming Workgroup meetings will include a review of progress against the Terms of Reference, to determine which of the Terms of Reference had been covered and whether any areas remained outstanding.

Next Steps

The Chair confirmed that the draft Workgroup Consultation would be shared on 03 August, to enable Workgroup members to review as much as possible before Workgroup meeting 9 on 10 August. They also noted that the actions log would be updated and reviewed during Workgroup 9.

Actions

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

Action Number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Date 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.	WG8	Open
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.	WG8	Open
36	WG5	FK/JSC	Map current and planned PMU locations to restoration regions and provide a clear visual representation, including coverage	WG8	Open

Public

			of HVDC links and bootstraps, to ensure comprehensive system monitoring.		
43	WG6	SMC	Review terminology for online data portals and system restoration regions. Further clarification is required on how data should be made available e.g. via data portal or API, within the Legal Text.	WG8	Open
47	WG6	SMC	Explore feasibility of defining “auto-reclosure”.	WG8	Open
50	WG7	SMC	Provide a single, consistent source/list for BMU, GSP, and transmission circuit names.	WG8	Open
51	WG7	SMC/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.	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	New

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Keren Kelly	KK	Code Administrator	Chair
Matthew Larreta	ML	Code Administrator	Technical Secretary
Guy Nicholson	GN	Statkraft	Proposer
Andrew Allan	AA	RWE	Workgroup Member

Public

Andrew Urquhart	AU	SSE	Workgroup Member
Arshad Anwar	AA	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Frank Kasibante	FK	NESO	Workgroup Member
Jesus Sanchez Cortes	JSC	NESO	NESO Subject Matter Expert (SME)
Mathew Chandy	MC	EDF Energy	Workgroup Member