

Public

Code Administrator Meeting

Summary

Workgroup Meeting 2: GC0186: Proposed Grid Code Changes – Post Electricity System Restoration Standard (ESRS)

Date: 9 July 2026

Contact Details

Chair: Sarah Williams, sarah.williams@neso.energy

Proposer: Antony Johnson, antony.johnson@neso.energy

Key areas of discussion

The Workgroup reviewed open actions, the National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) presentation on protection system risks during Electricity System Restoration (ESR) testing, and the updated legal text for GC0186. Discussion focused on whether the proposed drafting clearly reflects the intent of the modification, maintains existing testing obligations, and provides sufficient clarity for future restoration arrangements.

Next: The Proposer will update the legal text to address Workgroup feedback on testing flexibility, confidentiality, offshore arrangements and restoration provider roles. The draft Workgroup Consultation Report will be shared for member review and comment ahead of the next meeting. The revised legal text and consultation material will be reviewed by the Workgroup on 6 August.

Action Log Review

The Workgroup ran through the open actions and discussed the status of each item, as detailed below.

- 1- AJ/SW. Closed
- 2- All. Closed
- 3- AJ/GL. Closed. Presentation by NGET at WG2. Summary of the presentation and discussion provided below.
- 4- SW. Closed.
- 5- AJ. Closed. New action opened for wording of terms of reference to be amended and taken to Panel for approval (Action 10: Amend the Terms of Reference by replacing “ensure” with “consider” and submit the updated version back to Panel).

Presentation – Protection System Risks during ESR Testing

NGET presented the rationale for proposed changes to ESR testing requirements in the Grid Code. The presentation explained that current restoration testing requirements can create protection

Public

challenges where tests require parts of the transmission network to be energised in isolation. In some cases, completing the defined test scope may require additional protection studies, protection setting changes, temporary protection arrangements, additional resource and extended outage windows, while providing limited additional assurance.

The proposed approach is intended to allow NESO and the relevant Transmission Owner or Network Operator to agree an appropriate energisation boundary for a test, rather than requiring a specific section of network to be energised in all circumstances. NGET and NESO clarified that the proposal is not intended to reduce testing obligations, but to provide flexibility where energising additional assets would not materially improve confidence in restoration capability.

Workgroup Members broadly supported the principle of introducing flexibility but raised questions about whether the legal drafting clearly reflected the intended arrangements. Particular concern was raised around the phrase “where technically feasible”, as this could be read as allowing a test not to proceed where technical issues are identified. NESO clarified that the intention is only to allow flexibility over the energisation point, not to exempt parties from carrying out required testing.

The Workgroup agreed that the drafting should be reviewed to remove ambiguity and ensure the modification cannot be interpreted as reducing testing obligations. Workgroup members also noted the importance of maintaining transparency over restoration testing, including whether information on the number and type of tests completed each year could be made available to industry.

Review of Legal Text and High-Level Issues Identified

The Proposer explained that comments received on the draft legal text had been reviewed and incorporated where appropriate. The updated drafting includes changes to the Glossary and Definitions, a new Planning Code section, revisions across OC5, OC9 and the European Connection Conditions, and a minor consequential change to Balancing Code 2.

The discussion identified several high-level points that require further consideration before the Workgroup Report is finalised. These included confidentiality arrangements within restoration planning documents, the extent to which restoration processes should be harmonised across GB, and how the modification should apply to future offshore restoration arrangements.

On confidentiality, members discussed whether the proposed arrangements for Local Joint Restoration Plans, Distribution Restoration Zone Plans and Regional Restoration Plans reflect the latest operational thinking. NESO clarified that Regional Restoration Plans are intended to be operational planning documents used by NESO, Transmission Owners and DNOs, and are not expected to be signed by restoration providers. The Proposer acknowledged that the legal

Public

drafting may need further review to ensure it reflects the intended roles of anchor, top-up and secondary restoration providers.

Workgroup members also discussed how GC0186 should apply to future offshore restoration arrangements, including offshore Generators, OFTOs, hybrid projects and interconnector-connected services. The Workgroup agreed that the report should explain which scenarios are intended to be within scope, and which are not, so consultees can understand the proposed application of the solution.

The Workgroup discussed the extent to which GC0186 should seek to harmonise restoration arrangements across GB. Members noted that regional differences remain, particularly in relation to the role of Scottish Transmission Owners during restoration. Some members questioned whether a single GB-wide approach would better support consistency, while the Proposer noted that full harmonisation may require broader consideration beyond the scope of this modification.

The following points remain to be developed further in the legal text and Workgroup Report:

- Whether the confidentiality arrangements fully reflect the intended roles of anchor, top-up and secondary restoration providers.
- Which parties should be signatories to each restoration planning document.
- How the modification should apply to offshore restoration providers, OFTOs, interconnectors and hybrid projects.

Next Steps

Following the discussion, the Proposer agreed to undertake a further review of the legal text to address the points raised by the Workgroup, including confidentiality arrangements, offshore and OFTO scenarios, block loading terminology and the interaction between anchor, top-up and secondary restoration providers. Once these updates have been completed, a revised version of the legal text will be circulated for a final Workgroup review.

In parallel, the Workgroup Consultation Report will be drafted and shared on the collaboration space for members to begin providing comments ahead of the next meeting. The Terms of Reference will be amended to replace "ensure" with "consider" and returned to Panel for approval.

The Proposer also confirmed that updates to the Connection Conditions will be deferred until the drafting of the European Connection Conditions is more mature. The revised legal text and draft consultation report will then be reviewed by the Workgroup at the next meeting on 06 August.

Public

Actions

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

Action Number	Workgroup	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
6	WG2	AJ	Discuss confidentiality arrangements and restoration provider participation with NESO colleagues to ensure the legal text reflects the latest thinking on anchor, top-up and secondary providers.	WG3	Open
7	WG2	AJ	Engage with NGET on protection-related points raised during the presentation to gain a view from protection specialists, including comments on alternative protection approaches.	WG3	Open
8	WG2	AJ	Update the legal text following the meeting discussions and recirculate a revised version to the Workgroup for further review, including legal text relating to offshore generators, OFTOs, hybrid projects and interconnector-connected restoration services, and review the “technically feasible” drafting to address Workgroup concerns and remove ambiguity.	WG3	Open
9	WG2	SW	Draft and circulate the Workgroup Consultation for Workgroup review, and populate it ahead of the next meeting.	WG3	Open
10	WG2	SW	Amend the Terms of Reference by replacing “ensure” with “consider” and submit the updated version back to Panel.	WG3	Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Sarah Williams	SW	NESO	Chair
Mollie Griffiths	MG	NESO	Tech Secretary

Public

Alan Creighton	AC	Northern Powergrid	Workgroup member alternate
Antony Johnson	AJ	NESO	Proposer
Andrew Mcleod	AM	Northern Powergrid	Workgroup member
Andrew Urquhart	AU	SSE	Workgroup member alternate
Belinda Gonzales	BG	Scottish Power Renewables	Workgroup member alternate
Ben Green	BGr	Orsted	Workgroup member
Susan Brush	SB	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Ethan Glennie	EG	Ocean Winds	Workgroup member alternate
Clare McVeigh	CM	Orsted	Workgroup Member (Alt)
Garth Graham	GG	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member
Graeme Vincent	GV	SP Energy Networks	Workgroup member
Jeevan Dhaliwal	JD	Energy Networks	DCODE Representative
John Knott	JK	SP Energy Networks	Workgroup member
Jonathan Lakey	JL	SP Energy Networks	Workgroup member
Kwaku Nti	KN	Perigus Energy	Workgroup observer
Leon Burdekin -Roberts	LBR	EDF Power Solutions	Workgroup member

Public

Paul Swan	PS	SSEN Transmission	Workgroup member
Paul Turner	PT	SP ENWL	Workgroup member
Ross McFarlane	RM	Northern Powergrid	Workgroup observer
Tim Ellingham	TE	RWE	Workgroup member
Priyant Kumar	PK	NESO	Workgroup observer
Llewellyn Hoenselaar	LH	NESO	Workgroup observer
Victor Ugbome	VU	NESO	Workgroup observer